

Introduction

Thesis and Choice of Topic

This dissertation will undertake a long-overdue inquiry into the teaching on faith and love in Martin Luther (1483–1546), zeroing in on his commentary on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians (1535). My thesis is that faith and love operate as the overriding thematic pair, structurally and conceptually undergirding the Galatians commentary, and that this can especially be seen in dynamic interaction with his outlook on the functions of Christ and the law.¹ To substantiate the thesis, this dissertation brings to the fore

1. When I use “Christ,” it must be construed in the context of Luther’s notion of Christ as the core of the gospel. Viewing Christ as the quintessence of the gospel will help readers recognize that the title of this dissertation can also be rephrased as Luther’s doctrine of faith and love in relation to his understanding of the gospel and the law. The reason I chose “Christ” rather than “the gospel” is to feature Christ himself, who is present in Christian faith and active in Christian love, as I will explain. Even though God brings about faith in one’s heart only through God’s word, written or proclaimed, what is grasped by faith is not merely the written or proclaimed word, but Christ himself. The title of this dissertation signals my intention to underscore this.

With respect to the word of God preached and the word of God written, Luther always preferred the former to the latter. See David C. Steinmetz, *Luther in Context*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 132–35. Regarding a difference between the Word that became flesh [John 1:14] and the Word that is proclaimed by Christ or by a minister, Luther makes a clear distinction: “The former is the incarnate Word, who was true God from the beginning, and the latter is the Word that’s proclaimed. The former Word is in substance God; the latter Word is in its effect the power of God, but isn’t God in substance, for it has a man’s nature, whether it’s spoken by Christ or by a minister.” Martin Luther, *Table Talk*, in *Luther’s Works*, American edition, 75 vols., ed. Jaroslav Pelikan, Helmut T. Lehmann, and Christopher Boyd Brown (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955ff.; Philadelphia:

an interpretive framework that Luther himself provides, by which to understand his teaching on faith and love. This framework is comprised of two dimensions—alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness vis-à-vis proper, active, and progressing righteousness and holiness. In these two dimensions, Luther reconceptualizes faith and love, and deliberately presents them as a structurally and conceptually interlocked thematic pair. In Luther’s reconceptualization of faith and love, Christ, whom he sees as the essence of the gospel, occupies a central position. Furthermore, Luther’s contemplations of the person and functions of Christ in relation to the law reveal the dynamics between faith and love, and law and gospel, which all hinge on Jesus Christ.

Indeed, it may not be an exaggeration to say that the Achilles’ heel of existing Luther scholarship is its failure to delve into his teaching on love in conjunction with his teaching on justification by faith. The journey that has led me to this scrutiny of Luther’s concepts of faith and love in connection with his notions of the functions of Christ and the law has been long and meandering. In my earlier studies, the theology of love in St. Augustine (354–430) was one of my main theological foci. I was particularly interested in his notions of the *ordo amoris* (most explicitly delineated in his *De doctrina christiana*),² of the Holy Spirit as the love that binds

Fortress Press, 1955–86), 54:395 (no. 5177, dated 7–24 August 1540, hereafter cited as *LW* 54:395); *D. Martin Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Tischreden*, 6 vols. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1912–21), 4. 695. 16–21 (hereafter cited as *WA, TR* 4. 695. 16–21). Unless indicated as “my translation,” translations of Luther in this dissertation are based for the most part on the American edition of Luther’s Works.

2. With regard to the four different objects of love that must be loved in a right order, St. Augustine states that “quatuor sint diligenda, unum quod supra nos est, alterum quod nos sumus, tertium quod juxta nos est, quartum quod infra nos est.” St. Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*, 1. 23. 22, *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series Latina*, 34–35, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris, 1865); English Translation (ET) *Teaching Christianity*, trans. Edmund Hill, O.P., ed. John E. Rotelle, O.S.A. (Brooklyn, NY: New City Press, 1997), 1. 23. 22: “[T]here are four kinds of things to be loved: one which is above us, the second which we are ourselves, the third which is on a level with us, the fourth which is beneath us” See also *ibid.*, 1. 26. 27.

the lover and the beloved together, and of the Christian's spiritual journey in love.³ These theological explorations left an indelible mark on my mind.⁴ As I pursued Augustine's theology of love, an oversimplified general formula of comparison between Augustine and Luther caught my attention: Augustine, the theologian of love, and Luther, the theologian of faith.

