

Spring 2016

The Supper that Supposedly Split the Reformation: The Eucharist Controversy Between Huldrych Zwingli and Martin Luther

Jacob A. Clayton

Harding University, jclayton1@harding.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.harding.edu/tenor>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Clayton, Jacob A. (Spring 2016) "The Supper that Supposedly Split the Reformation: The Eucharist Controversy Between Huldrych Zwingli and Martin Luther," *Tenor of Our Times*: Vol. 5, Article 7.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.harding.edu/tenor/vol5/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Humanities at Scholar Works at Harding. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Tenor of Our Times* by an authorized editor of Scholar Works at Harding. For more information, please contact scholarworks@harding.edu.



HARDING
UNIVERSITY

THE SUPPER THAT SUPPOSEDLY SPLIT THE REFORMATION: THE EUCHARIST CONTROVERSY BETWEEN HULDRYCH ZWINGLI AND MARTIN LUTHER

By Jacob A. Clayton

On March 15, 1529, various German princes and representatives of the Holy Roman Empire (HRE) attended the second Diet of Speyer. This meeting dealt with the political upheavals rising from the religious movements of Martin Luther and others. The Diet decided to suppress these religious movements in order to restore Catholicism to the various principalities of the Holy Roman Empire.¹ However, the leaders of fourteen cities signed a protest and appeal because they were a part of the new religious movements. Thus, the other Catholic leaders called the dissenting leaders “Protestants.”²

Philip of Hesse, one of the Protestant leaders, wanted to unite all Protestants in order to counter the papal forces. However, political unity was impossible because of the religious disunity among the Protestant theologians. In an attempt to unite the Protestants, Philip invited the bickering theologians to his castle in Marburg on Oct. 2, 1529 to discuss their disagreements.³ Afterward, the theologians attempted to create fifteen articles

¹ G.R. Potter, *Zwingli* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 317, 318; Shawn D. Stafford, “A Different Spirit: Luther’s Approach toward the Reformed at Marburg,” *Lutheran Synod Quarterly* 50, no. 2-3 (June-September 2010): 122. Although Charles V of the HRE called the meeting, he was busy fighting the Turks in Austria and his regent Ferdinand presided in his place.

² Potter, 318; Stafford, 122; the princes who “protested” were Philip Landgrave of Hesse, John Frederick Elector of Saxony, George Margrave of Brandenburg-Anspach, George Prince of Anhalt, and the Dukes of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Ernest and Francis; the cities included Strassburg, Nuremberg, Weissenburg, Windsheim, Ulm, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nördlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny—all south Germans and sympathizers with Zwinglianism—Constance, and St. Gall.

³ Iren Snavelly, “The Evidence of Things Unseen: Zwingli’s Sermon on Providence and the Colloquy of Marburg,” *Westminster Theological Journal* 56, no. 2 (Fall 1994): 400; Potter, 316-319; Volker Leppin, “Martin Luther,” in *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*, ed. Lee Palmer Wandel (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Publishers, 2014), 48, 49; Stafford, 122; Ulrich Gäber, *Huldrych Zwingli: His Life and Work*, trans. Ruth C.L. Gritsch (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 131-135; W. P. Stephens, *The Theology of Huldrych Zwingli* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 248.

about their points of agreement. Although the theologians initially seemed to have reached a consensus through the Articles, the meeting ended up as a failure. Luther told his wife that the debate was an “amiable colloquy (i.e. friendly discussion),” but in reality, it was shouting match in which all sides repeated their favorite biblical texts over and over. They all interpreted the wording of the Articles differently, so they were ultimately divided further.⁴ The greatest disagreement was over the fifteenth article, which dealt with the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Martin Luther and Huldrych Zwingli, in particular, disagreed over this aspect of the Eucharist and they were the main spokesmen at Marburg.⁵ Thus, religious and political unity among Protestants was impossible since Luther and Zwingli were arrogant in their mindset in which both thought they could persuade the other easily. This difference of mindset was manifested in their ontologies, political views, emphases of fellowship and unity, and their hermeneutic principles toward the Eucharist.

