
Research on Faith and Love in Luther

Previous Research

Although the literature on Luther's teaching on faith and love is sparse in comparison with that on his teaching on justification by faith alone (and on other topics), some valuable research is available.¹

1. Though I cannot expound upon the contents in detail, the books, articles, and essays that aided me in my research on Luther's teaching on faith and justification can be selectively illustrated as follows: Virgil Thompson, ed., *Justification is for Preaching: Essays by Oswald Bayer, Gerhard O. Forde, and Others* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012), 15–119; Timo Laato, "Justification: The Stumbling Block of the Finnish Luther School," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 72 (2008): 327–46; Piotr J. Malysz, "Nemo iudex in causa sua as the Basis of Law, Justice, and Justification in Luther's Thought," *Harvard Theological Review* 100, no. 3 (2007): 363–86; Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, "Drinking from the Same Wells with Orthodox and Catholics: Insights from the Finnish Interpretation of Luther's Theology," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 34, no. 2 (2007): 85–96; Bruce L. McCormack, ed., *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006); R. Scott Clark, "Iustitia Imputata Christi: Alien or Proper to Luther's Doctrine of Justification," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 70 (2006): 269–301; Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Joseph A. Burgess and Marc Kolden, eds., *By Faith Alone: Essays on Justification in Honor of Gerhard O. Forde* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004); Mark C. Mattes, *The Role of Justification in Contemporary Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004); David A. Brondos, "Sola fide and Luther's 'Analytic' Understanding of Justification: A Fresh Look at Some Old Questions," *Pro Ecclesia* 13, no. 1

I will unearth secondary literature on this subject by classifying it in accordance with the assorted foci of research. In this section on previous research, special space will also be allotted to salient arguments of the modern Finnish Lutheran scholars, which are germane to our discussion on Luther's teaching on faith and love. Whether they receive a sympathetic hearing or opprobrium from other Luther scholars, it is certain that their unconventional contentions have sparked an interest in reexamining Luther's theology. The first part of this section, therefore, explores facets that characterize the interpretation of the Finns—or, more precisely, of Tuomo Mannermaa, founder of the Finnish school—from the vantage point of Luther's teaching on faith and love. In the second part of this section, research on Luther's teaching on faith and love is enumerated according to the diversely emphasized themes and angles.

Tuomo Mannermaa and Modern Finnish Luther Scholarship

The research model of the Finnish scholars was developed in the course of Finnish Lutheran–Russian Orthodox ecumenical dialogues (especially the implications of Luther's theology) conducted by scholars in the Department of Systematic Theology at the University of Helsinki since the mid-1970s.² The main topics of research thus

(2004): 39–57; William G. Rusch, ed., *Justification and the Future of the Ecumenical Movement: The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003); 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); ET *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); Gerhard O. Forde, *Justification by Faith—A Matter of Death and Life* (Mifflintown, PA: Sigler, 1999); Jared Wicks, "Justification and Faith in Luther's Theology," *Theological Studies* 44, no. 1 (1983): 3–29; Heiko A. Oberman, "'Iustitia Christi' and 'Iustitia Dei': Luther and the Scholastic Doctrine of Justification," *Harvard Theological Review* 59, no. 1 (1966): 1–26.

2. Concerning its history, consequences, and unresolved tasks, see Risto Saarinen, *Faith and Holiness: Lutheran–Orthodox Dialogue, 1959–1994 (Kirche und Konfession)*, (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), esp. 20–83, 232–69.

far have been the relation of Luther's doctrine of justification to the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of *theosis*, *theosis* in Luther, and the meaning of the Golden Rule in Luther. Other projects underway include Luther's pneumatology and the doctrine of the Trinity. This research model, stemming from an ecumenical endeavor, puts on the table an interesting new approach to Luther's teaching on faith and love.³

Their quintessential contention is that Christ's presence in faith itself, the idea of which they draw from Luther's own statement that "the One [Christ] who is present in the faith itself" (*in ipsa fide Christus adest*), is the structuring principle of Luther's theology.⁴ This claim is most pointedly expressed in Tuomo Mannermaa's *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus: Rechtfertigung und Vergottung*.⁵

On the basis of this structuring principle, the Finnish scholars underscore "participation" as a hallmark of Luther's doctrine of faith and love, arguing that Luther's view of justification can also be called *theosis* according to the ancient doctrine of the fathers, with whom Luther agreed.⁶ According to the ancient doctrine of the fathers,