My theological curiosity compelled me to probe Augustine and Luther's teachings on faith and love in order to investigate whether this comparison was accurate and, if so, what conceptual variance might explain it. While pressing on with this research, two findings attracted my special interest. First, Augustine was a theologian of faith no less than of love, and Luther was a theologian of love no less than of faith. Second, whereas Augustine employs love as the preeminent—but not exclusive—theological concept for the Christian's relation to God, Luther uses faith. These two discoveries induced me to look more specifically into Luther's teaching on faith and love against the backdrop of Augustine's, with the prevailing question being, what prompted Luther to choose faith rather than love as the primarily sanctioned theological concept defining the Christian's relation to God? I attempted to approach this question sensitively, bearing in mind the danger of casting Luther as a theologian of faith and Augustine as a theologian of love, which I had already found to be potentially misleading.

3. Tarsicius J. van Bavel, "Love," in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan D. Fitzgerald, O.S.A. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 509–16.

4. For instance, R. D. Crouse raises the question: "What are the phases, or moments, of the soul's ascent to God?" He finds an answer in the "triformal scheme of ascent—*exteriora, interiora (inferior), superiora*." Crouse, "*Recurrens in te unum: The Pattern of St. Augustine's Confessions*," *Studia Patristica* 14 (1976): 390. Crouse perceives this scheme in his analysis of the structure and unity of St. Augustine's *Confessions* as a triformal scheme of ascent. This triformal scheme constitutes the structure of the *Confessions* and defines the major divisions of the work, according to Crouse.

Over the course of my writing, I have faced several challenges in narrowing my research to a manageable scope for my dissertation. I decided to concentrate on Luther, as I considered that finding plausible answers to the question of his use of faith, in principle—rather than love in determining the Christian’s relation to God—might be a key to further comparative study between Augustine and Luther’s teachings on faith and love. On this restricted scale, my research has focused on Luther’s treatment of faith and love and the import of the dynamic relationship between the two, especially in interconnection with his ideas of the functions of Christ and the law. An assiduous exploration of these dynamics has dragged me straight into the center of the polemical turmoil of Luther’s Reformation theology. I have been able to glimpse, though never exhaustively, the rich content of the dynamics among these concepts in Luther’s theology, and I will endeavor to share what I have learned in this dissertation.

Problems Diagnosed

Appraising the divergent forms of these dynamics only fragmentarily or inattentively might yield the following misconceptions on the subject of faith and love in Luther’s theology. First, Luther’s theology has little or no teaching on love or sanctification.⁵ Second, Luther’s

5. John Wesley’s reaction to Luther, for example, illustrates this criticism. Luther certainly influenced Wesley’s conversion experience through his doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone. While listening to a Moravian brother’s reading of Luther’s preface to Romans on May 24, 1738, Wesley received assurance of salvation. Thereafter, Wesley showed an increased appreciation of Luther, praising his doctrine of justification. On June 18, 1738, Wesley preached a sermon on “Salvation by Faith.” *The Works of John Wesley*, vol. 1, *Sermons I: 1–33*, ed. Albert C. Outler (Nashville: Abingdon, 1984), 117–30. Wishing to learn more about the teaching on justification, Wesley even visited Hernhut, the Moravian headquarters in Germany. Even though he learned many things from this visit, afterwards Wesley became skeptical of the inclination of the Moravians, especially the Moravians in London, toward quietism, solafideism, and antinomianism. To Wesley, who regarded very highly the means of grace, this kind of inclination was unacceptable. Less than a year later, on April 4, 1739, Wesley recorded his first negative impression of Luther. *The Works of John Wesley*, vol. 19, *Journal*

idea of love or sanctification is reducible to his teaching on justification by faith.⁶ Third, Luther's thoughts on faith and love are self-contradictory. These three feasible, though fallacious, judgments on Luther's teaching on faith and love have been available in general evaluations of Luther's theology.

One of the critical reasons the vitality of his teaching on love has not been properly appreciated may be the prevalent assumption that faith and love are unqualifiedly at odds with each other in the whole of Luther's theology. The traditional one-sided emphasis on Luther's teaching on justification by faith alone has certainly exceeded attention to his teaching on love. This inclination has entailed, for instance, a predictable reaction: Luther's theology is deficient in teaching on love or works or sanctification, so that his theology inevitably undermines morality, engendering moral delinquency or dereliction of socio-ethical responsibilities. With regard to such a charge against Luther, William H. Lazareth surveys four representative twentieth-century Protestant misinterpreters of Lutheran theological ethics subsequent to nineteenth-century

and Diaries II (1738–1743), ed. W. Reginald Ward and Richard P. Heitzenrater (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 47.

Although he worked together with the Moravians in London and organized the Fetter Lane Society, he left it on July 18, 1740. In his journal entries of June 15–16, 1741, he sharply dissented from Luther's Galatians lectures. *Ibid.*, 200–10. In his sermon "On God's Vineyard," written in about 1787, Wesley stated, "Who has wrote [sic] more ably than Martin Luther on justification by faith alone? And who was more ignorant of the doctrine of sanctification, or more confused in his conceptions of it? In order to be thoroughly convinced of this, of his total ignorance with regard to sanctification, there needs no more than to read over, without prejudice, his celebrated comment on the Epistle to the Galatians." *The Works of John Wesley*, vol. 3, *Sermons III: 71–114*, ed. Albert C. Outler (Nashville: Abingdon, 1986), 505. Wesley's approach to Luther was mediated by his experience with Nicolaus Ludwig von Zinzendorf, the Moravians, and their appropriation of Luther. Therefore, Wesley's criticism on Luther must not be literally accepted but cautiously reevaluated.

