

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Seminar Papers

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1995

Luther and Zwingli on the Righteousness of God

Ilars Plume

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_plumei@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stmsp>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Plume, Ilars, "Luther and Zwingli on the Righteousness of God" (1995). *Master of Sacred Theology Seminar Papers*. 30.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stmsp/30>

This Seminar Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Seminar Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

LUTHER AND ZWINGLI ON THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD

A Seminar Paper presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Systematic Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Ilars Plume

May 1995

Approved by


Norman E. Nagel

LUTHER AND ZWINGLI
ON THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD

Introduction

When C. F. W. Walther speaks about the proper distinction between law and gospel, as evidenced in Chrysostom, he gives an excellent example from the early church, which throws light upon the significance of the whole question. Walther says that Chrysostom, although he was able to do with his audience whatever he pleased, "accomplished little because he was poor in distinguishing the Law from the Gospel, habitually mingling the one doctrine with the other."¹ As the consequence of such confusion, the merits and benefits of Christ are darkened and the gospel becomes a teaching of the law, as it happened in the papacy.² That was the problem which confronted the Augustinian monk, Martin Luther. He had been taught to understand the righteousness of God philosophically as an active righteousness, "with which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner."³ Luther lived "with an extremely disturbed conscience,"⁴ and "hated the righteous God who punishes sinners."⁵ In his Table Talk Luther says that this crisis, which lasted for a long time, finally was solved in an exegetical way:

True, I was aware of something, but what it was I did not know until I came to the passage in Romans 1: "The righteous shall live by faith." There I found help. Then I saw what Paul had in mind when he spoke of righteousness. There in the text stood "righteousness." I related the abstract and the concrete and became certain of my cause, learning to distinguish between the righteousness of the Law and the Gospel. I considered both to be the same and Christ to differ from Moses only in time and perfection. It was when I discovered the difference between the Law and the Gospel, that they are two separate things, that I broke through.⁶

Consequently, Luther's rediscovery of the gospel was in its clear distinction from the law, which resulted in a renewed christology.

As it is widely recognized among the scholars today, the main difference between Zwingli and Luther is to be found in their christology.⁷ The well-known Zwingli scholar G. W. Locher, when he speaks of the Marburg Colloquy, comes to this over-hasty conclusion:

Had the debate been about Christology from the very beginning, then their closeness would have been presupposed without question, and the controversy over the Lord's Supper would not have gained such fateful significance.⁸

If this is true, then it would follow that Luther was wrong to judge Zwingli as "arch-heretic"⁹ and refusing the handshake and recognition of Zwingli "as a brother in faith."¹⁰ Then at least Luther's followers should recognize Zwingli as "standing only in the service of 'maines lieben Herren Jesu Christi,'" in his work of Reformation.¹¹

It would be going too far to say that Zwingli was a Nestorian, but his christology definitely had weaknesses, similar to those of Scholastic theology.¹² My thesis, which I hope to demonstrate in this paper, is that Zwingli did not come to Luther's evangelical understanding of "the righteousness of God" because he did not recognize the importance of the proper distinction between the law and the gospel. The result of this was that Christ remained a lawgiver for him, as Christ was for Luther before his rediscovery of the gospel. I shall base my research on Luther's two sermons, "Sermo de duplici iustitia" (1519)¹³ and "Epistel auff den Palmtag" (1525),¹⁴ and on Zwingli's "Von götlicher und menschlichen gerechtigkeiten" (1523)¹⁵ with some supplementary passages from "Auslegung des 22. Artikels" in "Auslegung und Grunde der Schlussreden 14. Juli 1523."¹⁶

Martin Luther and the Righteousness of God

Luther's "Sermo de duplici iustitia" is an exposition of Philippians 2:5-6: "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Luther bases his interpretation on the two kinds of righteousness. The first one is the "alien righteousness" by which Christ "justifies through faith."¹⁷ This alien (Christ's) righteousness is explained through references to 1 Corinthians 1:30: "Who of God is made unto us wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption;" and to John 11:25: "I am the resurrection and the life."¹⁸ Although one cannot be sure that the sermon was preached on Palm Sunday, it is the epistle for that day,¹⁹ while the last quotation involves Easter and apparently identifies our righteousness by faith with that of the resurrected Christ.²⁰ But then Luther turns almost immediately to the incarnation and Christmas, quoting Isaiah 9:6 "For unto us a child is born, to us a Son is given."²¹

What the Lord has done before the resurrection, in his redemptive work—"living, doing, and speaking, suffering and dying"—now is given to me "as if I had lived, done, spoken, suffered and died as he did."²² It is given "as if" and not because I obey, suffer or die.²³ The sufferings and death which justify us are uniquely Christ's. And now the fruit of Christ's redemptive work, his righteousness, is given to the church. The righteousness of the bridegroom Christ becomes a common property with his bride the church, so that they are one spirit as bridegroom and bride are one flesh.²⁴ This alien righteousness, achieved on the cross, is communicated to the church through baptism, and whenever men are truly penitent.²⁵ Christ also says, "This is my body, which is given for you."²⁶ Thus the reference to all the means of grace (Baptism, Absolution, the Lord's Supper) is given in the very beginning of the sermon. Through the Sacraments

our heavenly Father grants to us "very great and precious gifts in Christ."²⁷ All that Christ has done he has done for us. He desires it to be ours, saying, "I am among you as one who serves" [Like 22:27].²⁸ And then the words, which probably have not been spoken in such a clarity since the time of apostles,²⁹ are to be heard from the pulpit of Wittenberg's city church:

Through faith in Christ, therefore, Christ's righteousness becomes our righteousness and all that he has becomes ours; rather, he himself becomes ours. Therefore the Apostle calls it "the righteousness of God" in Rom. 1 [17]: for in the gospel "the righteousness of God is revealed ...; as it is written, "The righteous shall live by his faith.""³⁰

Then Luther takes Romans 3:28 to show that such a faith is called the righteousness of God, and man is justified by it:

This is an infinite righteousness, and one that swallows up all sins in a moment, for it is impossible that sin should exist in Christ; he is one with Christ, having the same righteousness as he. It is therefore impossible that sin should remain in him.³¹

To be one with Christ means also to be one with his righteousness. Luther now explains the righteousness in Psalm 31:2 as a righteousness of God in which the psalmist is looking for his refuge through faith in the merciful God:

"In thee, O Lord, do I seek refuge; let me never be put to shame; in thy righteousness, deliver me!" It does not say "in my" but in "thy righteousness," that is, in the righteousness of Christ my God which becomes ours through faith and by the grace and mercy of God. In many passages of the Psalter faith is called "the work of the Lord," "confession," "power of God," "mercy," "truth," "righteousness." All these are names for faith in Christ, rather, for the righteousness which is in Christ. The Apostle therefore dares to say in Gal. 2 [20], "It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me." He further states in Eph. 3 [14-17]: "I bow my knees before the Father ... that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith."³²

Luther here already has in full his reformation perception of God's righteousness, as stated in his preface of 1545.³³ The words which he previously hated now are said in a joyful and clear tone. Now he is proclaiming only gospel,

and no law is mentioned. There is nothing that man can do. The righteousness of God is the gospel itself, given to us in the means of grace and whenever the gospel is heard. It is received through faith, freely without any merits or deeds.

