

Luther Battles the Fanatics

Arnold J. Koelpin

1483 - 1983

THE QUINCENTENARY OF LUTHER'S BIRTH

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary,
Mequon, Wisconsin
November 1, 1983

What made Martin Luther tick? That question undoubtedly is on the minds of all who pause this year to celebrate the quincentenary of the Reformer's birth. The answer often mirrors the respondent's own historical reflections, much like the person who seeks to find another in the murky waters of a deep well, and, looking down, sees his own face instead.

A popular tract distributed in the Minnesota archdiocese in our generation makes this assessment of Luther:

Psychologically, he was a strange character, almost a Jekyll and Hyde by turns. In religious moments his imagination poured itself out in poetry and hymns. But these, and many other beautiful passages that can be gathered from the writings of Luther, were merely the remnants of his Catholic inheritance. In sensual moments, he wallowed in his passions. . . . In belligerent moments he was stubborn to a degree, and flayed his opponents with violent streams of abuse. Luther's greatness was neither a truly human greatness, nor a truly Christian greatness. It was merely, as Maritain and Fisher have pointed out, an animal greatness - a greatness of force, energy, and vehemence of character.ⁱ

Is this then the way we are to understand this "German Hercules" who lashed out against pope and fanatic, Jew and peasant alike? How do we explain a man who at the same time tenderly admonishes, "You have Christ in your neighbor. You ought to serve him, for what you do to your neighbor in need you do to the Lord Christ himself"?ⁱⁱ

Luther himself provides a clue to what makes him tick. It can be found underneath the canopy stones in Katherine's portal of the Augustinian monastery. There is carved the face of Martin Luther and surrounding it is the motto he chose to be set in stone. It reads: IN SILENTIO ET SPE ERIT FORTITUDO VESTRA - "in quietness and hope is your strength."ⁱⁱⁱ

A meaningless motto, unfit for a fighter? By no means! This Old Testament scholar carefully chose words from the prophet Isaiah, whose situation in life matched his own. Both were caught in the midst of a struggle on two fronts: Isaiah between the superpowers of Assyria and Egypt, Luther between the papacy and the fanatics. Both sought strength, not in the choice of sides, but in the quietness of faith. The clue to understanding the Reformer, as his watchword indicates, is simply to be found in a willingness to wait for the Lord to act, by listening to God's Word and trusting his ways. "With closed eyes," Luther once wrote, "[Abraham] hid himself in the darkness of faith, and there he found eternal light."^{iv} The good Doctor followed the same course:

Did he really? How then does Luther, ebullient by nature, presume to act in quietness and reliance on God's Word? Others made similar claims. The spiritualists of his day also found strength in quietness and likewise cited Scripture as their guide. "Scripture speaks of a tranquility which is a means of coming to God," explained Hans Denck, a free spirit from Nuremberg, and then identified that means as "Christ himself, not to be regarded physically, but rather spiritually."^v Luther condemned him as a fanatic.

Why? Why did Luther not make common cause with such free spirits? What moved him to call them fanatics and enthusiasts? How did the two really differ? What is enthusiasm anyway? These questions drive us to the core of the battle between Luther and the fanatics. To understand, we must take Luther in context and there learn to appreciate more fully the truth of the saying: "What do they know of Luther who only Luther know?" Our insights into this historical encounter can do more than help us identify what made Luther tick. They can especially alert us to the radical nature of Luther's own theology. "For we must not think of the Reformation as though Martin Luther were the norm, and all else deviation from the Lutheran party line" scolds the English historian E. Gordon Rupp, and then explains himself:

For it is really Luther who is the great surprise. The medievalist, familiar enough with anti-clericalism, mysticism, and moralism, finds nothing very surprising in a Von Hutten, Carlstadt, Müntzer, or even Zwingli. But Luther is disconcerting, with his heights and depths of exploration of the Biblical world, his poised and balanced Middle Way between Popery and Puritanism, a more genuine "Via Media" than the Anglican muddle of principle and expediency. I say, he is the surprise. He gave the whole Reformation movement a new thrust and direction. But for him, Puritanism would have swallowed up Protestantism, and the whole matter of the Reformation might have dissolved in a new legalism in religion, and in sectarian strife.^{vi}

