
If Luther can speak, as he does, of the word's being "added" to something else—e.g., the cross (cf. Bultmann, *NTM*: 40)—he can also speak, conversely, of something else's being "added" to the word. This he does, e.g., when he says, "[I]t is not baptism that justifies anyone, but it is faith in that word of promise to which baptism is added" (*LW*, 36: 6~~8~~⁶).

But, then, allowing, as Luther himself allows in the same text, that, if he were to speak "according to the usage of the scriptures [1 Tim 3:16]," he should have "only one single sacrament, but with three sacramental signs" (18; cf. 93: "Christ himself is called a 'sacrament'"), one could say, *mutatis mutandis*, "It is not Christ that justifies or benefits anyone, but it is faith in that word of promise to which Christ is added"—"Christ" here being understood, of course, as a proper name for Jesus or Jesus Christ.

Jesus, or Jesus Christ, in other words, is the "one single sacrament" because he is "added" to God's *original* (implicit) word of promise analogously to the way in which baptism is one of the "three sacramental signs" because it is "added" to God's *decisive* (explicit) word of promise, Jesus Christ.

5 September 2007