CAPTIVE TO THE WORD

Martin Luther: Doctor of Sacred Scripture

by

A. SKEVINGTON WOOD
B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S.

*"I am bound by the Scriptures . . .
and my conscience is captive
to the Word of God".*
Martin Luther

THE PATERNOSTER PRESS

SBN: 85364 087 4

AUSTRALIA:
Emu Book Agencies Pty., Ltd.,
511, Kent Street, Sydney, N.S.W.

CANADA:
Home Evangel Books Ltd.,
25, Hobson Avenue, Toronto, 16

NEW ZEALAND:
G. W. Moore, Ltd.,
3, Campbell Road, P.O. Box 24053,
Royal Oak, Auckland, 6

SOUTH AFRICA:
Oxford University Press,
P.O. Box 1141, Thibault House,
Thibault Square, Cape Town

Made and Printed in Great Britain for
The Paternoster Press Paternoster House
3 Mount Radford Crescent Exeter Devon
by Cox & Wyman Limited Fakenham

CHAPTER XVI

LUTHER AND THE CHRIST-CENTREDNESS OF SCRIPTURE

IT IS BEING RECOGNIZED TODAY THAT WHAT HAS been described as Luther's Copernican revolution in theology involved a revision of traditional views about Christ as well as those about salvation. Indeed, the one depended upon the other. This was the pattern of Luther's own experience. It was only as he came to know Christ as a gracious redeemer, and not just as a "judge sitting on a rainbow", that he entered into the liberation which none but those who are right with God can enjoy.[1] For him, justification by faith did not occur in a vacuum as it were. It had its source and centre in Christ. It is he who is the believer's righteousness, as well as wisdom, sanctification and redemption (1 Cor. 1:30).

This realization that Luther's new approach to the Church's doctrine had as its basis a rediscovery of Christology was expressed by Robert L. Ottley in his major work on *The Doctrine of the Incarnation*. "Luther did indeed restore to Christendom the sovereign significance of the historical person of Christ," he declared, "obscured as it actually was in the popular mind by an immense formal system of mediation. He recalled men's minds from a false to a true conception of faith; from blind and mechanical reliance on a complex system to simple trust in a living person, the Divine Christ."[2] As a result of this Christological reorientation, the whole of Luther's theology found its focus in our Lord. Wilhelm Herrmann was hardly exaggerating when he claimed that "the attitude towards Jesus which Luther consciously held marks a step forward in the development of the Christian religion."[3]

We may trace the genesis of this awareness on Luther's part to the influence of Johann Staupitz, the vicar-general of his order. It was he who had told Luther: "One must keep one's eyes fixed on that man who is called Christ"; and who had on another occasion affirmed: "In Christ all treasures are hidden: apart from Him they are closed to us."[4] Luther followed the clue to its logical conclusion. Hence his theology was thoroughly Christocentric. Even his pivotal article of justification by faith alone found its ultimate reference in the person of our Lord. It was only

[1] *Dok.*, 346, 358, 381. LW. 24. 24.
[2] Robert L. Ottley, *The Doctrine of the Incarnation* (1896), p. 537.
[3] Wilhelm Herrmann, *The Communion of the Christian with God* (2nd edn. E.T. 1906), p. 148.
[4] LW. 54. 97. No. 526; WATR 2. 582. No. 2654a.

because Christ was no less than Son of God and Saviour of the world, that He could thus save to the uttermost those who came to the Father by Him. For Luther, according to Cave, "the Divinity of Christ was not just a doctrine of the Church. It was the one guarantee of men's salvation."[1]

In expounding the Apostles' Creed in his *Larger Catechism*, Luther drew out the soteriological significance of Christ's Lordship. "I believe that Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, has become my Lord. And what do the words 'to become thy Lord' mean? They mean that He has redeemed me from sin, from the devil, from death and all misfortunes. . . . So the main point of this article is that the little word Lord, taken in its simplest sense, means as much as Redeemer; that is, He who led us back from the devil to God, from death to life, from sin to righteousness, and holds us safe."[2] The Christian's assertion of belief, in the words of the *Credo*, implies that Christ is regarded both as Son of God and Saviour. The two belong together. If Christ is indeed the Son of God, then He will save; and only because He is divine is He able to save. "If Christ is divested of His deity," Luther stated, "there remains no help against God's wrath and no rescue from His judgment."[3] "If I saw in Christ only a man crucified and dying for me, then I would be lost."[4] But Luther had no hesitation about proclaiming the deity of our Lord.[5] His own testimony substantiated what he had learned from the Scriptures. "I have had so many experiences of Christ's divinity, that I must say: either there is no God, or He is God."[6]