This alien righteousness when imputed to us becomes an active power through which God works in the believer sanctifying him.

Therefore this alien righteousness, instilled in us without our works by grace alone—while the Father, to be sure, inwardly draws us to Christ—is set opposite original sin, likewise alien, which we acquire without our works by birth alone. Christ daily drives out the old Adam more and more in accordance with the extent to which faith and knowledge of Christ grow. For alien righteousness is not instilled all at once, but it begins, makes progress, and is finally perfected at the end through death.³⁴

One should be careful estimating this passage, for it could appear that Luther has here fallen back into Augustine's theology. But it is not at all so, because Luther here speaks about the alien righteousness as Christ in us for a sweeping out but not for the forgiveness of sins. In other words, he is speaking here about sanctification but not about justification. For the righteousness which forgives sins is "infinite, and one that swallows up all sins in a moment," as stated earlier.³⁵

At this point Luther moves to the second part of the sermon which speaks about sanctification—the righteousness which is worked together with the first one in cooperation with Christ. Ernst Bizer finds this part as "in Terminologie noch ziemlich sorglos, wenn diese Sorglosigkeit nicht einfach ein Zeichen dafür ist, dass er das Problem noch nicht bewältigt hat."³⁶ It could be put better by saying that Luther, although he uses the old terminology, does so with new meaning, speaking here about the second righteousness or sanctification. As Norman Nagel has stated:

This no longer fits the earlier *sacramentum* and *exemplum* description. The first and second righteousness are organically related, but the first is

decisive and altogether of Christ. It is of His obedience, suffering and cross. It is *iustitia aliena*, a righteousness which has no part in the *opus alienum*.³⁷

But there is something very special in the second part of the sermon concerning also the person of Christ. Luther's new discovery of the righteousness of God as the gospel, completely separated from the law, leads to the renewed christology, different from that of the Scholastics.³⁸ Returning to Philippians 2:5-7, Luther now finds this:

The term "form of God" here does not mean the "essence of God" because Christ never emptied himself of this. Neither can the phrase "form of a servant" be said to mean "human essence." But the "form of God" is wisdom, power righteousness, goodness and freedom too; for Christ was a free, powerful, wise man subject to none of the vices or sins to which all other men are subject.³⁹

It may be worth quoting here at length the description of this shift by Tom Hardt:

The settlement which the Lutheran Reformation worked out here and which forms a boundary against both Roman Catholic and Reformed Christology means that the banner of Cyrillian Christology is once again raised in the West. A false, unbiblical Nestorian, outlining Christology is replaced by the faith in One Lord. The Christology which had become the leading tradition in Latin Christendom had come to regard Christ's humanity as having the same relation to His divinity as Christ's clothing had to the human nature. Only a form of ownership, called in this case "person," ties together, from the beginning, the Son of the Virgin in the crib and the eternal Word. This leads to the notion that, e.g., the miracles wrought by the man Jesus in principle were worked in the same way as the miracles wrought by apostles and prophets: the power comes from a divine assistance rendered from the outside. The man Jesus cannot be worshipped either. The person of the God-Man has been split deeply. Nestorius, the one officially condemned, had once more seized power. From 1519 on, Luther proclaims an interpretation of Phil. 2:6ff which results in a decisive change. ... This big change was not caused by general speculation about the divine and the human and their relationship to each other, nor by a religious need, but (like the change in the question of justification) by a careful, exegetical study of a Bible verse. We find here an interesting parallel to the Reformation discovery of justification as far as the techniques of exegesis are concerned. In both cases Luther succeeds in freeing himself from the traditional philosophical interpretation of a single word; *gestalt* or "justice" in the

former case, “form” in the latter case. Around the latter word the renewed Cyrillian Christology is developed.⁴⁰

In conclusion, we can summarize: in the “*Sermo de duplici iustitia*” Luther has clearly stated the meaning of righteousness, consequently distinguishing the law and the gospel, works and faith, sanctification and justification, and the specific points of his christology are already present here.

Marc Lienhard, in discussing the “*Sermo de duplici iustitia*,” ends the part on Christ’s righteousness with a quotation from Althaus: “The incarnation is accomplished in the cross of Christ.”⁴¹ Though this is partly true, Luther’s christology does not end with Good Friday—there is also Easter as God’s absolution pronounced to humankind. We hear Luther say this again in April 1543: “*Resurrectio eius a mortuis est nostri iustificatio per solam fidem.*”⁴² (“His resurrection from the dead is our justification by faith alone.”) This view is already present in the sermon of 1519. From this observation I would like to move to Luther’s sermon of Palm Sunday 1525—“*Epistel auff den Palmtag Philippen 2.*” (The Bible text Philippians 2:5-12.)

Luther starts the sermon with an interesting note that he has preached on the same text a few years ago—a sermon entitled “The Twofold Righteousness”—but as “the text was not exhausted we will now examine it word by word.”⁴³ Luther was not the kind of preacher who would rush into the pulpit with some fresh ideas. The righteousness of God and the renewed christology, proclaimed with great joy towards the end of 1518, remained the main theme of his preaching and studies for the following years. Now Luther is declaring something that had been left untold. He has very little to say about our doing. That “has been sufficiently treated in other postils.”⁴⁴ Rather he speaks about the Lord, about who he is and what he does. Luther goes on verse by verse showing that the subject of Scripture

is none other but “the one, inseparable ‘I’ speaking and acting in the New Testament.”⁴⁵

As a Christian you have Christ, which means that in him and through him you already have all comfort for now and eternity. Everything he did, was done not for his own but for your sake.⁴⁶ If Christ, being true God, so humbled himself by becoming a servant to all, how much more should we! However, that is impossible for us. “For he is an infinite blessing—God himself—and we are but miserable creatures whose existence and life are not for one moment secure.”⁴⁷ This is all Luther has to say about men, except that terrible judgment awaits “those who fail to imitate the ineffable example of Christ; who do not humble themselves below their neighbors and serve them.”⁴⁸ Notice that he means here a humbling of themselves below their neighbors and serving them. He does not speak about doing penance and humbling themselves before God. From here Luther moves to the person of Christ.

The phrase “form of God” does not refer to “the divine essence and nature in Christ,”⁴⁹ but to “the assumption of a divine attitude and bearing, or the manifestation of divinity in what he does and by his presence (*annimmt und unterwindet*).”⁵⁰ Being in the “form of God” or “the form of a servant”

does not refer to the manifestation of divinity or servility as such, but to the characteristics and the expressions of the same. ... the essence is concealed but its manifestation is public. The essence implies a condition, while its expression implies action.⁵¹

The words of Paul suggest three aspects of the forms of manifestation: (1) the essence without the manifestation, (2) the essence together with its proper manifestation, and (3) the manifestation without the corresponding essence.⁵² The first one is when God withdraws his grace. The second is when God discloses it. The third one, however, is inconceivable for God. A manifestation of

divinity without the essence is rather a trick of the devil who usurps the place of God.⁵³ The form of a servant may be considered in the same threefold way: (1) a servant not conducting himself as such, (2) a servant conducting himself as one, (3) being not a servant but acting as one. The first one is all the descendants of Adam; the second one, all faithful Christians; the third one applies only to Christ.⁵⁴ Now Luther makes clear the meaning of Paul's words:

Christ was in the form of God; that is, both the essence and the bearing of Deity were his. He did not assume the divine form as he did that of a servant. ... The little word "was" expresses that divinity was in both in essence and form. ... This man humbled himself, taking upon him the form of a servant not his rightful form.⁵⁵

Many have failed to understand this great text because they place their own ideas above it and do not listen to the words spoken by Paul. They say that the text simply means that "Christ was born true God and did not rob divinity, etc."⁵⁶ Paul contrasts the words "existing in" with the phrase "took upon him."