In his own inimitable way Rupp latches on to the essence of Luther's church reform: Luther sought the middle way, which was not the golden mean, a third option between extremes, but something entirely different. It was the middle way of faith in the "Holy Gospel of the glory and grace of God."^{vii} "I am plagued by both sides," Luther once complained, "for the fanatics and Anabaptists are more hostile to me than the Pope. And the Pope is more hostile to me than they are. On both sides, all are enemies of the Gospel."^{viii} The battle lines were drawn.

Luther encounters the fanatics

Luther's first brush with the fanatics came during the turmoil that followed his excommunication from Rome and his indictment by the Edict of Worms. Germany was astir with reform. Despite the Edict people from all walks of life clamored for a new order in church and society. As a consequence Luther was confronted with reform ideas that jeopardized the reform movement, many of which pierced to the heart of his theology.

The Wittenberg insurrection of December 1521 brought the crisis out into the open. Luther now found himself face to face with an enthusiasm for reform that had a foreign ring. The encounter with the Zwickau "prophets" caused him to brand the men with the colloquial term for an excitedly confused person. They were "Schwaermer," he said; in this case, spiritually confused.^{ix} The name stuck. Over the years he was to charge them and all like them with throwing the evangelical movement into confusion. They confused the Gospel, they confused Christ, confused the Sacrament, confused God's Word. And such confusion confounded consciences and led to the destruction of faith. Schwaermerei struck at the heart of that very Gospel which had led Brother Martin to stand against the Roman church. It blasphemed God. It was anti-christ. It was the devil's own work and condemned with him.^x Luther was determined to strike down such enthusiasm wherever it reared its head with the only means he knew how - by attacking their words with the Word.^{xi}

This proved to be no easy task. In one decade from 1521-1530, the ranks of the fanatics swelled to such an extent that Luther was to count among the false brethren his own Wittenberg colleague, Carlstadt, fellow Saxon, Thomas Muentzer, Zwingli of Zurich, the Anabaptist sects, Caspar Schwengfeld, and that Epicurean

who fathered many of these spirits, Desiderius Erasmus. Lutherlike, he often rattled off their names in various combinations.^{xii}

Significantly, the new order had begun with the Zwickauer's attack on the practice of infant baptism. It rapidly enveloped all forms of sacraments. In Luther's eyes, the new baptism order, later finalized by the Zurich Anabaptists, differed not a whit from the sacramentarian order of the Lord's Supper.^{xiii} Together they had gone after the jugular and together they needed to be called to account before God and man, as Paul commanded, Titus 3, "As for a man who is factious, after admonishing him once or twice, have nothing more to do with him, knowing that such a person is perverted and sinful; he is self-condemned."^{xiv}

Luther counters the fanatics

On the sacrament

Since Luther's deep-seated antagonism to the fanatics' ways grew out of his grasp of the Gospel, he was convinced that advocates of the new sacramental order needed to be instructed about Christ and his work. He himself had gained insight into the nature of the sacrament while he was working on the pamphlet *The Pagan Servitude of the Church*, in 1520. There, with St. Paul to guide, he laid the foundation for far-reaching reforms of the Roman sacramental system by simply affirming that, at bottom, "there was only one sacrament," and that sacrament was Christ.^{xv} Any sacrament worthy of the name must take its direction from Christ. "What is true in regard to Christ," he stated flatly, "is also true in regard to the sacrament."^{xvi}