The humanity of Jesus was nevertheless fully recognized. Indeed, Luther found that the biblical account starts here, and only gradually builds up to a disclosure of our Lord's Messiahship and deity. "The Scriptures begin very gently, and lead us on to Christ as to a man, and then to one who is Lord over all creatures, and after that to one who is God. So do I enter delightfully and learn to know God. But the philosophers and doctors have insisted on beginning from above. We must begin from below, and after that come upwards."[7] Unless we do as the Bible does, we shall fail to set our feet on Christ the Ladder let down by the Father to bring us up to himself.[8] It is through the man Christ Jesus that we come to acknowledge the Saviour and the Son. "If you can humble yourself, hold to the word with your heart and hold to Christ's humanity – then the divinity will indeed become manifest."[9] Luther realized that the true manhood of our Lord is essential to salvation. If Christ is not "a real and natural man, born of Mary, then He is not of our flesh and blood. Then He has nothing in common with us; then we can derive no comfort from Him."[10]

[1] Cave, op. cit., p. 139. [2] PW. 99, 100.
[3] LW. 22. 22. [4] EA. 7. 185.
[5] Heinrich H. Schultz, *Die Lehre von der Gottheit Christi: Communicatio Idiomata* (1881), pp. 207–8.
[6] WATR. 1. 269. No. 583. [7] EA. 12. 412. [8] WA. 40. iii. 656.
[9] LW. 23. 102; cf., 103. [10] LW. 22. 23.

In considering the relationship between the divine and human natures of our Lord, Luther adhered strictly to the Chalcedonian formula. But he supplemented it with an explanatory theory of the *communicatio idiomatum* or transference of attributes. He firmly rejected Zwingli's conception of *alloeosis*, by which the interchange of qualities between the natures was reduced simply to a figure of speech.[1] Luther traced back this error to Nestorius.[2] He declared that he knew no God except the child at Mary's breast and the man nailed to the cross.[3] He insisted that the Saviour suffered for us in His divine as well as in His human nature. As Harnack discerned, no teacher of the Church since Cyril of Alexandria had laid such stress on the mystery of Christ's two natures, or drawn such consolation from it.[4] This must be borne in mind, for we shall shortly see that Luther's Christology at this point has an important bearing on his view of Scripture.

It is not surprising that, since for Luther "Christ fills the whole sphere of God", as Lindsay expressed it, he should regard the Bible as first and foremost a book about the Saviour.[5] The entire Scripture is "concerned only with Christ when you see its inner meaning, even though it may look and sound differently on the outside."[6] A favourite illustration is that of the *punctus mathematicus*: Christ is the "central point of the circle", around which everything else in the Bible revolves.[7] "This is the new element in Luther's doctrine of Scripture, the reformatory turn of his biblical theology," claims Kooiman. "To place the Bible in a central position had been done by the theologians of earlier centuries. To place Christ in the centre of the Bible, as totally as Luther did, was previously unheard of. With great monotony he hammered consistently upon this single anvil."[8] The Christ-centredness of Scripture was his most distinctive insight.

It was developed very early in his career as a biblical exegete.[9] Even so soon as in the *Dictata super Psalterium* (1513–15), he could announce: "I see nothing in Scripture except Christ and Him crucified."[10] In a sermon preached in November 1515, a fragment of which has been preserved, Luther said: "He who would read the Bible must simply take heed that he does not err, for the Scripture may permit itself to be stretched and led, but let no one lead it according to his own inclinations but let him lead it

[1] SL. 20. 1310; cf. Huldreich Zwingli, *Opera* (1581), 3. 523.

[2] LW. 23. 101 n. 80. Nestorius of Constantinople was a fifth-century heretic who held that there were two separate persons in the incarnate Christ, as against the orthodox doctrine that there was a single person with two natures. Nestorius denied the title θεοτόκος to Mary and rejected the *communicatio idiomatum*. It was only in His humanity that Christ was born, suffered and died. "I cannot worship a God who was born, put to death, and buried," he declared.

[3] WA. 39. ii. 280.

[4] Harnack, op. cit., Bd. III, p. 695.

[5] DCG. 2. 862.

[6] WA. 56. 414.

[7] WATR. 439. No. 2383.

[8] Kooiman, op. cit., pp. 207–8.