6. See Oswald Bayer, *Aus Glauben leben: Über Rechtfertigung und Heiligung* (Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1990), esp. 65–66; ET *Living by Faith: Justification and Sanctification*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), esp. 58–59; Gerhard O. Forde, "The Lutheran View of Sanctification," in *The Preached God: Proclamation in Word and Sacrament*, ed. Mark C. Mattes and Steven D. Paulson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 226–44.

dualistic and quietistic German Lutheranism: Ernst Troeltsch (“Conservatism”), Karl Barth (“Quietism”), Johannes Heckel (“Dualism”), and Reinhold Niebuhr (“Defeatism”).⁷

According to Lazareth, Troeltsch is most accountable for tenacious faulty presentations of Luther’s theological ethics. Mistakenly envisaging Luther from the perspective of nineteenth-century quietistic and dualistic German Lutheranism, Troeltsch, in *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*,⁸ made a frontal attack against Luther for the “social conservatism” of the German Lutheran church. Troeltsch railed against the Lutheran church’s inability to contend with the new social crisis in Germany at the end of the nineteenth century. This censure found an ally in Max Weber, whose reckoning of Calvinist activism as a necessary alternative to Lutheran quietism has had a long-lasting influence.⁹

In the wake of the First World War, however, Karl Holl took up Troeltsch’s allegation, avowing that Troeltsch had hardly ever seen the true sixteenth-century Luther, because he had availed himself of the distorted spectacles of nineteenth-century Lutheranism. In Lazareth’s opinion, Holl intelligibly exhibited the interrelatedness of Luther’s theology and ethics. According to Lazareth, Holl attributed Luther’s original contribution to Christian thought and social ethics

7. William H. Lazareth, *Christians in Society: Luther, the Bible, and Social Ethics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 3. As to controversies on Luther’s social or socio-ethical teachings, see also George Wolfgang Forell, *Faith Active in Love: An Investigation of the Principles Underlying Luther’s Social Ethics* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999; Augsburg Publishing House, 1954), 16–25; Eberhard Jüngel, *Zur Freiheit eines Christenmenschen: eine Erinnerung an Luthers Schrift* (Munich: Kaiser, 1991), 59–69; ET *The Freedom of a Christian: Luther’s Significance for Contemporary Theology*, trans. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988), 50–56; Martin Marty, “Luther on Ethics: Man Free and Slave,” in *Accents in Luther’s Theology: Essays in Commemoration of the 450th Anniversary of the Reformation*, ed. Heino O. Kadai (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967), 209–14.
8. For a detailed description of this, see Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, vol. 2, trans. Olive Wyon (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 472, 508–11.
9. For more on this argument, see Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. Talcott Parsons (London: Routledge, 2002), 39–80.

to the reformer's argument for the close relation between conscience and community. In the Christian life, faithful fellowship with God elicits just and loving fellowship with one's fellow humans.¹⁰

Next, Lazareth reviews Karl Barth's criticism of Luther's "Law-Gospel Quietism," which, Barth protests, separates law from gospel, creation from redemption, and society from church. This theology was thrown into question for its potential role of engendering a politically and ethically impotent "bourgeois ghetto" that was helpless to check the whims of the demonic Nazi dictatorship.¹¹

Third, Lazareth notes the critical response to Johannes Heckel made by Paul Althaus, who underwent a major reversal in his own theological and political ethics dating from the mid-1930s. Heckel declares that Luther's theology of justice and society, in its consistency with his governing doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone, raises a question about whether Luther ever understood the consequences of the problem of justice for his theology. Heckel's Luther speaks in tones reminiscent of both Troeltsch and Barth.