What this means Luther explains carefully, reaching to the early Christian fathers for help in expression. The term "sacrament," he points out, is merely the Latin translation of the Greek word "mystery." Whenever the Holy Scripture uses the term sacrament, he says, it does not mean the sign of something sacred, but "the sacred, secret, and hidden thing itself."^{xvii} A sacrament, therefore, does not merely point to the mystery. It is the mystery itself, by which the sacred comes to us under its outward sign. And, even though the sacred and holy is veiled under its outward sign, the two belong together as one, as Christ is one. "Thus," Luther clarifies, "Christ himself is called a 'sacrament' in 1 Tim. 3: 'Great indeed, is the sacrament (that is the mystery): He was manifested in the flesh, vindicated in the Spirit, seen by angels, preached among nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory.'^{xviii}

In this passage Luther finds the key to what Scripture says about the sacrament. Christ is the sacrament/mystery because he is both manifest and hidden, seen yet unseen, true man and true God, manifest in the flesh and preached that way, yet veiled in his Godhead under the cover of flesh. This foolishness, Luther indicates, is "the very wisdom of the Spirit, hidden in a mystery," of which St. Paul speaks to the Corinthians.^{xix} "Unless you believe it, you cannot understand it. Therefore, a sacrament is a mystery, or secret thing, which is set forth in words, but received by faith in the heart."^{xx} To tamper with the mystery is to tamper with faith at the same time, for faith is that which latches on to God's mystery, and lives by it.

The insights Luther gained in his struggle with Rome prepared him for the challenge brought by the fanatics. Anyone who undid God's mysteries, he warned, turned God's truth into a lie.^{xxi} "The sign and the promise should be tied to each other, not torn from each other," he stated. "For the promise always stands in such a way that the letter and seal should be together. Neither avails without the other. One doesn't have faith in a seal which stands by itself, nor in a letter by itself."^{xxii}

If Rome had gone too far in externalizing the sacrament by idolizing the outward signs at the expense of faith, the fanatics went to the opposite extreme. "In their teaching about the sacraments," Luther observed, "the papists go too far to the left, for they ascribe too much to the sacraments On the other hand, the sacramentarians go too far to the right because they take everything away from the sacraments."^{xxiii} Despising the outward signs, the fanatics emptied the mystery of all substance. In their enthusiasm for Christ, they tried to lay hold on the holy apart from its manifestations. In the new sacramental order they claimed Christ spiritually, apart from the flesh, just as they laid claim on baptism apart from the water.

Luther had encountered this way of thinking from the very outset of his battle with the fanatics. To Nicolaus Storch, leader of the Zwickau "prophets," the water of baptism was plain, common, ordinary water and nothing else. He had mocked the thought that "a handful of water is able to save a man."^{xxxiv} If water manifested anything at all to him, it merely mirrored the inner spiritual faith he had in Christ.

Carlstadt, too, maintained that Christ dealt with us "spiritually, not sacramentally."^{xxxv} The physical presence of Christ in the sacrament was repugnant to him. He rejected any suggestion that Christ was present any other way than spiritually.^{xxxvi} In a manner reminiscent of Hans Denck, Carlstadt extolled the supreme virtue of *Gelassenheit* as a means of coming to God through Christ spiritually, apart from the physical. *Gelassenheit* was a mystical way to faith that suggested spiritual abandonment and resignation or, as Rupp puts it, what in modern evangelical jargon would be called "commitment" or "full surrender."^{xxxvii}

These skirmishes with the "heavenly prophets" proved to be only a prelude for greater battles to come. In Switzerland, the Zwinglians were marching to the same drumbeat. They, too, appealed to a spiritual understanding of the sacrament apart from its outward sign. On the basis of John 6, they argued that Christ repudiated once and for all any physical partaking of his flesh when he said, "The Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing."^{xxxviii} It was to become their pet passage in the controversy.