Luther was a nominalist like William of Ockham and strongly emphasized a focus on scripture alone, to the extent of denying human reasoning to interpret Scripture.⁶ Thus, when he approached the verse, “Take, eat; this is my body,” in reference to Christ instituting the Lord’s Supper, Luther took the text literally and believed that the bread and wine became the actual body and blood of Christ.⁷ Unlike the Catholics, who believed that a priest miraculously turned the bread and wine into the literal body and blood

⁴ Martin Luther, “To Mrs. Martin Luther, October 4, 1529,” in *Luther’s Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, vol. 49, *Letters II*, ed. and trans. Gottfried G. Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 236; B.A. Gerrish, “Discerning the Body: Sign and Reality in Luther’s Controversy with the Swiss,” *Journal of Religion* 68, no. 3 (1988): 378; Stafford, 155-159; Potter, 331; Gäber, 137; Leppin, 53, 54; Stephens, 249, 250.

⁵ Martin Luther, “The Marburg Colloquy and the Marburg Articles,” in *Luther’s Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, vol. 38, *Word and Sacrament IV*, ed. Martin E. Lehmann, trans. A.T.W. Steinhäuser (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), 85-89; this will be denoted “LW 38” from here; Others who signed the Marburg Articles included Justus Jonas, Andreas Osiander, Stephen Agricola, Johann Brenz, and Caspar Hedio.

⁶ Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy* (New York: Cambridge Press University, 2006), 95; Leppin, 53; Stafford 127, 128; Snively, 402; Potter, 291; William of Ockham was an English Franciscan friar who lived from 1287-1347 and whose thought influenced parts of Europe during the late Medieval period; *Sola Scriptura* was the phrase which described the concept of focusing on the Bible alone as a person’s rule of faith and practice.

⁷ Wandel, 96, 99; the scripture used is found in Matt. 26:26, Mark 14:22, Luke 22:19, and 1 Cor. 11:24, describing Jesus’ institution of the Eucharist.

The Supper that Supposedly Split the Reformation

of Christ, Luther believed it happened miraculously as the person consumed the bread and the wine.⁸

As early as 1520, in *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, Luther regarded that Jesus' statement "It is the Spirit who gives life; the flesh is no help at all...",⁹ did not belong in the discussion of the Eucharist. He argued that the verse did not refer to the Eucharist since it had not yet been instituted when Jesus said this. Since the verse ends "The words I have spoken to you are spirit and life," Luther used this clause to emphasize the words, "This is my body/blood" and support his view of the corporeal eating.⁹ Thus, when he gave a rebuttal to Zwingli at the Colloquy in 1529, he supported his literal interpretation by emphasizing that the words of Christ, particularly those words that seemed to support his view of the body and blood, were to be obeyed and believed without discussion.¹⁰

On the contrary, Zwingli was influenced by humanists like Thomas Aquinas and Erasmus of Rotterdam. He was a realistic thinker and a priest who had a moralistic understanding of the gospel. He had a great respect for ancient paganism—to the extent that he pictured pagan heroes in heaven as he described in a sermon called "Divine Providence!"¹¹

While Luther felt that John 6:63 had no bearing on the Eucharist, Zwingli believed that the verse was referring to the Eucharist and he focused on it heavily. Zwingli thought the passage disproved the transformation of the

⁸ The Catholic idea of the transformation of the bread and wine into Christ's body and blood is called transubstantiation while Luther's idea of it, which did not involve a priest doing it, is known as consubstantiation.

⁹ Leppin, 51; Martin Luther, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," in *Luther's Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, vol. 36, *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. and trans. Abdel Ross Wentz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 19, 20; this work will be denoted as "LW 36 'BC'" from here; the Bible verse mentioned here is John 6:63.

¹⁰ LW 38, 27; given at the 2 p.m. session of the Marbury Colloquy on Oct. 2, 1529; in this rebuttal he said: "I admit that even if I shared your belief and would regard the body of Christ as being of no profit, these words can nevertheless not be refuted: 'This is my body.' No matter how many people have written against us, they have written as if we spoke of the sacrament without the word...As to the power of words: words merely signify, the human word is a mere sound...However, we add, when something is said by the Majesty on high, it does not become effective through our strength, but the strength of divine power. When God says: Take, do that, speak these words—then something takes place. He speaks and it is done. We must distinguish between what we say and God's command. Therefore, I say that the sacrament [Eucharist] should be celebrated within Christendom. There God establishes the sacrament upon his word and not upon our holiness..."