Luther comments:

Christ took upon himself the form of a servant, it is true, but in that form was no real servant. ... Christ disrobes himself of the divine form wherein he existed, to assume that of a servant, which did not express his essential character; but we lay aside the servant form of our real being and take upon ourselves, or arrogate to ourselves, the form of God to which we are not fitted by what we are in reality.⁵⁷

Luther recognizes that Paul is not offering some defense for Christ. In fact he rebukes those who usurp the rights of God, acting against their own conscience. What they want to take by theft is Christ's by right. This is the way the expression "Christ thought it not robbery to be equal with God" is to be understood. Paul puts it in a different way, however, when speaking about Christ's assumption of the servant form. Why, Luther asks, does he not say, "He held it not robbery to assume the form of a servant"? It apparently fits here better

than in the former case, so that Christ's divinity naturally belongs to him, while humanity does not.⁵⁸

"The substance of the matter," rejoices Luther, "is that he who becomes a servant does not and cannot assume anything, but only gives, giving even himself."⁵⁹ It is marvelous how justification and christology, the person of Christ and his work, now fit together. It is not in the same realm as the example of the saints. Who Christ is and what He does is something completely unique. "He does not rank with the saints who lack the divine essence; he has in addition to divine form, the divine essence and nature."⁶⁰ He also does not fit together with the saints regarding his servitude. The saints are servants by their nature, while Christ's service was assumed only for our benefit "when he served the disciples and gave himself for us."⁶¹ What Paul means by the "form of God" and "form of a servant" then is

That the man Christ was God, and could, even his humanity, have borne himself as divine. But this is precisely what he did not do; he refrained; he disrobed himself (geeußert) of his divinity and bore himself as a mere man like others.⁶²

Now Luther draws a conclusion setting forth in seven points the consequences of which have been said previously. First, he points here to the true deity of Christ, who laid aside his divine majesty—not acting as the God he truly was. He did it himself, and not by some outside power.⁶³ Second, Christ was God working for our benefit. It was the unique work of salvation done by him. Nothing is asked from us to serve him in compensation. It was a free, gratuitously performed service for our good. The minister and servant was the eternal God himself. Everyone who is not touched by this service and willing to serve his fellows is without excuse.⁶⁴ Third, being born of Mary, Christ became human by his nature. We understand by that just ordinary humanity, without any special privilege.⁶⁵

Fourth, he ate, drank, slept, was thirsty and hungry and needed to sleep. He also had the same experience as other men in their relation to God and the world.⁶⁶ Fifth, he went further than anybody else, giving his life for us.⁶⁷ Sixth, he became not only subject to men, but also to sin, death, and devil. And bearing it all for our sake, he died on the cross, not as a man but as a worm.⁶⁸ Seventh, in doing this he was moved by the obedience to the Father. In this we see the Father's love towards us—only love and not wrath, so that he does not ask our obedience, but Christ is the One who is doing it for us. This is the gospel through which, that is, through Christ, the Father draws us to himself.⁶⁹

After his humiliation Christ is highly exalted, glorified, proclaimed, confessed, honored and recognized as God:

It is true that Christ is thus exalted in person and seated on high in the fullness of power and might, executing everywhere his will: though few believe the order of events is for the sake of Christ. Freely the events order themselves, and the Lord sits enthroned free from all restrictions. But our eyes are as yet blinded. We do not perceive him there nor recognize that all things obey his will. The last day, however, will reveal it. Then we shall comprehend present mysteries; how Christ laid aside his divine form, was made man, and so on: how he also laid aside the form of a servant and resumed the divine likeness; how as God he appeared in Glory; and how he is now Lord of life and death, and the King of Glory.⁷⁰

Having stated this, Luther says, "This must suffice on the text."⁷¹

Ian Siggins has observed that in this remarkable sermon Luther pictures Jesus as truly human, thus "revitalizing the somewhat Apollinarian Christ of the scholastic tradition."⁷² This helped him also to escape the dangers of Docetism.⁷³ The distinction "between a nature and the function of a nature" will later serve for refuting Zwingli's *alloeosis*,⁷⁴ and it was also clear "that the main lines of Luther's position were thoroughly laid before the sacramental dispute grew fierce."⁷⁵

We may conclude that Luther's wrong attempt to find a gracious God was corrected in his exegetical discovery of "the righteousness of God" and later of the "form of God." Who Christ is and what he does no longer depended upon philosophical concepts. Now Christ not only was not a judge, he even did not require us to do anything.

The picture of the risen Christ given by Luther at the end of this sermon was one of the Supreme King reigning over the universe. But now he had a human face, and his will executed everywhere was the love drawing us to the Father without anything required of us. This new picture of Christ later caused Luther to say that the Reformation happened while he, Philip, and Amsdorf were drinking beer. Now he knew that God himself is carrying the Reformation and that it was his work. He also did not have to serve God to gain his grace. God gave it freely. What was left for Luther and us is to thank God, and "to serve one another with body, property, honor spirit and soul, even as his Son served us."⁷⁶

Zwingli and the Righteousness of God

Zwingli's sermon "Von götlicher und menschlicher gerechtigkeiten" by its title and structure reminds one of Luther's "Sermo de duplici iustitia." Yet while Luther's sermon was preached on Palm Sunday, Easter or even at Christmas time, and was based on the christological hymn of Philippians 2, Zwingli preached his on St. John the Baptist's Day,⁷⁷ and it was, in fact, tied mainly to the Sermon on the Mount. I believe this fact reveals the character of these writings as well as of both reformers. Two days before Zwingli preached his sermon, the group of radicals to whom Zwingli initially had close ties had held a meeting with the city council. Among other things, the question of tithes was raised.⁷⁸ Zwingli, who regarded the reform of the church at Zurich as the first step in the reformation of the Confederation with a later expansion to all of Europe,⁷⁹ felt

threatened. His criticism, based on the divine and human righteousness, was directed against both the radicals and the city council.

Zwingli starts with an observation that people have wrongly regarded God as righteous because he gives his righteousness to everyone.⁸⁰ God's righteousness is rather that he himself in his essence is righteousness and goodness, and nothing of that kind exists which does not come from him.⁸¹ This righteousness of God is to be seen in his word, which reveals that it is as far above our righteousness as God is above humankind.⁸² From this it follows that we cannot by ourselves achieve his righteousness. Regardless of our impotence, God demands that we be like him if we desire to dwell in his presence.⁸³ Further, on the basis of the parable of the marriage feast in Matthew 22:11-13 and from Isaiah 33:14-17, Zwingli confirms that those who wish to dwell with God must be completely innocent.⁸⁴

Christ has summed it all up in a few words in Mt. 5:8, "Blessed are those who are pure in heart, for they shall see God." But what is a pure heart or which of them is pure? On earth there is none; for what is there that is not selfish, impressed by itself or in some way tainted something that God cannot tolerate at all.⁸⁵

By stating this Zwingli demonstrates on the Scriptural basis the main human problem: we all have fallen short in the eyes of God and therefore are separated from him. Although, as W. P. Stephens points out, Zwingli in 1526 spoke of original sin as a disease, his mature position affirmed man's total corruption in the same way as he did in 1523.⁸⁶

Having established the fact of our sinfulness and corruption, Zwingli immediately turns to the gospel. He points here to the initial activity of our salvation as coming from God and manifested in the incarnation for satisfaction of his righteousness.