Heckel argues that Luther spiritually divides humanity between Christians and non-Christians, who live in two kingdoms under two corresponding governments—the former internally by the Word, and the latter externally by the sword. In this framework, Heckel's Luther resorts to an exclusively christological foundation for Christian justice (Christ or Caesar). In contrast, Althaus's Luther is of the view that Christians are citizens as well as saints. They, accordingly, under law and gospel, practice both civil and Christian righteousness. The Creator's "left-hand rule" against injustice, corruption, and oppression governs Christians and non-Christians alike. As public citizens, Christians obeying Christ can and should

10. Lazareth, *Christians in Society*, 6.

11. *Ibid.*, 10. Lazareth enumerates Barth's articles and tracts criticizing the public ethics of Luther in general and of German Lutheranism in particular. See *ibid.*, 11.

also render to Caesar what belongs to Caesar without thereby making themselves guilty of serving Satan as well.¹²

Fourth, Lazareth introduces Reinhold Niebuhr's critique of Luther's "Cultural Defeatism."¹³ Lazareth endeavors to show that Niebuhr's charge against Luther was determined predominantly by the evaluation of Ernst Troeltsch. Niebuhr faulted Luther for a kind of quietistic tendency and cultural defeatism, as if Luther had failed to articulate the ethical, and particularly the socio-ethical, implications of faith.¹⁴

An overview of Luther scholarship reveals not only a long history of misinterpretation but also an underappreciation of the gravity of faith and love as a thematic pair for Luther's theology as a whole. For instance, among the well-accepted texts frequently used as an extended introduction to Luther's theology, it is hard to find faith and love paired as a theme, as in Paul Althaus and Bernhard Lohse.¹⁵ In his very valuable book *The Theology of Martin Luther*, Althaus seems to be cognizant of the significance of Luther's teaching on love in its connection to faith, since he brings up the subject of faith and love. Furthermore, he integrates two essays pertinent to the discourse of faith and love in Luther. However, he touches on the subject only sporadically, not intensively under a fixed subtitle of faith and love.

12. *Ibid.*, 24–25.

13. *Ibid.*, 25.

14. For further details, see Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, vol. 2, *Human Destiny* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1964), 185–98; Niebuhr, "Love and Law in Protestantism and Catholicism," in *Christian Realism and Political Problems: Essays on Political, Social, Ethical and Theological Themes* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953), 162–63.

15. Paul Althaus, *Die Theologie Martin Luthers*, 4th ed. (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975); ET *The Theology of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966); Bernhard Lohse, *Luthers Theologie in ihrer historischen Entwicklung und in ihrem systematischen Zusammenhang* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995); ET *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*, trans. and ed. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999). See also Bernhard Lohse, *Martin Luther: Eine Einführung in sein Leben und sein Werk* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1981); ET *Martin Luther: An Introduction to His Life and Work*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).

On that account, the subject of faith and love does not catch the eye as a paired theme but remains inconspicuous. In addition, the two essays are only added as appendices and certainly are not earmarked for fathoming out the weight of faith and love as a thematic pair.¹⁶

Althaus's other book entitled *Die Ethik Martin Luthers* contains the first chapter on "Ethos auf dem Boden der Rechtfertigung," which, indeed, could have incorporated subtitles reflecting faith and love as a thematic pair.¹⁷ Two of its subtitles, "Das Leben als Übung des Glaubens" and "Das Leben des Christen als Kampf mit sich selbst" might better have been named "Die Liebe: das Leben als Übung des Glaubens" and "Die Liebe: das Leben des Christen als Kampf mit sich selbst."¹⁸

Although dealing with the issue of faith and works, Lohse also fails to present the substance of the relationship between faith and love in Luther's theology. Among many things that could be mentioned in the section on "Faith and Works" in his very profitable book, *Martin Luther's Theology*, the following passage deserves special notice:

Compared with the tradition, but also with some New Testament writings, Luther seldom spoke of 'works.' Characteristically, he preached only once on the periscope of the world judgment in Matthew 25:31-46, dealing, of course, with the point of the text regarding the inquiry into deeds of love for the neighbor at the last judgment, and for his part stressing that works should never be isolated from faith.¹⁹

16. Althaus, *Die Theologie Martin Luthers*, 357-85; ET *The Theology of Martin Luther*, 429-58. The footnotes 61 and 62 in the English translation (p. 456) must refer to *WA* 20, not *WA* 36.

17. "Ethos on the Basis of Justification." Paul Althaus, *Die Ethik Martin Luthers* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), 11; ET *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 3.

18. "Life as the Exercise of Faith." "The Life of the Christian as a Struggle with Himself." "Love: Life as the Exercise of Faith." "Love: The Life of the Christian as a Struggle with Himself." Althaus, *Die Ethik Martin Luthers*, 23, 26; ET *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, 16, 19.

19. Lohse, *Luthers Theologie*, 281; ET *Martin Luther's Theology*, 264.

Lohse continues, “In fact, Luther always claimed that where one’s status before God is involved, works are not decisive: here, only justification *sola fide* applies. Only in a very limited sense did he hold to the ‘necessity’ of works.”²⁰ While perusing Lohse’s handling of the issues of faith, love, and works, we might sense his reluctance to expatiate on the topics of love and works. Even when he does not disprove the presence of love and works in Luther’s theology, the length and significance of those topics are kept to a minimum. He might be concerned about the prospect that any serious account of love and works in Luther might compromise the profundity of his doctrine of justification by faith. Christians might even relapse into their reliance upon works- or self-righteousness in pursuit of a modern version of pietism, such as the holiness movement. Irrespective of those potential explanations, I am of the opinion that he sounds too cautionary and hesitant to advance a fair presentation of Luther’s teaching on faith and love as a thematic pair.