¹¹ Stafford, 128; Potter, 291; Leppin, 51.

bread and wine into the literal body and blood of Christ because of the phrase, “the flesh is no help at all.” He took the phrase “This is my body/blood” symbolically and believed that the word “is” meant “signifies.” He also used logic to confirm this since the flesh and blood were not seen nor tasted.¹² Thus, when he was at the 6 a.m. session of the Marburg Colloquy on Oct. 2, it was no surprise that Zwingli told Luther that John 6:63 was going to break his neck.¹³

Besides their basic ontological views, Zwingli and Luther had different political ideas. First of all, Luther was already prejudiced toward Zwingli before Marburg since Zwingli agreed with Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt on the Eucharist in 1524.¹⁴ Luther wanted nothing to do with the Swiss, of which Zwingli was a part, because he thought they were rebellious, fanatical peasants. After all, Luther wanted to maintain loyalty to Emperor Charles V and be in his good favor rather than cause trouble like Zwingli’s followers did.¹⁵ Also, he disliked religious warfare since he believed that only Christ could defend the Gospel.¹⁶

Just as the Saxons despised the Swiss, the Swiss resented the Saxons because Saxony had an elector for the Holy Roman Emperor while the Swiss Cantons did not. One of Zwingli’s Swiss supporters, Johann Oecolampadius said the Lutherans were eaters of flesh and drinkers of blood and accused them of worshiping a baked God. In return, Luther considered Zwingli’s followers to be possessed with the devil and hypocritical in their faith.¹⁷ Thus, with these presuppositions, unity was a mere fantasy.

Unlike Luther, Zwingli was an active politician wanting the Protestants to ban together against the Catholics since he believed that the gospel could be spread by the sword as well as through teaching, which

¹² Gäber, 132, 133; Stephens, 228, 229.

¹³ LW 38: 26.

¹⁴ Gäber, 132; Gerrish, 379; Luther wrote to Nicholas von Amsdorf on December 2, 1524 saying “Carlstadt’s poison crawls far. Zwingli at Zurich... and many others have accepted his opinion, continually asserting that the bread in the sacrament is no different from the bread sold in the market.”

¹⁵ Snavely, 401; Luther’s views also reflected the views of the people in Wittenberg as well as Saxony in general.

¹⁶ Stafford, 129.

¹⁷ Martin Luther, “The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ against the Fanatics,” in *Luther’s Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, vol. 36, *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. Abdel Ross Wentz, trans. Frederick C. Ahrens (Philadelphia: Muhlenburg Press, 1959), 336, 344; denoted as LW “Sacrament against Fanatics” from here; Gerrish, 378.

The Supper that Supposedly Split the Reformation

Luther considered radical.¹⁸ Following the second Diet of Speyer, Zwingli wanted Philip of Hess's support to spread his religious movement both evangelically and militarily.¹⁹ When Zwingli arrived at Marburg, he submitted his military plan concerning an alliance with Protestant anti-Hapsburg enemies, the French king, and the Turks.²⁰

Although Zwingli was enthusiastic about the meeting at Marburg since he thought he could sway Luther to his thinking, it did not happen because he and Luther differed on fellowship and unity. Zwingli thought the doctrinal differences between the Saxons and the Swiss would not affect genuine fellowship among them. After all, he believed that both the Swiss and the Saxons were believers in the same faith and spirit. However, this is not how Luther and his followers saw it.²¹

Luther believed Christian fellowship demanded doctrinal agreement. In a letter he wrote to duke of Saxony in May 1529, Luther compared an alliance with the Swiss to an alliance with the devil's forces because of their doctrinal disagreements.²² Thus, it was clear that Luther had no intention of forming any alliances with them nor would he even refer to them as Christian brethren. At the preliminary discussions on Oct. 1, 1529 at Marburg, Luther and Philip Melancthon accused Zwingli and Oecolampadius of teaching against original sin, saying that the Holy Ghost does not come through the Word and Sacrament, denying Christ's divinity, teaching salvation through works, and giving a false view of how a man obtains faith.²³ Thus, it is no surprise that Luther ended the Colloquy by telling Martin Bucer and the others present that the spirit of the Saxons were different than the others and

¹⁸ LW 36: 336,344; Potter, 291, 292.

¹⁹ Snively, 400, 401.

²⁰ Stafford, 130.