God saw this our misery and impotence and took pity, finding means by which his righteousness might be appeased on our behalf so that we might dwell with him; he therefore allowed his son to become human through the pure handmaiden, Mary, conceived without any sin through the Holy Spirit.⁸⁷

Zwingli has described the saving work of Christ in several different ways, from almost Abelardian to Irenaean and Athanasian. But the dominant one is that of Anselm's interpretation,⁸⁸ though other elements were present.

Now since he who was innocent suffered death for us guilty sinners, he paid off for us the beautiful righteousness of God, which otherwise no human being is able to satisfy; thus he earned for us the right to come to God by virtue of his free grace and gift. Whoever hears this and believes this without doubt shall be saved. That is the gospel.⁸⁹

Though we are saved on account of Christ, "yet that which God demands still remains,"⁹⁰ as also "our impotence to fulfill his demands remains."⁹¹ Therefore we must at all times come to God through the one, righteous, innocent Jesus Christ, for he alone is the advocate and recompense for our sin unto eternity.⁹² Everything we do "is nothing and has no value before God ... everything that God shows toward you happens not on account of your merit, but because it is a free gift from him."⁹³ This certainly is a very clear gospel passage and indicates that Luther's influence on Zwingli in this period was probably stronger than Zwingli himself acknowledged. It seems that Zwingli was at least very close to the distinction between law and gospel as he spoke of human corruption and justification simultaneously.

I hope it is apparent then that anyone who seeks to come to God through works errs, for he may see from the outset by the very first commandment that he cannot keep it. Thus God commands what is appropriate to his righteousness; but we are incapable of keeping his commandments. Yet no one can aid us in this our impotence except God alone. He has done it through his son Christ Jesus.⁹⁴

The content of the last two sentences is important for the whole picture of Zwingli's understanding of the righteousness of God.

One must clarify the meaning of "God's aid done through his son Christ Jesus." Because it is not enough to know *that* God does everything, it is of the greatest importance to know *where* God does it. If it did happen at the cross, and now is distributed by the resurrected Lord in Word and Sacraments, then it is the gospel as understood by Luther. If it happens in the believer, then law and gospel are mixed, and such interpretation would be close to that of Augustine, which caused considerable difficulty for Luther in his early career.⁹⁵

Zwingli thought that just as there are two types of righteousness, divine and human, so there are two types of law. One type looks to the inward person, the other type to the outward person. The first righteousness is that by which God is righteous, the other is civil righteousness. The first type of law is divine, the second is civil. The first kind of law no one is able to fulfill.⁹⁶

Just as there is no one who is righteous except for the one God and the one who by grace, of which Christ is the guarantor is made righteous through faith.⁹⁷

This statement on justification here sounds very much like Luther, if by "made righteousness" is meant Baptism. It does not speak of justification as a process. One "is righteous" who "by grace" and "through faith" "gerecht würdt gemachet." But unfortunately, besides this clear gospel passage, other statements can be found to indicate that Augustine's interpretation of the doctrine of justification is still present in Zwingli's theology:

Everyone is bid to seek divine righteousness which means unceasingly, in keeping with his will, to strive after innocence until we reach the measure of Christ. ... our diligence in matters of divine righteousness is not sufficient. However our impotence is richly compensated by the one Christ. ... the pure word of God is to be proclaimed unceasingly; for in it one learns what God demands of us and with what grace he comes to our aid.⁹⁸

The will of God here, which we have to keep, characterizes Zwingli's emphasis and terminology, separating him from Luther and uniting him with Erasmus, many humanists, and some church fathers. The picture of Christ as example remained a part of Zwingli's theology.⁹⁹

Besides Erasmus, another influence that separated Zwingli from Luther and made an impact on his interpretation of divine and human righteousness was "the corporate theory of society"¹⁰⁰ as Robert Walton states:

He recognized no distinction between church and state and believed that together they formed a single society which was best governed when the clergy and the magistracy worked in harmony to realize the will of God. His conception was basically medieval and was specifically conditioned by the constitutional traditions of the Swiss city state. Despite all the arguments to the contrary, he retained throughout his career the belief in the balance of power between the prophet, who proclaimed the norms of divine righteousness to society, and the magistrate, who administered human righteousness.¹⁰¹

Such emphasis on conformity of the believer to God's will makes the righteousness of God the law, the highest norm for society, as Walton noted. In Zwingli's case, as well as in others where such theology exists, the doctrine of justification loses its external character and becomes an inward process, as Gottfried Locher rightly observed:

Instead of "justification" (*Rechtfertigung*), Zwingli likes to render the Greek more literally as "making righteous" (*Gerechtmachung*). For him it coincides with forgiveness. ... For Zwingli, the justification that comes through faith is primarily inward and spiritual, and this provides the basis for the outward justification.¹⁰²

But Locher, who acknowledges such interpretation as true, is certainly wrong when he points to the fact that, although Luther spoke of justification as *extra nos*, he thought of it "as something that is very 'inward.'"¹⁰³ For Luther, after his reformation discovery, that which "is very 'inward'" always meant sanctification,

not justification. The latter for Luther was completely objective, located outside us, and received by faith.¹⁰⁴

Zwingli often seemed to speak in the same way,¹⁰⁵ but as noted above, he also spoke differently. Several passages indicate that by the righteousness of God, he did not understand gospel but rather law. One such passage reads:

Again one must recognize that divine righteousness and mercy must be taught unceasingly by the fact that God condemns us if we fail to do so, for Christ says in Mt. 25:41-45, “those who have failed to feed him, give him drink, shelter, clothe, visit and comfort him in sickness and imprisonment in the persons of the poor, shall be consigned unto eternal fire.” All these things, of course, are not commanded by human righteousness, for no magistrate forces anyone to give alms, shelter, clothing and such like. Yet if we fail to do these things we shall be consigned to eternal pain along with the goats. Much more so shall the one be counted among the damned who was entrusted to proclaim this but failed to do so.¹⁰⁶

What clearly follows from this passage is that divine righteousness is the law. It is not what Christ has done for us, but what we must do. In other words, Zwingli understood the righteousness of God as a divine obligation pressing on us rather than as divine favor or a benevolence bestowed on us. But the human righteousness for him was only external, civil righteousness. It would be rather difficult to equate it with the sanctification as found in Luther for whom the personal dimension was more important than the social.

If in this light we have to understand everything that was previously said, then for Zwingli God’s righteousness was the law that must be taught, learned and obeyed. In no way is it really given to us as a gift;¹⁰⁷ it always remains far away from us.¹⁰⁸ The gospel is nothing more than perfected law.¹⁰⁹ In “The exposition of the sixty-seven articles,” Zwingli confirms that this is how he is to be understood, stating that the law should be called gospel rather than law, because it reveals God’s will,¹¹⁰ and “the law is gospel to him who loves God.”¹¹¹

It is obvious that equating God's righteousness with his will, as was the case also in early Luther, makes Christ into a lawgiver or the new Moses, and therefore destroys the true meaning of the gospel.