Rationale

In venturing to write this dissertation, I strive to demonstrate that the aforementioned misrepresentations or underestimations of the gravity of Luther’s teaching on faith and love as a thematic pair do not do justice to Luther and his theology. This dissertation presses home Luther’s own affirmation that the whole of the Christian life consists in both faith and love. On this basis, I call into question an interpretive paradigm that overemphasizes or concentrates exclusively on his doctrine of justification, consequently overlooking his teaching on love or relegating it to the margins. Such a defective paradigm falls far short of appropriately demonstrating the intrinsic dynamics between faith and love as a paired theme, let alone as a

20. Lohse, *Luthers Theologie*, 281; ET *Martin Luther’s Theology*, 264.

comprehensive theological thematic pair, in Luther's theology. It has produced an unwarranted dichotomy between theology and moral-social ethics and a propensity for losing sight of the moral or socio-ethical implications in his theology. Such a paradigm has also precipitated the contestable opinion that Luther's theology fosters an individualistic piety disjoined from communal-social involvement as validated by his teachings on the law and the gospel or the two kingdoms.

A careful reassessment is demanded regarding how to interpret the assertion that the doctrine of justification by faith is the center of Luther's theology. When a center is isolated in the middle of a circle and not interconnected to the whole circle, then it stops being a center. It becomes only a solitary dot. In fact, an unbalanced overplaying of Luther's doctrine of justification has been unwarrantedly supported by the oft-cited phrase *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* ("the article, by which the church stands or falls"). However, the exact wording cannot be traced to Luther himself.²¹

21. T. Mahlmann explains that the expression "articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae" is traceable to Franz Turretini. Mahlmann also mentions that the spread of the expression was contributed to by Friedrich Loofs's "failed attempt at finding the origin of this expression." T. Mahlmann, "Articulus stantis et [vel] cadentis ecclesiae," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, vol. 1, 4th ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 799. Referring to Mahlmann, Eberhard Jüngel also points out in discreet words that, although similar formulae are found in Luther and this phrasing has indeed been employed to signify a high view of this doctrine, the exact phrasing does not appear in Luther. Eberhard Jüngel, *Das Evangelium von der Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen als Zentrum des christlichen Glaubens: Eine theologische Studie in ökumenischer Absicht* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1998), 13–14; ET in *Justification: The Heart of the Christian Faith—A Theological Study with an Ecumenical Purpose*, 3rd ed., trans. Jeffrey F. Cayzer (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001), 16–17. See Friedrich Loofs, "Der 'articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae,'" *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 90 (1917): 323–420, esp. 344.

Carter Lindberg draws attention to the usage of this formula by an eighteenth-century Lutheran orthodoxy: "In 1712, Valentin Löscher, the champion of Lutheran orthodoxy, termed the doctrine of justification the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*." Carter Lindberg, "Do Lutherans Shout Justification but Whisper Sanctification? Justification and Sanctification in the Lutheran Tradition," in *Justification and Sanctification: In the Traditions of the Reformation. The Fifth Consultation on the First and Second Reformations Geneva, 13 to 17 February 1998*, ed. Milan Opočenský and Páraic Réamonn (Geneva: World Alliance of Reformed Churches, 1999), 100–101. Lindberg comments that Löscher's context differs from that of Luther's.

Such a narrowly focused perspective will find it difficult to come up with proper answers to seemingly self-contradictory statements of Luther, such as his categorical rebuff of the law and works of love vis-à-vis his unreserved endorsement of them. When faith and love are appositely considered together as a thematic pair, Luther's theology becomes more perspicuously nuanced. This outlook heightens an interpretive insight of Luther's theology, which is, in fact, repeatedly urged by Luther himself: there is a time to talk only about justification by faith; there is a time to talk only about love; and there is a time to talk about both faith and love. Instead of paying heed to this aspect of the art of Luther's rhetoric (proper time and proper place), many people rush to judgment: either denying his doctrine of love or insisting on an apparent self-contradiction in Luther's theology.²²

It is no surprise when we confront the same question by Luther scholars who expand their interest into Luther's teaching on love in relation to his teaching on faith: how can Luther's concept of love be brought into harmony with his doctrine of justification by faith alone?²³ How can Luther's plea that where faith operates, the law, works of the law, and love must entirely vanish be harmonized

Consequently, although Löscher's formula is "comparable in intent to Luther's position," since Löscher was speaking in the wake of the period of confessionalization, the church to which he referred in his formula was "the *Lutheran* church as a denomination." *Ibid.*, 101 (*italics original*). See Gerhard Sauter, "Rechtfertigung," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*, vol. 28 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 315; ET "God Creating Faith: The Doctrine of Justification from the Reformation to the Present," trans. Arthur Sutherland and Stephan Kläs, *Lutheran Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (1997): 17–102, esp. 44.