²¹ Ibid; Martin Bucer, another theologian at the Colloquy, thought as Zwingli did on the unity issue.

²² Martin Luther, "To Elector John, May 22, 1529," *Luther's Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, vol. 49, *Letters II*, ed. Gottfried G. Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 226.

²³ Hermann Sasse, *This is My Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959), 217, 224-225, quoted in Stafford, 131, 132.

others needed to repent for their evil beliefs.²⁴

Although Luther and Zwingli's views of fellowship and unity was a major contributor to Marburg's failure, the core issue concerned their hermeneutic principles. Specifically, the problem dealt with the literal or figurative meaning of the passage "This is my body." For Luther and Zwingli, this exegetical problem was closely connected to their Christological views and their view towards Scripture in general.²⁵

Throughout the 1520's, Luther was thoroughly convicted in the literal interpretation of the "Words of Institution" since he believed the real presence was deeply rooted in the scriptures. This was the center of his theological thought.²⁶ In 1520, he wrote *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* to theologians and other religious officials. In this work, he constantly referred to the Eucharist in light of his description of the Avignon papacy—a period between 1309 and 1377 when the pope resided in Avignon, France instead of Rome. Also, by this time, he began to emphasize the individual aspect of the Eucharist rather than the social aspect.²⁷ The next year, he wrote *The Misuse of the Mass* to his fellow Augustinians at Wittenberg in which he criticized the Catholic practice of treating the Eucharist as a sacrifice. Here, he argued that the only sacrifice mentioned in the New Testament was the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and that all the scriptures that directly referred to the Eucharist did not mention it being taken

²⁴ LW 38: 70-71; here is the quote in full: "I am not your master, not your judge, and not your teacher either. Our spirit is different from yours; it is clear that we do not possess the same spirit, for it cannot be the same spirit when in on place the words of Christ are simply believed and in another place the same faith is censured, resisted, regarded as false and attacked with all kinds of malicious and blasphemous words. Therefore, as I have previously stated, we commend you to the judgment of God. Teach as you can account for it before God."

²⁵ Stafford, 133.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 139; Sasse, 104, quoted in Thomas J. Davis, "The Truth of the Divine Words: Luther's Sermons on the Eucharist, 1521-28, and the Structure of Eucharistic Meaning," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 30, no. 2 (Summer 1999), 324.

²⁷ LW 36 "BC," 14-57; Wandel, 96, 97; Thomas J. Davis, "Discerning the Body: The Eucharist and the Christian Social Body in Sixteenth Century Protestant Exegesis," *Fides et Historia* 37, no. 2/vol. 38, no. 1 (Summer-Fall, 2005/Winter-Spring, 2006), 71; Davis's journal is in a combined issue.

The Supper that Supposedly Split the Reformation

in a sacrificial way.²⁸

By March 6, 1522, he returned to Wittenberg after having hidden in Wartburg castle in Eisenach for ten months following his condemnation at the Diet of Worms. The following week, he preached a series of eight sermons in Wittenberg—three of which dealt with the Eucharist. In these sermons, he emphasized the Word of God and said that laypersons taking the cup committed no sin. He also preached against rapid and radical changes that other reformers had introduced to Wittenberg.²⁹ In 1525, when Luther was in opposition with Carlstadt, his former colleague, for rejecting the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, he wrote a treatise called *Against the Heavenly Prophets*. In this work, he reaffirmed his belief in the bodily presence of Christ at the Eucharist and claimed the literal eating proceeds the spiritual eating.³⁰ He also stated in the treatise that a person will obtain comfort from the sacrament if they have a bad conscience from their sins because of Christ's sacrifice—thus attaching the Eucharist to salvation.³¹ Luther finalized the German Mass the next year in which he preserved much of the medieval Catholic mass, but got rid of its "abuses" and added his own modifications to it in which he moved the "Sign of Peace" to match his beliefs and put greater emphasis on the sermon.³²

On March 28 and 29, 1526, Luther preached three sermons for Easter Sunday in which two dealt with the Eucharist.³³ In these discussions on the sacrament, he explained the *objectum fidei*, or the object of faith, and the actions that are taken because of faith. He then anonymously described

²⁸ Martin Luther, "The Misuse of the Mass," in *Luther's Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, vol. 36, *Word and Sacrament II*, ed. Abdel Ross Wentz, trans. Frederick C. Ahrens (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), 162-198; found in Part II *Concerning the Words of the Mass, which Prove that the Mass is not a Sacrifice*. In this, Luther quotes Heb. 10:10, Matt. 26:26-28, Mark 14:22-24, Luke 22:19,20, and 1 Cor. 11: 23-25; Wandel, 97.