Luther's answer to the fanatics was firm and unyielding. He scored them for abandoning the external Word or any outward manifestation of God in their quest for spiritual union with Him. By dividing flesh from Spirit, they were, in effect, separating the Word and elements from the Spirit and ascribing salvation alone to the latter. All that remained of the Word, in that case, was a mere external witness which comes to the heart of man and finds the Spirit already existing there. Contrariwise, should the Word not find the Spirit in an unbelieving heart, then it was not the Word of God.^{xxxix}

What spiritual confusion such enthusiasm brings! If the fanatics were bent on having a pure spirit, Luther admonished, "then they've got him, that is, the Devil, who has no flesh and blood."^{xxxix} But Christ and his Word and the sacraments are otherwise. Through them God works faith. He gives the sacred through the external. "God has determined," Luther observed, "to give the inward to no one except through the outward. For he wants to give no one the Spirit or faith outside of the outward Word and sign instituted by him."^{xxxxi}

In a summary statement, Luther made his case against the fanatics in no uncertain terms. He said:

We'll stick to the oral Word. The devil can't stand where this means is. . . . There are people who can't stand a bodily God, as God became flesh for us. They want to have a spiritual God and boast of their use [of the Word], though the use without the fact is a figment of the imagination. God's sending [of his Son into the flesh] is a fact. The sacrament of baptism is a fact. Those people don't distinguish between the fact and the use of the sacrament. Water, they say, is water, and they don't see it is God's water. . . .

I'd like to ask a fanatic how he becomes certain from his thoughts and the arguments of his own heart apart from the Word. We have the Scriptures, miracles, sacraments, testimonies. God sent his Son into the flesh, and of him it was said that men saw him, touched him, etc. We intend to stick to this.^{xxxii}

The fanatics remained equally adamant in their spiritualism. As their enthusiasm caught on, their numbers increased. Pastors from Hungary alerted Luther to the work of Matthias Biró Deváy, an evangelical pastor, who was infecting the eastern bounds of the Empire with the sacramentarian faith.^{xxxiii} At the same time, Anabaptist communities were spreading along the Rhine and Danube thoroughfares and beyond. The Muenster tragedy confirmed Luther in his opposition to such fanatics. So did the letters of Caspar Schwengfeld. The polite and precise Silesian nobleman and former follower of Luther continued to spread his ideas about faith in and around Ulm in south German Swabia. He set up prayer conventicles for Scripture study apart from any congregational ministrations of the sacraments.

By 1540 it became apparent that the doctrinal differences over the sacrament could not be overcome. To those who felt that mere disagreement on this one article of faith should not hinder fellowship, Luther had a ready answer. As he had previously refused fellowship with the sacramentarians at Marburg, he once again reaffirmed his action at the end of his life. "Since my death is now imminent," he wrote in a *Brief Confession Concerning the Holy Sacrament* (1544), "I want to take this testimony and this honor along with me before my dear Lord and Savior Jesus Christ's judgment seat, that I have earnestly condemned and avoided [*gemieden*] the fanatics and enemies of the sacrament - Karlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Stenckefeld, and their disciples at Zurich and wherever they are They have been admonished often enough and also earnestly enough by me and others We continue to preach against their blasphemous and deceitful heresy, as they know full well."^{xxxiv}

Luther felt such harsh judgment was justified. He saw in the fanatics' way of reasoning a revival of early Christian heresies concerning Christ, - Nestorius and Eutyches alive again, dividing Christ, confusing his natures. Like them, these fanatics were tampering with the holy, with the mysteries of God, with faith itself. "If someone does not want to believe the article of faith concerning the Lord's Supper," the old Doctor said with measured rhetoric, "how will he ever believe the article of faith concerning the humanity and divinity of Christ in one person?"^{xxxv} The early church condemned the errorists, and Luther did the same with their counterparts. The fanatics had broken the fellowship, perversely, persistently.

Out of the turmoil of the Reformation, the new church order had arisen in Central Europe to free Christians from enslavement to Roman ceremonies. The adherents of this new order honored Luther as an early champion in the struggle. Yet, at the same time, they chided him for not shaking loose entirely from Roman ceremonies. "Luther had indeed destroyed the papacy," they cheered, and then booed, but "he can't build a new church."^{xxxvi} He is still too Catholic; he fails to introduce new worship forms.