It may be helpful to finish with a quote from Joachim Rogge that gives a good picture of Zwingli the reformer. The author has stated it in a positive way, yet I find it says something quite different:

[Zwingli shows himself to be] a man who had committed himself to the progressive forces in church and world with the aggressive word of God at his back. To open oneself to Zwingli's spirit means therefore today, as it did for him in his own day, to stand up for a true reordering of church and world out of the radicalism of faith, despite all opposition.¹¹²

Conclusion

The examination of Luther's "Sermo de duplici iustitia" confirms the shift in his understanding of the righteousness of God. He explains it not as an attribute or essence of a punitive God who demands perfection from believers, but as a gift freely given to believers for the sake of Christ. It is bestowed through the gospel, both proclaimed and in the Sacraments. The law is clearly distinguished from the gospel and has only a preparatory role in justification, which is now described as the external act of God linked with the resurrection of Christ. This Reformation discovery led to a renewed christology, which was already present in the "Sermo de duplici iustitia" and more completely demonstrated in the "Epistel auff den Palntag" of 1525. The characteristics of this christology are those of Chalcedon, but with a new vital emphasis on the humanity of Christ.

Zwingli's sermon "Von götlicher und menschlichen gerechtigkeiten" was written with a strong evangelical accent, which may well be explained as Luther's influence. But his medieval heritage, especially regarding law, gospel, and righteousness as well as his understanding of society, was a constant

obstacle in Zwingli's career. His interpretation of the righteousness of God remained that of Augustine and was to be understood in the punitive and process way as the righteousness by which God deals with the sinner.

The justification of the latter was understood to happen inwardly as a gradual process, though on account of Christ's saving work. Nothing was said by Zwingli about the way in which Christ's merits are to be received. The impression was left that Christ's work was only an historical act, which somehow aids us in our striving for righteousness, but no concrete means of communicating it was mentioned. It might well be (to say more would be to go beyond the limits of this paper) considered the direct work of the Spirit, worked through faith—a position prompted by a strong influence of Neo-platonic thought on Zwingli's doctrine of justification.

No significant changes have been noticed in Zwingli's christology. Christ remained for him perfecter of God's will, and consequently a new lawgiver. It was caused by the mixing of law and gospel. This involved a reference to man in process of becoming more fit for God, whereas for Luther the reference is to Christ—what he has done and freely given us—whose complete righteousness is as surely given us as he is our full and only Savior.

NOTES

¹ C. F. W. Walther, *The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel*, translated by W. H. T. Dau (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1991), p. 50.

² Theodore Tappert, ed., *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), p. 563.

³ *Luther's Works* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1960), vol. 34, p. 336. (Hereafter cited as LW; thus LW 34, p. 336.)

⁴ LW 34, p. 336.

⁵ LW 34, p. 336.

⁶ *D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1883-). (Hereafter cited as WA. *Tischreden* volumes cited as WA-Tr.) WA-Tr 5, 210, No. 5518

⁷ David P. Scaer, *Christology, Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics*, vol. 6, edited by Robert D. Preus (Fort Wayne: International Foundation for Confessional Lutheran Research, 1993), p. 15.

⁸ Gottfried W. Locher, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981), p. 173.

⁹ LW 37, p. 162.

¹⁰ Herman Sasse, *This Is My Body* (Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1957), p. 230.

¹¹ Gottfried W. Locher, *Die Theologie Huldrich Zwinglis im Lichte seiner Christologie* (Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1952), p. 23.

¹² See for example Sasse, pp. 118-24.

¹³ WA 2, pp. 142-52. English translation in LW 31, pp. 297-306.

¹⁴ WA, 17/II, pp. 237-45. English translation in *Luther's Epistle Sermons, Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost*, translated and edited by John N. Lenker (Minneapolis: The Luther Press, 1909), vol. 2, pp. 169-80. (Hereafter cited as Lenker; thus Lenker 2, pp. 169-80.)

¹⁵ *Huldreich Zwingli's Sämtliche Werke*, in *Corpus Reformationum*, vols. 88-101, edited by Emil Egli and Georg Finsler (Berlin: Verlag von C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1905-), vol. 2 of *Sämtliche Werke*, pp. 474-525. (Hereafter cited as Z; hence Z 2, pp. 474-525.) English translation in Huldrych Zwingli, *Writings*, translated by H. Wayne Pipkin, in *Pittsburgh Theological Monographs, New Series*, vol. 13, General Editor Dikran Y. Hadidian (Allison Park: Pickwick publications, 1984), vol. 2, pp. 3-41. (Hereafter cited as ZW; thus ZW 2, pp. 3-41.)

¹⁶ Z 2, pp. 230-33. English translation in ZW 1, pp. 184-87.

¹⁷ LW 31, p. 291; WA 2, p. 145: "Duplex est iusticia Christianorum, sicut et duplex peccatum est hominum. Prima est aliena et ab extra infusa. Haec est qua Christus iustus est et iustificans per fidem . . ."

¹⁸ LW 31, p. 297; WA 2, p. 145.

¹⁹ Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther: His Road To Reformation, 1483-1521*, translated by James L. Schaaf (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 229, dates this sermon on Palm Sunday, March 28, 1518. Kurt Aland does the same: *Der Weg zur Reformation: Zeitpunkt und Charakter des reformatorischen Erlebnisses Martin Luthers*, *Theologische Existenz Heute*, Schriftenreihe, N. F. no. 123 (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965), pp. 102-04. Walther von Loewenich, *Duplex Iustitia. Luthers Stellung zu einer Unionsformel des 16. Jahrhunderts*, *Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz*, vol. 68 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1972), pp. 2, 10, leave the problem unsolved, but Tom G. A. Hardt, "Justification and Easter. A Study in Subjective and Objective Justification in Lutheran Theology," in *A Lively Legacy: Essays in Honor of Robert Preus*, edited by Kurt E. Marquart, John R. Stephenson, and Bjarne W. Teigen (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary, 1985), p. 68, n. 3, emphasizes the importance of the fact that Luther's Reformation discovery took place later than March 28, 1518. He connects the date of the sermon with the second part of 1518. The year given by the WA editor is 1518. WA 2, p. 143.

²⁰ Hardt, "Justification and Easter," p. 52.

²¹ LW 31, p. 298; WA 2, p. 145. George Yule, "Luther's Understanding of Justification by Grace Alone in Terms of Catholic Christology," in *Luther: Theologian for Catholics and Protestants*, edited by George Yule (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985), p. 92.

²² LW 31, p. 298; WA 2, p. 145: "meum est quod Christus vixit, egit, dixit, passus est, mortuus est, non secus quam si ego illa vixissem, egissem, dixissem, passus essem et mortuus essem."

²³ Norman E. Nagel, *Luther's Understanding of Christ in Relation to His Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, (PhD dissertation, Cambridge University, 1961), p. 163. Nagel's observation points to the fact that Luther has overcome Augustine's concept of Christ working salvation in us.