22. For instance, Luther states, "We concede that good works and love must also be taught; but this must be in its proper time and place, that is, when the question has to do with works, apart from this chief doctrine. But here the point at issue is how we are justified and attain eternal life." *LW* 26:137; *D. Martin Luthers Werke*, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, 72 vols., ed. J. F. K. Knaake et al. (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau, 1883–2009), 40/1. 240. 17–20 (hereafter cited as *WA* 40/1. 240. 17–20): "Concedimus, docendum quoque esse de bonis operibus et charitate, Sed suo tempore et loco, quando scilicet quaestio est de operibus extra hunc capitalem articulum. Hic autem Status causae est, Qua re iustificemur et vitam aeternam consequamur."
23. Regarding this form of the question, see, for instance, Helmar Junghans, "Martin Luther über die Nächstenliebe: Auszug aus seiner Auslegung der Epistel zum 4. Sonntag nach Epiphania"

with his contention that love is the fruit of faith and the fulfillment of the law?²⁴ These questions center around Luther's exegeses of biblical passages such as Romans 1:17 and 3:28 (justification by faith alone apart from works prescribed by the law) and Galatians 2:15–16 (justification by faith in Jesus Christ) vis-à-vis Matthew 7:12 (the Golden Rule), 22:36–40 (love your God and love your neighbor as yourself), Romans 13:10 (love as the fulfillment of the law), Galatians 5:6 (faith working through love), 1 Corinthians 13:13 (love as the greatest of faith, hope, and love),²⁵ Matthew 5:17–18 (Christ has not come to abolish the law but to fulfill it), and Romans 3:31 (not overthrowing the law by faith but upholding it).

Method

An ideal method for dealing with misinterpretations or underestimations of the importance of Luther's teaching on love might be to demonstrate his teaching on faith and love as an inclusive thematic pair in his theology as a whole. In reality, however, a formidable obstacle to this method is the fact that Luther is one of the most prolific theological authors in the history of world Christianity. Considering the sheer volume of Luther's works, it would be a lifelong work to consult all his texts in order to accomplish the task. Furthermore, his works are handed down to us in various literary genres, such as commentaries, lectures, treatises, disputations,

(Röm. 13, 8–10) in der 'Fastenpostille' von 1525," *Luther: Zeitschrift der Luther-Gesellschaft* 62, no. 1 (1991): 4.

24. Luther's stance on this issue will be expounded in chapter 4.

25. Apropos this issue, see, for instance, Rainer Vinke, "'... aber die Liebe ist die größte unter ihnen' Zu Luthers Auslegung von 1. Korinther 13," in *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther, Freedom as Love in Martin Luther: 8th International Congress for Luther Research in St. Paul, Minnesota, 1993, Seminar 1 Referate/Papers*, eds. Dennis D. Bielfeldt and Klaus Schwarzwäller (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995), 167–80. Vinke examines Luther's position on Paul's prioritization of love over faith in 1 Cor. 13.

sermons, letters, prefaces, liturgical comments, prayer books, catechisms, and table talks.

After deep meditation, I elected to focus on his 1535 Galatians commentary as the main text of analysis, in consultation with a restricted number of his other texts to substantiate and complement some of the major arguments. Selecting the 1535 Galatians commentary and additional texts from among those different literary genres, though only in a confined scope, should provide a decent opportunity to let Luther speak for himself regarding his teaching on faith and love. The 1535 Galatians commentary was chosen as the primary text because it is deemed as representing Luther's mature theology, and Luther himself esteems it as the masterpiece among his many works.²⁶ Showing the central role of Luther's teaching on faith and love in this commentary, thus, should yield good evidence toward establishing the noteworthiness of this teaching in his theology as a whole.

Indeed, *The Freedom of a Christian* has been reckoned as the classical locus for Luther's teaching on faith and love. Nonetheless, the 1535 Galatians commentary displays his teaching on faith and love in full measure, since it is expounded in its interdependence with his ideas on the functions of Christ and the law. Furthermore, *The Freedom of a Christian* is usually treated as an isolated tractate to discuss his teaching on faith and love as merely one of his many other teachings on diverse theological themes. However, showing the central role of Luther's teaching on faith and love in this Galatians commentary would entail far-reaching ramifications on how to view

26. In one of his table talks, Luther mentions that "The Epistle to the Galatians is my dear epistle. I have put my confidence in it. It is my Katy von Bora." *LW* 54:20 (no. 146, dated 14 December, 1531–22 January 1532); *WA, TR* 1:69. In another talk, Luther states that whoever wishes to become a theologian needs to read the Bible and Philip Melancthon's *Loci Communes*, and afterward if he wishes, he can read Melancthon's *Romans* and his [Luther's] *Galatians* and *Deuteronomy*. *LW* 54:439–40 (no. 5511, dated Winter of 1542–1543); *WA, TR* 5:204.

and value this teaching in his theology as a whole. Investigating faith and love in this commentary should serve as a good point of departure for a more extensive study on faith and love in the whole of his theology and set up a paradigm.