[9] Reu, *Luther and the Scriptures*, pp. 46–48.

[10] WA. 4. 153; cf. WA. 3. 597.

to the source, that is the cross of Christ. Then he will surely strike the centre."[1] And in his exposition of the *Seven Penitential Psalms* (1517), Luther wound up like this: "As for me, I confess: Whenever I found less in the Scriptures than Christ, I was never satisfied; but whenever I found more than Christ, I never became poorer. Therefore it seems to me to be true that God the Holy Spirit does not know and does not want to know anything besides Jesus Christ, as He says of Him, 'He will glorify me' (John 16:14)."[2]

Erasmus had already anticipated Luther in stressing this. "Nothing is to be sought in Scripture but Christ," he had demanded.[3] But, as Reu brought out, there is a difference in viewpoint between Erasmus and Luther. "For Erasmus Christ was the centre of the Scriptures because He is the best model of the moral life; for Luther, because He is the crucified and risen One who brought about forgiveness, righteousness, and life, and gives it to us, as he continues in his exposition to the Psalms (1517): 'Christ is God's grace, mercy, righteousness, truth, wisdom, power, comfort, and salvation, given us of God without any merit.'"[4] This quest for Christ in Scripture is not to be confined to the New Testament. It applies equally to the Old. The whole Bible treats of Christ. Readers are not to imagine that the Old Testament is incapable of conveying such a revelation. In the memorable words of his preface to the Old Testament, Luther warned against such a superficial conclusion. "I beg and really caution every pious Christian not to be offended by the simplicity of the language and stories frequently encountered there, but fully realize that, however simple they may seem, these are the very words, works, judgments and deeds of the majesty, power, and wisdom of the most high God. For these are the Scriptures which make fools of all the wise and understanding, and are open only to the small and simple, as Christ says in Matthew 11(:25). Therefore dismiss your own opinions and feelings, and think of the Scriptures as the loftiest and noblest of holy things, as the richest of mines which can never be sufficiently explored, in order that you may find that divine wisdom which God here lays before you in such simple guise as to quench all pride. Here you will find the swaddling clothes and the manger in which Christ lies, and to which the angel points the shepherds (Luke 2:12). Simple and lowly are these swaddling clothes, but dear is the treasure, Christ, who lies in them."[5]

Luther employed a variety of metaphors to express the centrality of Christ in Scripture. We have noted his allusion to the mid-point of the circle. Another favourite expression of his was to speak about Christ as

[1] WA. 1. 52. [2] LW. 14. 204.

[3] Oecolampadius acknowledged that he had learned this from Erasmus (Otto Scheel, *Luthers Stellung zur Heiligen Schrift* (1902), p. 10; Reu, *Luther and the Scriptures*, p. 148, n. 92.

[4] Reu. *Luther and the Scriptures*, p. 47; WA. 1. 219; LW. 14. 204.

[5] LW. 35. 236.

"the sun and truth in Scripture".[1] Everything else, even within the Bible itself, is not to be compared with Christ as a source of illumination. Indeed, it is only as He sheds his light on the rest that it becomes intelligible to us. When the sun rises, it supersedes the moon and stars. Their light – so bright in the darkness of night – fades away when the sun comes up. "The same thing is true of Christ. The prophets are the stars and the moon, but Christ is the sun. Wherever Christ appears, speaks, and shines, His words have a validity that invalidates and stifles all others and renders them of no account, even though the moon and the stars also glitter and glisten beautifully. Thus Moses, the Law, and the prophets are a good and learned message, but compared with the message of Christ they are as nothing; for they are like a wax candle that is lighted during the day to compare it with the brilliance of the sun. The candle's gleam pales and fades before the sun's rays and light. Thus Moses and the prophets also pale into insignifiance before Christ. For Christ alone must prevail."[2] And again: "All Holy Writ points to the fact that Moses must proclaim the law, but that Christ will abolish and obscure the message of the law, just as the sun dims the light of the moon and the stars. You can see that the stars are not shining during the day, though they are fixed in the heavens before your very eyes. The sun deprives them of their light. But when the sun sets, we again behold the glittering stars. When the big light vanishes, the lesser lights begin to shine and gleam. *But if Christ, the Sun, should go down, then may God help us!*"[3] Hence Christ "should be acknowledged as the sun, and His Word as such a light of grace that men forget everything else".[4]