²⁴ LW 31, p. 297; WA 2, p. 145: "Sicut sponsus habet omnia, quae sunt sponsae, et sponsa habet omnia, quae sunt sponsi (omnia enim sunt communia utriusque, sunt enim una caro), ita Christus et Ecclesia sunt unus spiritus."

²⁵ LW 31, p. 297; WA 2, p. 145: "Haec ergo iusticia datur hominibus in baptismo et omni tempore verae poenitentiae."

²⁶ LW 31, p. 298; WA 2, p. 146.

²⁷ LW 31, p. 297; WA 2, p. 145.

²⁸ LW 31, p. 298; WA 2, p. 146: "et quicquid fecit, nobis fecit nostrumque esse voluit, dicens: Ego in medio vestrum sum sicut qui ministrat."

²⁹ George Yule, "Luther's Understanding," p. 92, claims that it could be said also by Athanasius or Irenaeus or Cyril of Alexandria.

³⁰ LW 31, p. 298; WA 2, p. 149: "Igitur per fidem in Christum fit iusticia Christi nostra iusticia et omnia quae sunt ipse, immo ipsemet noster fit. Ideo appellat eam Apostulus iusticiam dei ad Ro: i. Iusticia dei revelatur in Euangelio, sicut scriptum est: Iustus ex fide vivit." See Ernst Bizer, *Fides ex auditu: Eine Untersuchung über die Entdeckung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes durch Martin Luther*, (Neukirchen: K. Moers, 1958), p. 110.

³¹ LW 31, p. 298; WA 2, p. 146: "Haec est iusticia infinita et omnia peccata in momento absorbens, quia impossibile est, quod peccatum in Christo haereat: at qui credit in Christo, haeret in Christo, estque unum cum Christo, habens eandem iusticiam cum ipso. Ideo impossibile est, quod in eo maneat peccatum." Bizer, *Fides ex auditu*, p. 110.

³² LW 31, p. 299; WA 2, p. 146: "In te, domine, speravi, non confundar in aeternum: in iusticia tua libera me, non 'in mea,' sed 'in tua,' inquit, id est in iusticia Christi dei mei, quae est per fidem, per gratiam, per misericordiam dei nostra facta, et haec vocatur in psalterio per multa loca opus domini, confessio, virtus dei, misericordia, veritas, iusticia. Omnia haec sunt nomina fidei in Christum, immo iusticiae quae est in Christo. Unde Apostolus ad Gala: ij. audet dicere: Vivo iam non ego, vivit vero in me Christus, et ad Ephe: iij. Ut det vobis Christum habitare per fidem in cordibus vestris."

³³ Martin Brecht, "Iustitia Christi: Die Entdeckung Martin Luthers," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 74 (1977): 219. Bizer, *Fides ex auditu*, p. 111, has the same opinion: "Ist das Neue in diesem Sermon der Nachweis, dass Christus durch den Glauben alle seine Güter und sich selbst dem Menschen zu eigen gibt. Dafür hat sich Luther eine theologische Begründung geschaffen." Also Norman Nagel, *Luther's Understanding*, p. 169, Kurt Aland, "Der Weg zur Reformation," pp. 104-05, and Albrecht Peters, "Luthers Turmerlebnis," *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 3 (1961): 236. They point to an important change in the clarity of interpretation of God's righteousness as the free gift given to a sinner for Christ's sake.

³⁴ LW 31, p. 299; WA, p. 146: "Oponitur peccato originali, quod alienum similiter est sine nostris actibus per solam generationem nobis cognatum et contractum. Et ita Christus expellit Adam de die in diem magis et magis, secundum quod crescit illa fides et cognito Christi. Non enim tota simul infunditur, sed incipit, proficit et perficitur tandem in fine per mortem."

³⁵ See page 7; Gottfried Hoffmann, "Luther and Justification," *The Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 24/1 (1984): 50, n. 21, also observes that this passage could be misunderstood: "W² 10, 1266 reads: 'For this alien righteousness is not poured in all at once; but rather it begins, grows, and is finally perfect through death.' In contrast with this, the text presented in WA 2, 146, 34f. has only: 'For it is not completely infused, but it begins, advances, and is perfected in the end through death.' The subject ought to be connected with the faith and knowledge of Christ which comes immediately before. The driving out of the Old Adam portrayed here really pertains to the second kind of righteousness which flows out of faith and is exercised according to the measure of faith." [Note: In Hoffmann's quotation, "W²" refers to the so-called "Walch 2" edition of Luther's works, which was edited and reprinted as the "St. Louis edition" by Concordia Publishing House. Volumes and columns are the same in "W²" and in "SL."]

³⁶ Bizer, *Fides ex auditu*, p. 111.

³⁷ Nagel, *Luther's Understanding*, pp. 164-67.

³⁸ Peters, "Luthers Turmerlebnis," p. 236.

³⁹ LW 31, p. 301; WA 2, p. 147-48: "Forma dei hic non dicitur substantia dei, quia hac Christus nunquam se exinanivit, sicut nee forma servi dici potest substantia human: sed forma dei est sapientia, virtus, iusticia, bonitas, deinde libertas, ita quod Christus homo fuit liber, potens, sapiens, nulli subiectus nec vicio nec peccato sicut sunt homines cuncti."

⁴⁰ Tom G. A. Hardt, *On the Sacrament of the Altar: A Book on the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1984), p. 2.

⁴¹ Marc Lienhard, *Luther, Witness to Jesus Christ: Stages and Themes of the Reformer's Christology*, translated by Edwin H. Robertson (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982), p. 113.

⁴² WA 39/II, p. 237. Hardt, "Justification and Easter," p. 56.

⁴³ Lenker 2, p. 169; WA 17/II, p. 237.

⁴⁴ Lenker 2, p. 180; WA 17/II, p. 245.

⁴⁵ Hardt, *On the Sacrament of the Altar*, p. 2.

⁴⁶ Lenker 2, p. 170; WA 17/II, p. 238: "Das ist unter euch Christen, die ihr nu Christum habt und alle fülle und gnüge an ihm und inn ihm ... er nichts fur sich gesucht, sondern alles fur euch."

⁴⁷ Lenker 2, p. 170; WA 17/II, p. 238.

⁴⁸ Lenker 2, p. 170; WA 17/II, p. 238: "Über die gehen, so diessem unaussprechlichen exempel Christi nicht nachfolgen und sich nich auch unter ihre nehisten lassen und ihn dienen."

⁴⁹ Lenker 2, p. 171; WA 17/II, p. 238: "Das Gotliche wesen und natur inn Christo."

⁵⁰ Lenker 2, p. 171; WA 17/II, p. 239: "Das sich einer stellet als ein Got und auch also geberdet odder sich der gotheit annimpt und unterwindet."

⁵¹ Lenker 2, p. 171; WA 17/II, p. 239: "Nicht wird geredt von götlichem wesen odder knechtischem wesen eusserlich, sonder von dem geberden und erzeigen des wesens. ... das wesen ist heimlich, aber das zeigen geschicht öffentlich. Und das wesen ist etwas, aber das geberden thut etwas odder ist eine that."

⁵² Lenker 2, p. 172; WA 17/II, p. 239.

⁵³ Lenker 2, p. 172; WA 17/II, p. 239.

⁵⁴ Lenker 2, p. 172; WA 17/II, p. 239-40.