This dissertation also makes reference in footnotes to the lectures on Romans (1515–16), *Treatise on Good Works* (1520), *The Freedom of a Christian* (1520), *Table Talk*, and several sermons. The Romans lectures are pivotal in inquiring into Luther's teaching on faith and love because they disclose the way Luther learns from Paul the art of thinking and speaking about faith and love and their relationship.²⁷ Hence, they furnish us with the embryonic context, both conceptual and historical, for the further development of Luther's teaching on faith and love. In particular, Luther assimilates Paul's way of speaking about faith first (Romans 1–11) and then love (Romans 12–16), which certainly made a long-lasting impact upon Luther.

The *Treatise on Good Works* is crucial in comprehending Luther's teaching on faith and love, especially since Luther wrote it on realizing that he could not bypass the battlefield, namely, the clarification of his position on love or works of love. Since *The Freedom of a Christian* has been a classic for the treatment of Luther's concepts of faith and love, it certainly deserves mention in this dissertation. The *Table Talks* also offer useful statements for Luther's teaching on faith and love in his plain and everyday words throughout his Reformation career. The several sermons referred to cover a good scope of Luther's Reformation career (between 1515

27. "When I was a monk I was a master in the use of allegories. I allegorized everything. Afterward through the Epistle to the Romans I came to some knowledge of Christ. I recognized then that allegories are nothing, that it's not what Christ signifies but what Christ is that counts." *LW* 54:46 (no. 335, dated Summer or Fall 1532); *WA, TR* 1:136. Luther's acknowledgement of St. Paul's significance for him is also detected in the statement he made when a son was born in 1533: "[H]e was named Paul. I've had him named Paul because St. Paul furnished me with many a good passage and argument, and so I wish to honor him by naming a son after him." *LW* 54:184 (no. 2946a, dated 29 January 1533); *WA, TR* 3:111.

and 1546). Therefore, they allow us to gain some perspective on how Luther consistently deals with faith and love as the overriding thematic pair in those sermons throughout his Reformation career. The sermons, differently oriented in their purpose and writing style from his polemical disputations, commentaries, and lectures, make their own contribution to the broad picture of Luther's teaching on faith and love.

In analyzing the Galatians commentary and other texts, this dissertation fundamentally adopts a theological-ideological-structural (versus historical-genetic) approach to Luther's teaching on faith and love. At the same time, this dissertation guards against fabricating a speculative interpretation of Luther's teaching on faith and love. Bearing this danger in mind, it also strives to read Luther with concern for the contexts of his time and the various polemical debates out of which his teaching on faith and love have had their developmental formation.²⁸ However, since the main goal of this dissertation does not lie in a historical-genetic exploration, it will not attend to the minutest details of Luther's historical context or aim at distinguishing Luther's stance from those of his predecessors or contemporaries. Nor does it attempt to prove that he understands

28. A historical-genetic approach puts into perspective historical-contextual necessities, showing that the relationship between faith and love must not be marginalized in Luther's theology. On the methodological issue in Luther studies, see Lohse, *Luthers Theologie*, 17–21; ET Martin Luther's *Theology*, 6–10. Markus Wriedt strongly emphasizes that Luther's theology grew out of a concrete situation and that the "lively, situation-centered and context-related style of Martin Luther's Scripture interpretation cannot and could not be pressed into a Procrustian bed of orthodox confessional and doctrinal writings." Markus Wriedt, "Luther's Theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Martin Luther*, ed. Donald K. McKim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 87. Helmar Junghans also illustrates some advantages and disadvantages of depicting Luther's theology from a developmental versus a systematic perspective. Helmar Junghans, "The Center of the Theology of Martin Luther," in *And Every Tongue Confess: Essays in Honor of Norman Nagel on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, trans. Gerald S. Krispin, ed. Gerald S. Krispin and Jon D. Vieker (Dearborn, MI: Nagel Festschrift Committee, 1990), 179–94, esp. 180–81.

his opponents' arguments accurately or trace the development of his thoughts on faith and love from one text to another.