All Scripture has been given for the sake of Christ, in order that He might be made known and glorified. In Him alone does it find its meaning. Because of this, everything is to be understood with reference to Him. Christ is "the substance of Scripture" and "if He is known, everything else becomes plain and perspicuous".[5] Christian doctrine as set out in Scripture is "one eternal and round golden circle, in which there is no crack".[6] It has to do only with Christ. Commenting on Romans 10:4 – "For Christ is the end of the law, that everyone who has faith may be justified" – Luther explained that this meant "every word in the Bible points to Christ".[7] The question in Deuteronomy 30:12 – "Who will go up for us to heaven?" – seems to have nothing at all to do with Christ, but in Romans 10:5–9 Paul shows that it has. It was as if the apostle "wanted to give us an impressive proof of the fact that the whole Scripture, if one contemplates it inwardly, deals everywhere with Christ, even though in so far as it is a sign and a shadow, it may outwardly sound differently".[8]

Thus Luther can conclude that "in the whole Scripture there is nothing

[1] WA. 3. 26.
[2] LW. 23. 279–80.
[3] Ibid., 281.
[4] Ibid.
[5] LW. 7. 285.
[6] LW. 27. 38.
[7] LCC. 15. 288.
[8] Ibid.

but Christ, either in plain words or involved words".[1] "Take Christ out of the Scriptures," he asked Erasmus, "and what will you find remaining in them?"[2] Scripture contains "nothing but Christ and the Christian faith."[3] It is this Christocentric approach to the Bible which transforms it for the reader, as Luther had discovered for himself. In particular, the Old Testament when interpreted in this way takes on a totally fresh significance "Everything becomes new in this Christ, even the prayers of the dear patriarchs, because they called upon this very same Christ, who has now come and has fulfilled what they believed and looked for. Now Scripture and the Psalms ring just as new on our lips, if we believe in Christ, as they did when David first sang them. In brief, from now on Christ wants all variation and disparity removed and everything unified, so that, as St. Paul declares, there will henceforth be but one God, one church, one faith, one prayer and worship, one Christ (Eph. 4 : 4–6), 'the same yesterday and today and forever' (Heb. 13 : 8). To sumarize, God will hear and acknowledge only what is presented in the name of Christ."[4]

It is in terms of this recognition that all Scripture relates to Christ that Luther's oft-quoted statement in his Preface to James must be understood. There he claimed that "all the genuine sacred books agree in this, that all of them preach and inculcate (*treiben*) Christ. And that is the true test by which to judge all books when we see whether or not they inculcate Christ."[5] Attempts have been made to raise this to the level of a discriminating criterion within Scripture itself, as if Luther was prepared by such a yardstick to pick and choose from the whole range of God's Word that which was ultimately authoritative for the Christian. But this, of course, was far from his mind. He believed that all the canonical books inculcated Christ, and for this reason he accepted them in their entirety. His query about James was concerned with its canonicity. He did not hesitate to announce in the following sentence in the Preface that "all the Scriptures show us Christ".[6] In view of this, everything in Scripture is to be seen in the light of Christ. "If you would interpret well and confidently, set Christ before you," Luther wrote in his introduction to the Old Testament, "for He is the man to whom it all applies, every bit of it."[7] This was his "brief suggestion for seeking Christ and the Gospel in the Old Testament".[8] And again, in his lectures on Romans: "There a great stride has been made towards the right interpretation of Scripture, by understanding it all as bearing on Christ."[9] It in this context that we realize the shrewdness of Kramm's comment that for Luther the rule, "what inculcates Christ," is a principle of interpretation within Scripture, not a principle of selection.[10]

[1] WA. 11. 223. [2] BW. 26. [3] WA. 8. 236.
[4] LW. 24. 397. [5] LW. 35. 396. [6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., 247. [8] Ibid., 248. [9] WA. 56. 4.
[10] Hans Herbert Walther Kramm, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (1947), p. 114.

Luther's Christocentric approach to Scripture provides the clue to the paradox involved in his insistence on the primacy of the literal sense, whilst conceding that there is a further, inner, spiritual meaning.[1] Luther took his stand on the literal sense. That for him was fundamental. But he recognized that there is an inward meaning of the Word to which the eyes of faith must penetrate. It is not supplementary to the literal sense, but communicated by it. Luther's major contribution to biblical interpretation lay in the fusion of the literal and spiritual in a new and dynamic relationship. His view treated the Scriptures dialectically. It resolved the tension between the literal and the spiritual sense. It took into account the interaction between the historical elements of the Bible. It transcended the normal categories of internal and external significance and achieved a vital synthesis between the letter and the spirit.