In Luther's eyes that was just the problem. He charged the fanatics with innovation. By changing the sacraments into mere ceremonies, they were replacing Roman ceremonial with a new set of ceremonial laws. This was not the evangelical way. "These wretched men think that building up the church consists of the introduction of some sort of new ceremonies," he complained. "They don't realize that building up the church means to lead consciences from doubt and murmuring to faith, knowledge, and to certainty." To abandon the mysteries in building the church was for Luther to abandon the true Gospel. And that was symptomatic of another problem.

Luther counters the fanatics

Legalism

From his first contact with the fanatics during the Wittenberg disturbances, Luther detected a spiritual cocksureness that seemed foreign to the spirit of the Gospel. "All of the fanatics with whom I endured long conversations attacked me with the greatest and most presumptuous arrogance," Luther reminisced. At the time, the Zwickau "prophets" made bold claims on the Spirit apart from Word and sacraments, citing visions and direct conversations with God. When Luther asked for an external sign to confirm their words, one of the trio shot back that Luther would see signs enough in the future.

The outward signs did come, and they multiplied. Everywhere the fanatics' bold front led to even bolder action. Self assurance often swung over to rash external deeds.

The new church order began in Wittenberg by trying to demolish everything connected with the Roman mass. Under the leadership of Carlstadt, the movement attempted to do away with traditional forms, images, and vestments. To a people still steeped in Catholic forms and doctrines, he made such statements as: "Whoever partakes only of the bread, sins"; "Organs belong to theatrical exhibitions and princely palaces"; "Images in church are wrong"; "Painted idols standing on altars are even more harmful and devilish."^{xxxvii}

Carlstadt's rhetoric was superseded only by Thomas Muentzer's call for a new spiritual order of the elect. He summoned the common folk to alert. The time had come for Christians-in-covenant to overthrow the

unjust and godless oppressors, and he, "Thomas Muentzer, with the sword of Gideon,"^{xxxviii} would lead the way. "What are you still sleeping for, why have you not recognized the will of God - do you think he has abandoned you, is that it? Ah, how often have I told you that God can only reveal himself in this way, in your apparent abandonment The whole of Germany, France and the Roman lands are awake - the Master will start his game On! On! On! Let not your sword grow cold, let it not be blunted. Smite, cling, clang, on the anvil of Nimrod, and cast the tower to the ground. God goes ahead of you, follow, follow, follow."^{xxxix}

In Zurich the movement for a new church order began less dramatically with the eating of two pork sausages in defiance of an Ash Wednesday fast.^{xi} Zwingli supported the action by publishing his first reformatory treatise, *Concerning Freedom and the Choice of Food*. Significantly, it had to do with external ceremonies. Within a year Zwingli was calling on the Zurich City Council to do away with not only relics and images, but also church organs and singing. He based his call to reform on the contention that all church ordinances must be in accordance with God's Word. "God does not desire our decree and doctrine when they do not originate with him," he argued successfully before the Council.^{xli}

Out of the Zurich scene arose the new baptist order. Unlike Zwingli, the Anabaptists severed connections with civil authorities in order to set up communities of true believers. The new order of baptism excluded minors and all who could or did not give verbal expression of faith in the heart. Only such were given the water mark who did so of their own free will. "The water does not confirm or increase faith, as the scholars at Wittenberg say," the Anabaptist leader, Conrad Grebel, wrote to Thomas Muentzer, "and [does not] give very great comfort [nor] is it the final refuge on the deathbed Baptism does not save."^{xlii} It, too, like the Lord's Supper and foot-washings, was merely a New Testament ceremony, a picture and reminder of spiritual truths.