⁵⁵ Lenker 2, p. 173; WA 17/II, p. 240: "Christus was inn Göttlicher gestalt, das ist, er hatte das wesen sampt dem geberde. Denn er nam solch Göttlich geberde nicht an, wie er die knechts gestalt an nam. ... Inn dem wörtlin 'war' ligt die macht, das er das Göttlich wesen hatte mit und sampt der Göttlichen gestalt ... demutiget er sich und nach knechtische gestalt an, die ihm nicht geburt"

⁵⁶ Lenker 2, p. 174; WA 17/II, p. 241: "Christus war ein rechter Gott geboren und hatte es nicht geraubt u."

⁵⁷ Lenker 2, p. 174; WA 17/II, p. 241: "Denn Christus nam wol an knechtische gestalt, darinnen er nicht ist. ... So eussert sich nu Christus göttlicher gestalt, darinnen er war und nimpt an sich knechtische gestalt, darinnen er nicht ist. Wir aber eussern uns knechtischer gestalt, darinnen wir sind, und nemen odder unterwinden uns göttlicher gestalt, darinnen wir nicht sind."

⁵⁸ Lenker 2, p. 175; WA 17/II, pp. 241-42.

⁵⁹ Lenker 2, p. 175; WA 17/II, p. 242: "Aber es hellt sich also, das wer knecht wird, der nimpt nichts und kan nichts nemen, sondern gibt nür von sich, auch sich selbs zu eigen."

⁶⁰ Lenker 2, pp. 175-76; WA 17/II, p. 242: "Nicht wie andere heiligen, wilche nicht das wesen haben gehabt, sondern hat daneben auch das Göttlich wesen und natur gehabt inn der Göttlichen gestalt."

⁶¹ Lenker 2, p. 176; WA 17/II, p. 242: "Er unter den Jüngern gedient und sich für uns geben hat."

⁶² Lenker 2, p. 176; WA 17/II, p. 242: "Nemlich, das der mensch Got war und hette auch inn der menscheit mügen auff Göttliche wise geberden, hats aber nich gethan, sondern des sich enthalten und geeussert und geberdet, wie ein schlecht ander mensch thut."

⁶³ Lenker 2, pp. 176-77; WA 17/II, p. 243.

⁶⁴ Lenker 2, p. 177; WA 17/II, p. 243.

⁶⁵ Lenker 2, pp. 176-78; WA 17/II, p. 243.

⁶⁶ Lenker 2, p. 178; WA 17/II, p. 244.

⁶⁷ Lenker 2, p. 178; WA 17/II, p. 244.

⁶⁸ Lenker 2, p. 178; WA 17/II, p. 244.

⁶⁹ Lenker 2, p. 179; WA 17/II, pp. 244-45.

⁷⁰ Lenker 2, p. 18; WA 17/II, p. 245.

⁷¹ Lenker 2, p. 180; WA 17/II, p. 245.

⁷² Ian D. Kingston Siggins, *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), p. 200.

⁷³ Siggins, *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ*, p. 216.

⁷⁴ Siggins, *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ*, p. 233.

⁷⁵ Siggins, *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ*, p. 219.

⁷⁶ Lenker 2, p. 180; WA 17/II, p. 245: "Denn Gott will, das einer des andern knecht sei mit leib, gut, ehre, geist und seele, wie sein son uns gethan hat."

⁷⁷ ZW 2, p. 3.

⁷⁸ W. P. Stephens, *Zwingli: An Introduction to His Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), p. 23.

⁷⁹ Robert C. Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967), p. 220.

⁸⁰ ZW 2, p. 5; Z 2, p. 475: "Got ist nit allein darumb gerecht, das er eim ieden das sin gibt, als die menschen die gerechtigkeit beschriben hand."

⁸¹ ZW 2, p. 5; Z 2, p. 475: "Er ist der gestalt gerecht, das er der unversert kann ist aller unschuld und frommgheit und gerechtigkeit und alles güten; dann er ist die gerechtigkeit, frommkeit und alles gütes selb wesentlich, also, das nüt fromm noch gerecht noch güet ist, denn das aus im kumpt."

⁸² ZW 2, 6; Z 2, pp. 475-76: "diese also lutren, reinen, unvermischten gerechtigkeit gottes sehend wir an sinem eignem wort; Dannen har wir wol ermessen mögend, das die götliche gerechtigkeit ver über die menschlichen ist, so verr got über den menschen ist. Daraus volgt, das wir zu siner gerechtigkeit nit lange mögend, das ist: das wir die mass siner schone, unschuld und reinigkeit nit erlangen mögend."

⁸³ ZW 2, p. 6; Z 2, p. 476: "Noch erfodet got, das wir sygind wie er, ob wir anderst by in wonen begerind."

⁸⁴ ZW 2, pp. 6-7; Z 2, pp. 476-77.

⁸⁵ ZW 2, p. 7; Z 2, p. 477.

⁸⁶ Stephens, *Zwingli*, pp. 74-75.

⁸⁷ ZW 2, p. 7; Z 2, p. 477: "Dis unser iamer und onmacht hat got gesehen und darüber erbarmt und mittel funden, damit sin gerechtigkeit versünet wurde für uns, das wir by im wonen möchtind: und hat darumb sinen sun lassen mensch werden, von der reinen magt Maria on alle sünd vom heiligen geist empfangen."

⁸⁸ Stephens, *Zwingli*, pp. 56-57.

⁸⁹ ZW 2, p. 7; Z 2, p. 478: "unnd so er aber, der unsculdig was, für uns schuldigen sündler den tod leyd, bezalt er für uns die so schönen gerechtigkeit gottes, die sust ghein mensch vernügen mag, das er uns verdient hat, dass wir zu got kummen mögend uss siner fryen gnad und gab. Welicher das hort und gloubt ungezwyflet, der wirt sälig. Das ist das euangelium."

⁹⁰ ZW 2, p. 7; Z 2, p. 478: "Noch blybt für und für das, so got erfordert."

⁹¹ ZW 2, p. 7; Z 2, p. 478: "Und sind aber an der that nimmer also, ja es ist uns nit möglich, das wir, die wyl wir lebend, so rein sygind."

⁹² ZW 2, pp. 7-8; Z 2, p. 478: "Darumb müssend wir zu aller zyt durch den einigen, gerechten, unsculdigen Jesum Christum zü got kommen; den der ist allein der fürstender und bezaler für unser sund in die ewigkeit."

⁹³ ZW 2, p. 8; Z 2, p. 479: "Du wirst ouch din werck erkennen, das es nüt ist und nüts werdt vor got und alles, das dir got bewyst, dass es nit umb dinen verdienst, vonder uss siner fryen gab bescheche."

⁹⁴ ZW 2, p. 11; Z 2, p. 483: "Also hoff ich, sye offenbar, das ein ieder, so gurch sine werck wil zü got kummen, irre; dann er sicht glych an dem ersten gebott, das er das nit erfüllen mag. Also gebüet uns got, das warlich siner grechtigkeit zimpt; aber uns ist nit möglich sine gebott ze halten. Der selben unser onmacht mag aber nieman ze hilff kummen denn der eynig got; der hates geton durch sinnen sun Christum Jesum."