This *rapprochement* was made possible because, as Blackman hints, for Luther Christ is both the literal and the spiritual sense of Scripture, and these two are one in Him.[2] It is He who reconciles the apparently incompatible. The acknowledgement of Christ as Lord of Scripture supplied the context in which the holy alliance of letter and spirit may be effected.[3] In the first flush of his own discovery of this hermeneutical key, Luther could declare: "Christ is the head of all the saints, the origin of all, the source of all streams. . . . Therefore the words of Scripture concerning Christ at the same time share life with Him. And in this way all the four senses of Scripture flow into one."[4] Eventually he discarded the *quadriga* altogether because of its misuse by Roman propagandists. But his Christocentric exegesis nevertheless ensured that ample justice should be done to every intrinsic shade of biblical meaning.

That introduces us lastly to Luther's Christological conception of Scripture, which was determinative for his whole outlook. His Christocentric perspective led him to affirm that, since Christ is the only revealer of God, He is the essential content of Scripture. But if the question is raised as to the mode of our Lord's manifestation in the Word, Luther offered a profoundly constructive solution. As the divinity and power of God are embedded in the vessel of Christ's incarnate body, so the same divinity and power of God are embedded in Scripture, a vessel made of letters, composed of paper and printer's ink.[5] In order to grasp the biblical revelation in its fulness it is necessary to conceive of Scripture in terms of the divine-human nature of Christ.[6]

[1] Cf. A. Skevington Wood, *Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, p. 34. Some material in the remainder of the chapter first appeared in this Tyndale Lecture in Historical Theology which I was privileged to deliver at Cambridge in 1959.

[2] Blackman, op. cit., p. 120.

[3] Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, *The Authority of the Biblical Revelation* (1946), p. 102.

[4] *Luther Today*, 74. [5] WA. 3. 515.

[6] WA. 3. 403–4. Cf. Erich Roth, "Martin Luther and the Continental Reformation" *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol CLIII(1952), p. 173.

Luther's recognition of this incarnational factor in the doctrine of Scripture was one of his most relevant insights. The clue to his biblical interpretation is the Christological method of Scripture itself. The very categories Luther employed were Christological rather than scientific, philosophical, or even narrowly theological. For him the basic problem was the reconciliation of the divine and human elements in Scripture. The Bible is God's Book. Its writers were God-inspired men. Through it God still speaks. But the writers were also human, and what they wrote has been recorded in the normal fashion. Luther realized that the issue raised is Christological at the core. His argument stemmed from the statement that "sacred Scripture is God incarnate".[1] He drew a deliberate analogy between Scripture and the person of Christ, between the Word written and the Word made flesh. "And the Word," he said, "is just like the Son of God."[2]

As in the doctrine of the incarnation the Church announces that our Lord was at once fully God and fully man, so Luther would have us maintain the full divinity and full humanity, as it were, of Holy Scripture. Orthodox theology enjoins us to hold in tension the humanity and divinity of our Lord. We have to confess that He was both fully man and yet fully God. It is a heresy to deny either. Docetism erred in overlooking His humanity: Psilanthropism erred in rejecting His divinity.[3] The same sort of problem confronts us in the Bible: namely, the reconciliation of the divine and human elements in the Word. Luther believed that the Chalcedonian formula concerning the two natures of Christ should also be applied to the Bible. As we are required to recognize the two natures of our Lord, "without confusion, without mutation, without division, without separation," so too we ought to recognize the dual nature of Scripture and hold both to its full humanity and its full divinity.[4] Moreover, Luther related his concept of *communicatio idiomatum* to the Scriptures, as well as to the person of Christ and the sacraments, thus safeguarding the unity of the Bible from arbitrary fragmentation.[5] What is predicated of one element pertains to the other: there is a sort of interpenetration. The relevance of Luther's Christology, as summarized at the beginning of this chapter, will be appreciated.

Luther's Christological approach to Scripture retains its value today, and has something to teach us as once again the issue of its divine-human composition has been raised in the forefront of discussion. "The Church must develop its doctrine of the Scriptures," suggested Emil Brunner, "on

[1] Cf. SL. 3. 21. [2] *Luther Today*, p. 84.

[3] Cf. A. Skevington Wood, *The Principles of Biblical Interpretation*, p. 83.

[4] *ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως. Symbole der Alten Kirche ausgewählt von Hans Lietzmann* (1931), pp. 35–36.