Plan of the Dissertation

A survey of recent secondary literature on Luther's teaching on faith and love is laid out in chapter 1. In this chapter, I endeavor to present previous research pertinent to Luther's teaching on faith and love. To elucidate the slightly divergent emphases and perspectives among the studies, I have categorized the research in varying subthemes and spotlighted their characteristics. In particular, taking into account the current exchange of views with regard to Finnish Luther scholarship, I furnish chapter 1 with a special space to look into its core arguments. Against the backdrop of the previous research, I then describe features that distinguish my research. These traits will also serve as a rationale for my undertaking of this dissertation.

In terms of the general arrangement of the remaining chapters, which are intended to give Luther opportunities to express his own voice as much as possible, chapters 2 and 3 examine faith and love as two conflicting theses in the dimension of alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness. Chapters 4 and 5, on the other hand, address faith and love as two harmonious theses in the dimension of proper, active, and progressing righteousness and holiness.

Chapter 2 dwells, at the outset, on the literary structure and logical cohesion of the commentary hinging on faith and love on the basis of Luther's exegesis of Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. This depiction will expose the two dynamic dimensions to tackle the paradoxical relationship between faith and love, establishing an interpretive framework for Luther's teaching on faith and love. This chapter then proceeds to probe his notion of faith as antithetical to love, especially in the context of his polemical disputes with both his medieval Roman Catholic and intra-Reformation opponents. The

controversy with his Roman Catholic disputants, in particular, revolves around Luther's attack on Thomas Aquinas's ideas of merit and *fides caritate formata* and Gabriel Biel's notion of congruous merit (*meritum de congruo*). The debate with his intra-Reformation opponents progresses on the issues of the place of work or sanctification in a Christian life and on the sacramental controversy.

The polemical controversies pinpoint the marrow of Luther's problem with his adversaries: the law competes with Christ in a duel over justification of the unrighteous. This chapter, accordingly, puts stress on Luther's reconceptualization of faith as the only means of grasping Christ, the sole savior, in one's heart. Faith is not only necessary but also sufficient for justification. Drawing on Paul, Luther advocates *fides Christo formata* as an alternative to the philosophically fashioned scholastic formula *fides caritate formata*. The chapter concludes with Luther's reaffirmation of his stance regarding justification by faith in Christ alone in his campaign against the internal opponents.

Chapter 3, in continuation of our investigation of Luther's concept of faith as an opposing thesis to love in the dimension of alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness, lays bare three cardinal facets of Luther's reconceptualization of faith, namely, justifying faith. They are designated as follows: (1) faith as knowing the truth of the heart about God, Christ, and self; (2) faith as trusting in God and Christ; and (3) faith as being active in love. This chapter also calls attention to Luther's presentation of a theological or spiritual function of the law. Luther's reconceptualization of faith unreservedly excludes the entire law as long as it claims its jurisdiction over sinners for their justification. Nevertheless, Luther holds that, insofar as the law does not transgress Christ's jurisdiction in the matter of justification, the law can stimulate faith in Christ. On the grounds of this theological function of the law, Luther's

reconceptualization of faith incorporates the law into its duly qualified role in the dimension of alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness.

Chapter 4 delves into Luther's reintroduction of love in harmony with faith. Luther's reconceptualization of love is essentially sketched as fruits of faith authenticating its genuineness; so Luther labels this love as incarnate faith. Concentrating on Luther's reconceptualization of love in conjunction with his reconceptualization of faith, this chapter accentuates his scrupulous and deliberate reconstruction of the relationship of faith to love. Chapter 4 especially inquires into Luther's perceptions of the twofold direction of Christian freedom, the Christ-given law of love, the twofold way of fulfilling the law, and christological terminologies and concepts as logical rationale for his reintroduction of love compatible with faith.

This chapter puts forward the relationship between the two dimensions of righteousness and holiness—alien, passive, and perfect vis-à-vis proper, active, and progressing. As a consequence, this chapter plays up the complexity of the relationship between faith and love, which cannot be properly appreciated if approached as the mere juxtaposition between two things of equal level and weight or as parallel lines that never intersect each other. To confirm this relationship, a simile (Christians like Christ) and two metaphors (doer with deeds and tree with fruits) that epitomize Luther's position on the relationship between faith and love are illustrated at the end of the chapter.

Chapter 5 gives prominence to the three paramount relations, in which the fruits of faith are borne in performance of love—to God, to others, and to self. This chapter also endeavors to clarify that the theological or spiritual function of the law does not entirely vanish in the dimension of proper, active, and progressing righteousness and

holiness. In chapters 2–5, Luther’s teaching on faith and love is, thus, continuously scrutinized in the dynamics of his conceptions of the functions of Christ and the law. These four chapters are designed to enrich our comprehension of Luther’s teaching on faith and love in those dynamics. The conclusion recapitulates the main arguments of each chapter. It also contains my reflections on the issues of the third use of the law and *theosis*, which are relevant to Luther’s teaching on faith and love.