²⁹ Davis, "The Truth of Divine Words," 326; Wandel, 97.

³⁰ Gerrish, 377; Gäber, 132.

³¹ Wolfgang Simon, "Worship and the Eucharist in Luther Studies," *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 47, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 144.

³² Wandel, 97, 98; the "Sign of Peace" took place right before the "Breaking of the Bread" and involved the priest asking Christ to grant them peace and then the congregation would show a gesture of peace to one another such a hug, or a handshake.

³³ These sermons were later published under the title *The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ—Against the Fanatics* in following October in which Luther did not want them to be published.

the various people who rejected this, namely Zwingli.³⁴ This was one of the first messages that directly dealt with his opposition to the Swiss. However, the Swiss received these sermons, along with his other writings, as a polemic. Thus, Zwingli and his followers were more intense in their critique of Luther's Eucharist views.³⁵

After Zwingli published *A Clear Briefing about Christ's Supper* in February 1526, Luther was furious and thought Zwingli and the Swiss were greater adversaries to him than the Catholic forces. Thus, he published *That These Words of Christ, "This Is My Body," Still Stand Firm* in 1527 in which he claimed that the Swiss were possessed by the devil and were wrong about the figurative interpretation of the Words of Institution while he asserted his literal interpretation was correct.³⁶ A series of literary attacks between Luther and Zwingli resulted from that point and continued until their face-to-face argument, at the Marburg Colloquy. At Marburg, their arguments did not change; Luther famously wrote *Hoc est corpus meum*—"this is my body"—on the table and he continued to argue his point for three days.³⁷

Unlike Luther who was set in his beliefs on the Eucharist, Zwingli did not have a fully developed symbolic view of the Eucharist until 1524. Zwingli also did not consider it essential to salvation.³⁸ Before he arrived in Zurich in 1519, Zwingli stressed the communal nature of the Eucharist and spiritual eating in John 6:53-56 just as Erasmus had, while rejecting Augustine's view of corporeal eating. Although he still tolerated transubstantiation at the time, he was looking for a more spiritual interpretation.³⁹ Yet in a response to Bishop Hugo in 1522, Zwingli denied that the mass was a sacrifice. Just like Luther, Zwingli found references in Hebrews that referred to Christ's sacrifice, but could not find any evidence

³⁴ LW 36 "Sacrament against Fanatics," 331, 335; Gerrish, 380.

³⁵ LW "Sacrament against Fanatics," 331-333; Martin Luther, "That These Words of Christ, 'This Is My Body,' etc., Still Stand Firm against the Fanatics," *Luther's Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, vol. 37, *Word and Sacrament III*, ed. and trans. Robert H. Fischer (Philadelphia, Muhlenberg Press, 1961), 5; denoted as "LW 'These Words of Christ'" from here; this information was found in the introductions to both works.

³⁶ Gäber, 133-135; Stafford, 139; LW "These Words of Christ," 5-7, 13-150.

³⁷ Davis, "The Truth of the Divine Words," 323; Gäber, 135; Leppin, 53; Stafford, 139.

³⁸ Carrie Euler, "Huldrych Zwingli and Heinrich Bullinger," in *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*, ed. Lee Palmer Wandel (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Publishers, 2014), 59; Stephens, 218; Gäber, 132.

³⁹ Gäber, 131; Euler, 58; Stephens, 218; Stafford, 134.

The Supper that Supposedly Split the Reformation

for a sacrifice taking place during the Eucharist.⁴⁰ In the eighteenth article of the *Sixty-Seven Articles* he published on January 29, 1523, Zwingli further explained these concepts. Here, he called the Eucharist a memorial instead of a sacrifice. Since they agreed on this point, it seemed that Zwingli and Luther had similar views. However, Zwingli later explained that he had not addressed his different views of the corporeal presence in the Eucharist in order to avoid conflict.⁴¹ In a letter to his former teacher, Thomas Wytenback on June 15, 1523, Zwingli described the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist saying that Christ is present through faith. Yet, he still thought the participants ate Christ even though the Scripture that stated that Christ was seated at the right hand of God confused him.⁴²