[5] Cf. Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice* (E.T. 1930), p. 105; Seeberg, op. cit., Bd. IV, pp. 382–3.

the same lines as the doctrine of the two natures. The Bible shares in the glory of the divinity of Christ and in the lowliness of his humanity."[1] Luther would have concurred. But he would hardly have drawn the unconvincing conclusion that Brunner did from his assertion, when he wrote elsewhere: "Naturally the Scripture is an historical document written by men and, to that extent, also participating in the frailty of all that is human, in the relativity of all that is historical. Men must first have forgotten what to come in the flesh, to become historical, meant, to be able to set up a doctrine of an infallible book."[2] As Paul K. Jewett, who has submitted Brunner's concept of revelation and inspiration to critically searching analysis, points out with compelling pertinency: "What Brunner nowhere makes clear is why this dualism, which renders impossible an infallible written revelation, is no barrier to an infallible personal revelation in Christ."[3] Luther, on the other hand, pressed the analogy between the incarnation and the nature of Scripture to its logical limit in his Christological approach. The human element of Scripture for him was no more liable to error than was the human nature of Christ.

In conceding that Scripture was both human and divine, Luther did not thereby open the door to the suggestion of fallibility. He scrupulously avoided the charge of what we might describe as biblical Nestorianism. "Luther . . . was well acquainted with the 'human side' of Scripture," wrote Francis Pieper, "but only in the sense that God caused His Word to be written by men in the human tongue. Luther is horrified at people who dare to claim that Scripture is not entirely and in all its parts the Word of God because the writers, such as Peter and Paul, after all were men."[4] Commenting on I Peter 3:15, Luther advised his readers how to meet the objections of those who argue: "You preach that one should not hold to the teaching of men, even though Peter and Paul, yes, even Christ, were men too."[5] It was sufficient, Luther counselled, for Christians to base their proof on Scripture. If others refused to believe it, they should not argue. They were under no obligation to compel unbelievers to regard Scripture as something more than merely the human words of Peter and Paul, but as the Book of God. "If you hear people who are so completely blinded and hardened that they deny that this is God's Word or are in doubt about it, just keep silence, do not say a word to them, and let them go their way. Just say: 'I will give you enough proof from Scripture. If you want to believe it, this is good; if not, I will give you nothing else.'"[6] Thus firmly

[1] Emil Brunner, *Revelation and Reason* (E.T. 1947), p. 272.

[2] Emil Brunner, "Christliche Glaube nach reformierter Lehre", *Der Protestantismus der Gegenwart* (1926), p. 254; cf. *Inspiration and Interpretation*, ed. John F. Walvoord (1957), p. 230.

[3] Paul King Jewett, "Emil Brunner's Doctrine of Scripture", *Inspiration and Interpretation*, p. 230. Cf. Armin Moellering, "Brunner and Luther on Scriptural Authority", *Concordia Theological Monthly*, Vol XXI (1950), pp. 801–18.

[4] Pieper, op. cit., p. 278. [5] LW. 30. 107. [6] Ibid.

did Luther, in his Christological account of Scripture, hold to its absolute divine authority, despite the fact that it was mediated through men.

Kooiman is therefore justified in claiming that Luther's view of the Bible has closer bonds with his doctrine of the incarnation than with any theory of inspiration.[1] "Behind his concept of Scripture stands his doctrine of the descent of God in the flesh. Christ is both God and man – a miracle at which the reformer never ceased to be astonished. So also the Scripture is divine and human, at the same time. God's Word, clad in human words, is really present among us."[2] "The Holy Scripture is God's Word, written, and so to say, 'in-lettered,'" according to Luther, "just as Christ is the eternal Word of God incarnate in the garment of His humanity. And just as it is with Christ in the world, as He is viewed and dealt with, so it is also with the written Word of God. It is a worm and no book, compared with other books."[3] Like the Son of Man, the Scripture possesses neither form nor comeliness. There is no outward attraction. It is not esteemed by unbelieving men, any more than the Saviour is. Yet within this "simple basket of reeds, patched with clay, pitch, and such things . . . there lies . . . a beautiful living boy, like Moses."[4] "Christ lies in the crib, wrapped in swaddling clothes."[5] It is He who makes the Book unique to faith.

[1] Kooiman, op. cit., p. 237. [2] Ibid. [3] WA. 48. 31.
WA. 16. 82. [5] WA. 10. i. 15.