Luther sensed the hand of Erasmus lurking behind the new church order and the acts of the fanatics. "He is responsible for the sacramentarians," Luther concluded after reviewing Erasmus' *Annotations* on the New Testament, and then added, "To the extent that he is hung up on grammar, to that extent he harms the Gospel."^{xliii}

For some time Luther had considered the scholar from Rotterdam to be an Epicurean, i.e. a rationalist and sceptic. In method and approach Erasmus followed the rabbinical grammarians of old who strained over the words of the law and missed the promise underlying it. "In all his writings there is no statement anywhere about faith in Christ, about victory over sin, etc.,"^{xliiv} Luther said with purposeful hyperbole.

He knew what he was talking about. Erasmus' dislike for the mysteries of faith was well documented in his diatribe *On Free Will*.^{xliv} He considered the whole Christian life in itself sacramental. For Erasmus the sacrament was not, as it was for Luther, "the sacred, secret, hidden thing itself."^{xlvi} It was, as its Latin etymology and meaning indicated, merely an oath of allegiance by which we obligate ourselves to our Captain and Lord, Jesus Christ. Its emblems were mere outward signs, flags under which the Christian soldier fights, ceremonials representing our commitment to lead a Christian life.^{xlvii}

The ties between Erasmus and the new church order were obvious in the fanatics' stress on outward ceremonies and concern for spiritual life apart from the oral Word and sacraments. The New Testament, in effect, had been reduced to a new book of canon law, which was basically little different from its Roman counterpart.^{xlviii}

Luther reacted vigorously to the new church order of the fanatics. He charged them with destroying the whole doctrine of the Gospel and turning God's Word into a new order of law by a cunning interpretation of Scripture.^{xlix} Robbed of the external Christ, they became artful designers of outward rites. Instead of Christ's righteousness they preached a ceremonial righteousness of external works. In their iconoclasm they forgot that Moses' law was for the Jews and was surpassed by Christ.¹

This Law/Gospel confusion had dire consequences for true faith. "If the teaching of faith is placed in the background and works are put forward," Luther warned, "then nothing can be good and there is neither counsel nor help [through the Gospel]. Then works lead to vainglory and seem to people to be something great, while God's glory disappears."^{li}

The whole problem with the arrogant fanatics was that they sought to build the church by breaking images, throwing out singing and organs from the church services, manhandling the sacrament, and even

slaughtering the godless, and by all such sort of external means. But the church is built in a quieter manner, where "the Gospel is preached in its purity and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel."^{lii}

What was achieved by "their course of action?" Luther asked simply in a series of rhetorical questions. "Would they therewith have become Christians? Where would faith and love be? Should they come later? Why should they not have precedence?"^{liii} No, the fanatics had turned Christian faith inside out. Their law preaching is murder for consciences. It makes law where there is none, breaks Christian freedom, and draws consciences from the understanding of grace to the deceptive appearance of good works. "With laws, sin, and works . . . nothing is set right."^{liv} There is no certainty in empty ceremonies and in performing rites out of obedience to a new order of law.

But "baptism is a certain sign, in which is comprehended the true God, who made heaven and earth,"^{lv} as is also the holy Super and the holy Word. Luther served notice on all the fanatics that the Holy Spirit "is not acquired through breaking images or any other works, but only through the gospel and faith."^{lvi} For God works from the outside in and in this way counters the devil's delusion:

"The first [way] is the LAW of God, which is to be preached so that one thereby reveals and teaches how to recognize sin . . .

Secondly, we are to preach the comforting word of the GOSPEL and the forgiveness of sins, so that the conscience again may be comforted and established in the grace of God.

Now the third is JUDGMENT, the work of putting to death the old man, as in Romans 5, 6, and 7. Here works are concerned, and also suffering and affliction, as we through our own discipline and fasting, watching, labor etc., or through other persecution and disgrace put to death our flesh. This putting to death is not handled correctly by these false prophets. For they do not accept what God gives them, but what they themselves choose...