After reading writings by Cornelius Hoen and Carlstadt in 1524, Zwingli further developed his view of the symbolic interpretation of the Words of Institution. Hoen pointed out that the word *est* (is) was best interpreted *signifies* because of various examples in Scripture. Carlstadt had published five treatises on the Eucharist that November, emphasizing Christ being the subject of the Eucharist. Zwingli approved of that view and added it to his own interpretation of the Eucharist.⁴³ As a result, Zwingli wrote a letter to Matthew Alber, a minister who was supported by one of Luther's followers, which publically described his new view of the Eucharist. Zwingli defended his figurative view of the Words of Institution and used John 6:63 extensively to support his claims that the Eucharist was symbolic. By the end

⁴⁰ Stephens, 218, 219; Gäber, 131; Euler, 58; one of the passages Zwingli used was Heb. 9:12: "he entered once for all into the holy places, not by means of the blood of goats and calves but by means of his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption.

⁴¹ Huldrych Zwingli, "The Eighteenth Article," *Selected Writings of Huldrych Zwingli*, vol. 1, *In Defense of the Reformed Faith*, ed. E.J. Furcha and H. Wayne Pipkin, trans. E.J. Furcha (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1984), 110, 111; Gottfried W. Locher, *Zwingli's Thought: New Perspective* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Publishers, 1981), 220; Stephens, 119-221; Huldrych Zwingli, *Commentary on True and False Religion*, ed. and trans. Samuel Macauley Jackson, 2nd ed. (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1981) 198, quoted in Euler, 58, 59; Stafford, 134.

⁴² Stafford, 134; Stephens 223.

⁴³ Potter, 155, 156; Locher, 221; Euler, 59; Gäber, 132; Stephens 227, 228; Stafford, 135-137.

of 1525, Zwingli had written several treatises on this topic.⁴⁴

After publishing *A Clear Briefing about Christ's Supper* in February 1526, he became involved in heated literary discussions with Luther from this point until the Marburg Colloquy. Throughout the Colloquy, he constantly attempted to argue from John 6 in order to sway Luther's thinking. Yet, the meeting was a failure since neither Luther nor Zwingli were willing to compromise.⁴⁵

In conclusion, the Protestant movement divided over factors such as differing ontologies, political views, emphases of fellowship and unity, and hermeneutical principles. While Luther was traditional and highly emphasized *Sola Scriptura*, Zwingli was more humanistic, realistic and scholarly in his approach. Since the Saxons and Swiss were prejudiced toward each other, it is no surprise that Luther and Zwingli disliked each other for that reason, and Zwingli's involvement in politics was radical to Luther who refused to be involved in politics. While it did not bother Zwingli to treat others as Christian brethren despite some "minor" different beliefs, Luther was unwilling to fellowship with those who disagreed with him on any theological point.

Yet, perhaps the greatest divider of the two was their arrogance. Luther had established his view of Christ's presence in the Eucharist because of his literal interpretation and the importance of the sacrament itself and refused to change his views despite Scriptures that might have indicated otherwise. Although Zwingli was willing to change his understanding toward the Eucharist and establish the symbolic meaning, he displayed too much confidence in his ability to sway Luther to his mindset. This aspect was evident in their Colloquy arguments since Luther constantly emphasized *Hoc est corpus meum* while Zwingli constantly emphasized John 6:63. Thus, Luther and Zwingli could not have found harmony in their religious ideas and the Marburg Colloquy failed to unite the Protestants for these reasons.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Huldrych Zwingli, "Letter to Matthew Alber Concerning the Lord's Supper, November 1524," *Selected Writings of Huldrych Zwingli*, eds. E.J. Furcha and H. Wayne Pipkin, vol. 2, *In Search of True Religion: Reformation, Pastoral and Eucharistic Writings*, ed. H. Wayne Pipkin (Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1984), 135-139; Gäber, 132, 133; Stephens, 228, 229; Euler, 60; Potter, 156; Alber preached at Ruetlingen and was supported by Konrad Hermann, one of Luther's followers. The letter was never sent to him nor was it intended for him. Zwingli published it most likely to circulate his new Eucharistic views.

⁴⁵ Stafford, 137; Gäber, 135-137.

⁴⁶ Potter, 342.