⁹⁵ For a good summary of Augustine's doctrine of justification see Norman E. Nagel, "Martinus: 'Heresy, Doctor Luther, Heresy!'" *The Person and Work of Christ*, in *Seven-Headed Luther: Essays in Commemoration of a Quincentenary 1483-1983*, edited by Peter Newman Brooks (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), p. 34.

⁹⁶ ZW 2, p. 12; Z 2, p. 484: "Darumb sind zweyerley gsatz, glych wie ouch zwo gerechtigkeiten sind: ein götliche unnd ein menschliche. Ein teil der gsatzen sehend allein den innerenen menschen an, als wie man got, wie man den nächsten sölle lieb haben. Und dise gsatz mag nieman erfüllen."

⁹⁷ ZW 2, p. 12; Z 2, p. 484: "Also ist ouch nieman gerecht denn der einig got, und der, so durch genad, dero pfand Christus ist, gerecht würdt gemacht durch den glouben."

⁹⁸ ZW 2, p. 19; Z 2, pp. 493-94: "Alle menschen gheissen werden die götlichen gerechtigkeit süchen, das ist: nach sinem willen der unschuld sich flyssen fur unnd fur, bis das wir die mass Christi treffend. Unser flyss an der götlichen grechtikeit nit zükummen mag. Die unsere onmacht ersetzt aber rychlich der einig Christus. ... Also sol das luter wort gottes on underlass usskündt werden; denn darinn erlernet man, was got von uns erforderet, und mit was gnaden er uns ze hilff kumpt."

⁹⁹ Stephens, *Zwingli*, pp. 70-71.

¹⁰⁰ Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy*, p. 225.

¹⁰¹ Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy*, p. 225.

¹⁰² Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, p. 183.

¹⁰³ Locher, *Zwingli's Thought*, p. 183.

¹⁰⁴ See Uuras Saarnivaara, *Luther Discovers the Gospel: New Light upon Luther's Way from Medieval Catholicism to Evangelical Faith* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951), p. 10.

¹⁰⁵ ZW 2, p. 20; Z 2, p. 496.

¹⁰⁶ ZW 2, p. 21; Z 2, p. 497.

¹⁰⁷ LW 34, p. 336.

¹⁰⁸ WA-Tr 5, p. 210, no. 5518.

¹⁰⁹ ZW 2, p. 10; Z 2, p. 481: "Das got sinen sun für uns geben hat als einen volbringer sines willens."

¹¹⁰ ZW 1, p. 185; Z 2, p. 232: "Dann das gsatz ist güt, gerecht und helig Ro. 7. [Rom. 7:12]. Wiltu wissen warumb? Darumb, das es nüt anderst ist weder einoffnung und anzeigen des willens gottes, das wir an dem wort des gebottes sehend, was got wil und erfordret. Desshalb es billicher euangelium hiesse weder ein gsatz. Denn wenn sölte nit freuwen, der in menschlicher finsternus und unwüssenheit lebt, wenn im got sinen willen ufftäte?"

¹¹¹ ZW 1, p. 185; Z 2, p. 232: "Deshalb ich da oben geredet hab, das gsatz sye dem gotschulder ein euangelium."

¹¹² Joachim Rogge, "Zwingli the Statesman," in *Huldrych Zwingli, 1484-1531: A Legacy of Radical Reform*, edited by E. J. Furcha, ARC Supplement, no. 2 (Montreal: McGill University, 1985), p. 58.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Original Works and Translations

- The Book of Concord*. Edited by Theodore Tappert. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- D. Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1883- .
- Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*. Edited by Emil Egli and Georg Finsler in *Corpus Reformatorum*, vols. 88-101. Berlin: Verlag von C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1905- .
- Luther's Epistle Sermons: Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost*. Translated and edited by John N. Lenker. Minneapolis: The Luther Press, 1909.
- Luther's Works*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, and St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955- .
- Zwingli, Huldrych. *Writings*. Translated by H. Wayne Pipkin. Pittsburgh Theological Monographs, New Series, no. 13. General Editor Dikran Y. Hadidian. Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1984 .

Secondary Sources: Books and Articles

- Aland, Kurt. *Der Weg zur Reformation: Zeitpunkt und Charakter des reformatorischen Erlebnisses Martin Luthers* *Theologische Existenz Heute, Schriftenreihe*, N. F. no. 123. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1965.
- Bizer, Ernest. *Fides ex auditu: Eine Untersuchung über die Entdeckung der Gerechtigkeit Gottes durch Martin Luther*. Neukirchen: K. Moers, 1958.
- Brecht, Martin. "Iustitia Christi: Die Entdeckung Martin Luthers," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 74 (1977): 179-223.
- Brecht, Martin. *Martin Luther. His Road To Reformation, 1483-1521*. Translated by James L. Schaaf. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

- Hardt, Tom G. A. "Justification and Easter. A Study in Subjective and Objective Justification in Lutheran Theology," In *A Lively Legacy: Essays in Honor of Robert Preus*. Edited by Kurt E. Marquart, John R. Stephenson, and Bjarne W. Teigen. Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary, 1985. Pp. 52-78.
- Hardt, Tom. G. A. *On the Sacrament of the Altar: A Book on the Lutheran Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. Fort Wayne: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 1984.
- Hoffmann, Gottfried. "Luther and Justification," *The Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 24/1 (1984): 1-83.
- Lienhard, Marc. *Luther, Witness To Jesus Christ: Stages and Themes of the Reformer's Christology*. Translated by Edwin H. Robertson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1982.
- Locher, Gottfried W. *Die Theologie Huldrych Zwinglis im Lichte seiner Christologie*. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1952.
- Locher, Gottfried W. *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspectives*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981.
- Loewenich, Walter von. *Duplex Iustitia. Luthers Stellung zu einer Unionsformel des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, vol. 68. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1972.
- Nagel, Norman E. *Luther's Understanding of Christ in Relation to His Doctrine of the Lord's Supper*. PhD dissertation, Cambridge University, 1961.
- Nagel, Norman E. "Martinus: 'Heresy, Doctor Luther, Heresy!' The Person and Work of Christ." In *Seven-Headed Luther: Essays in Commemoration of a Quincentenary 1483-1983*. Edited by Peter Newman Brooks. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983. Pp. 25-49.
- Peters, Albrecht. "Luthers Turmerlebnis," *Neue Zeitschrift für Systematische Theologie* 3 (1961): 203-36.
- Rogge, Joachim. "Zwingli the Statesman." In *Huldrych Zwingli, 1484-1531: A Legacy of Radical Reform*. Edited by E. J. Furcha. ARC Supplement, no. 2. Montreal: McGill University, 1985. Pp. 44-61.

Saarnivaara, Uuras. *Luther Discovers the Gospel: New Light upon Luther's Way from Medieval Catholicism to Evangelical Faith*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951.

Sasse, Herman. *This Is My Body*. Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1957.

Scaer, David P. *Christology*. Confessional Lutheran Dogmatics, vol. 6. Edited by Robert D. Preus. Fort Wayne: International Foundation for Confessional Lutheran Research, 1993.

Siggins, Ian D. Kingston. *Martin Luther's Doctrine of Christ*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.

Stephens W. P. *Zwingli: An Introduction to His Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Walther, C. F. W. *The Proper Distinction between Law and Gospel*. Translated by W. H. T. Dau. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1991.

Walton, Robert C. *Zwingli's Theocracy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Yule, George, ed. *Luther: Theologian for Catholics and Protestants*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1985.