In the fourth place such WORKS OF LOVE toward the neighbor should flow forth in meekness, patience, kindness, teaching, aid, and counsel, spiritually and bodily, free and for nothing, as Christ has dealt with us.

In the fifth and last place, we ought to proclaim the LAW and its works, not for the Christians, but for the crude and unbelieving. For among Christians we must use the law spiritually, as is said above, to reveal sin. But among the crude, masses, on Mr. Everyman, we must use it bodily and roughly.^{lvii}

The Wittenberg professor knew the comfort of these articles of faith well. From the outset of the battle with the fanatics, he warned that they did not know the way of faith because they lacked the sign. Among them, he wrote to Melanchthon, "the sign of the Son of Man is missing, which is the only touchstone of Christians, and a certain differentiator between the spirits."^{lviii} That sign was the true Christian cross, which is not self imposed.

Luther lived with that cross. He never arrogantly and defensively claimed to be immune to the spirit of enthusiasm. He had clearly identified enthusiasm in the *Smalcald Articles* as that which "clings to Adam and his descendents from the beginning to the end of the world. It is a poison implanted and inoculated in man by the old dragon."^{lix} Battling the devil's arts, Luther admitted, proved far more difficult than the struggle with the fanatics. "The bouts I engaged in during the night," he said, "have become much more bitter than those during the day. For my adversaries have only annoyed me, but the devil is able to confront me with arguments... When the devil comes, he is lord of the world and confronts me with strong objections, for Christ has set us not against flesh and blood, but against the powers of the air."^{lx}

Such spiritual struggles proved to be the training grounds for faith and reliance on God and his Word. From this vantage point Luther was able to identify and unmask the fanatics' ways, "I did not learn my theology all at once," he stated frankly. "I had to ponder over it ever more deeply, and my spiritual trials were of help to me in this, for one does not learn anything without practice. This is what the fanatics and sects lack. They don't have the right adversary, the devil."^{lxi}

The vision of the church militant as an ongoing contest between God and Satan moved Luther to battle the fanatics. Called to be a preacher of Christ and his Word, Luther condemned the new spiritual order because it laid claims on God's Spirit apart from Christ and his work, because it turned Christ's sacraments into make-believe ceremonies, because it confused consciences concerning the way to faith. In the struggle with Satan, therefore, it failed.

The Reformer walked a different path. He found his strength in the quietness of faith, in reliance on God's Word and God's ways. "I simply taught, preached, and wrote God's Word; otherwise I did nothing,"^{lxii} Luther explained to the congregation in the aftermath of the Diet of Worms. He waited for God to act, for, in the final analysis, the battle was the Lord's.^{lxiii}

Arnold J. Koelpin

11/1/83

ENDNOTES

Abbreviations:	EA	=	Erlangen Edition of Luther's Works
	LW	=	Luther's Works (American Edition)
	WA	=	Weimar Edition of Luther's Works
	WTR	=	Weimar Edition: Table Talk
	W ²	=	Walch Edition 2, St. Louis

ⁱ *New Light on Martin Luther* (Radio Replies Press, 1945), p. 17. Imprimatur: Johannes Gregorius Murray, Archiepiscopus Sancti Pauli.

ⁱⁱ Quoted in Roland H. Bainton, *The Martin Luther Christmas Book* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), p. 38.

ⁱⁱⁱ Isaiah 30:15.

^{iv} EA op. ex. 4, p. 136.

^v Walter Fellmann, ed., *Hans Denck, Schriften, 2.* (Guertersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1956), p. 35:29-31. In "Quellen and Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte," Vol. XXIV.

^{vi} E. Gordon Rupp, "Luther and Carlstadt," in *Luther Today* (Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1957), p. 109.

^{vii} LW 31:31. Thesis 62 of the *Ninety-five Theses*.

^{viii} WTR III, 2873b.

^{ix} Explained in Wilhelm Maurer, "Luther und die Schwärmer," as part of a collection of his works in E-W Kohls and G. Mueller, eds., *Kirche and Geschichte I: Luther und das evangelische Bekenntnis* (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970), p. 107, footnote 8.

^x WTR IV, p. 485:6ff., WTR III, 3323b, WTR I, 342, LW 38:291f & 304f.

^{xi} The passage on enthusiasm in the "Smalcald Articles," VIII, 3ff., found in the *Book of Concord*, T.G. Tappert, ed., (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959), p. 312f.

^{xii} LW 3&287f & 291; WTR II, 1400 & 2064, and *passim* in the Table Talk.

^{xiii} LW 38:288; W² 20:1762.

^{xiv} *Ibid.*

^{xv} LW 36:18, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," (1520), as quoted in John Dillenberger, ed., *Martin Luther* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), an Anchor Book, p.256.

^{xvi} LW 36:35.

^{xvii} LW 36:93.

^{xviii} *Ibid.*

^{xix} LW 36:94.

^{xx} *Ibid.*

^{xxi} LW 54:198 (3330a).

^{xxii} LW 54:56.

^{xxiii} LW 54:43 (314).

^{xxiv} WTR II, 2060.

^{xxv} A.B. Karlstadt, "Dialogus . . . von dem gewlichen und abgoettisch miszbrauch des hochwirdigsten sacraments. 1524," in E. Hertzsch, ed., *Karlsadts Schriften aus den Jahren 1523-25* (Halle/Saale, 1956), Vol. 2, p. 25:1 - 16.

^{xxvi} LW 40:204.

^{xxvii} Rupp, op. cit., p. 122.

^{xxviii} Found in Donald J. Ziegler, ed., *Great Debates of the Reformation* (New York: Random House, 1969), p. 76f.

^{xxix} WTR III, 3868.

^{xxx} WA 23:261.

^{xxxi} LW 40:146.

^{xxxii} LW 54:197f (3330a).

^{xxxiii} LW 38:283.

^{xxxiv} LW 38:287f.

^{xxxv} LW 54:195.

^{xxxvi} *Ibid.*

^{xxxvii} Quoted in Ernest G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1950), p. 536.

^{xxxviii} Written at the end of a letter to Count Ernst of Mansfeld. See Hans J. Hillerbrand, ed., *The Reformation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1978 reprint), p. 225.

^{xxxix} Thomas Muentzer, "To his Followers in Allstedt," in E.G. Rupp & B. Drewery, eds., *Martin Luther* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1970), p. 120f.

^{xl} Hillerbrand, op. cit., p. 127f.

^{xli} *Ibid.*, p. 140.

-
- ^{xlii} The letter is found in The Library of Christian Classics, Volume XXV, G.H. Williams & A.M. Mergel, eds., *The Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press), p. 80.
- ^{xliii} WTR V, 5670.
- ^{xliv} LW 54:78 (466).
- ^{xlv} LW 33:19 & 24-26
- ^{xlvi} See endnote 17.
- ^{xlvii} Ernst-Wilhelm Kohls, *Die Theologie des Erasmus*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, 1966), p. 73ff.
- ^{xlviii} Maurer, *op. cit.*, p. 125.
- ^{xlix} LW 40:79.
- ^l LW 40:80-101 *passim*.
- ^{li} LW 40:81.
- ^{lii} Tappert, *op. cit.*, p. 32, from Article VII of the *Augsburg Confession*.
- ^{liii} LW 40:81.
- ^{liv} LW 40:82.
- ^{lv} WA 16:178.
- ^{lvi} *Ibid.*
- ^{lvii} LW 40:82f.
- ^{lviii} LW 48:366.
- ^{lix} Tappert, *op. cit.*, p. 313.
- ^{lx} LW 54:93 (517).
- ^{lxi} LW 54:51 (352).
- ^{lxii} LW 51:77.
- ^{lxiii} 1 Samuel 17:47.