3. For further information, see the Finish Luther Studies websites at <http://blogs.helsinki.fi/ristosaarinen/luther-studies-in-finland/> and <http://blogs.helsinki.fi/luther-studies/>. A recent brief introduction to the methodological orientations and the main results of the Mannermaa School can be found in Tuomo Mannermaa, "Why Is Luther So Fascinating? Modern Finnish Luther Research," in *Union with Christ: The New Finnish Interpretation of Luther*, ed. Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 1–20. This collection of essays by Finnish Luther scholars is the first attempt to give an overview in English of this new Luther paradigm.
4. A classic formulation of this view that the Finnish scholars frequently employ is found, for example, in Luther's *Lectures on Galatians* (1535): "It takes hold of Christ in such a way that Christ is the object of faith, or rather not the object, but so to speak, the One who is present in the faith itself." *LW* 26:129; *WA* 40/1. 228. 34–229. 15: "quo Christus apprehenditur, Sic ut Christus sit obiectum fidei, imo non obiectum, sed, ut ita dicam, in ipsa fide Christus adest."
5. Tuomo Mannermaa, *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus: Rechtfertigung und Vergottung. Zum ökumenischen Dialog*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte und Theologie des Luthertums, Neue Folge, Band 8 (Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1989).
6. With regard to the historical background of the Finnish scholars' research on their main themes, see Anna Briskina, "An Orthodox View of Finnish Luther Research," trans. Dennis Bielfeldt, *Lutheran Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (2008): 16–18. She mentions that "[w]ith its publications on the

deification means a believer's participation in or union with God. Luther says that Christ is present in faith itself. For that reason, a believer participates in Christ through faith. Christ is God; hence, a believer participates in God through faith.⁷

According to Mannermaa, deification is fundamentally the result of God's love. Human beings cannot participate in God on the basis of their own love; rather, only God's love can effect their deification. A Christian's participation in Christ is thus the result of the divine presence acting in her as love.⁸ What is noticeable in this argument is that Mannermaa sees this participation as a participation in the very *ousia* of God.⁹ There is, then, a "real-ontic"¹⁰ unity between Christ

teaching of *theosis* in Luther, the Mannermaa School thus became linked to an already well-established Scandinavian tradition of Luther research." *Ibid.*, 17.

7. For a synopsis in English of *theosis*, see Tuomo Mannermaa, "Theosis as a Subject of Finnish Luther Research," *Pro Ecclesia* 4 (1995): 37–48. For further references, see also Mannermaa, "Theosis als Thema der finnischen Lutherforschung," in *Luther und Theosis: Vergöttlichung als Thema der abendländischen Theologie*. Referate der Fachtagung der Luther-Akademie Ratzeburg in Helsinki 30.3–2.4. 1989. Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft A 25, ed. Simo Peura and Antti Raunio (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft; Erlangen: Luther-Akademie Ratzeburg, 1990), 11–26; Mannermaa, "Justification and *Theosis* in Lutheran-Orthodox Perspective," in *Union with Christ*, 25–41; Mannermaa, *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*; Mannermaa, "Hat Luther eine trinitarische Ontologie?" in *Luther und Ontology: Das Sein Christi im Glauben als strukturierendes Prinzip der Theologie Luthers*. Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft 31. Referate der Fachtagung des Instituts für Systematische Theologie der Universität Helsinki in Zusammenarbeit mit der Luther-Akademie Ratzeburg in Helsinki 1.–5.4. 1992, ed. Anja Ghiselli, Kari Kopperi, and Rainer Vinke (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 1993), 9–27; Mannermaa, "Hat Luther eine trinitarische Ontologie?" in *Luther und die trinitarische Tradition. Ökumenische und philosophische Perspektiven*, Veröffentlichungen der Luther-Akademie Ratzeburg, Bd. 23, ed. Joachim Heubach (Erlangen: Martin-Luther-Verlag, 1994), 43–60; Mannermaa, "Doctrine of Justification and Trinitarian Ontology," in *Trinity, Time, and Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 139–45; Simo Peura, *Mehr als ein Mensch? Die Vergöttlichung als Thema der Theologie Martin Luthers von 1513 bis 1519 (More than a Human Person? Deification as a Theme of Luther's Theology from 1513 to 1519)*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, Band 152 (Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1994); Peura, "Die Teilhabe an Christus bei Luther," in *Luther und Theosis*, 121–61.
8. Tuomo Mannermaa, "Grundlagenforschung der Theologie Martin Luthers und die Ökumene," in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 200.
9. Tuomo Mannermaa, "Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Liebe in der Theologie Luthers," in *Luther in Finnland—Der Einfluß der Theologie Martin Luthers in Finnland und finnische Beiträge zur Lutherforschung*, ed. Miikka Ruokanen, Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft A 23 (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 1986), 99–110. This essay originally appeared in

and the Christian, though the substance of each does not change into anything else.¹¹

Finnish in *Teologinen Aikakauskirja/Teologisk Tidskrift* (1979): 329–40. See also Mannermaa, “Freiheit als Liebe: Einführung in das Thema,” 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 Schwarzwaller (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995), 9–18. In this paper, Mannermaa cites a passage from Luther expressing his teaching on Christian participation in the divine nature (or in the name of God) through faith: “Das haben wyr (sagt er) durch die krafft des glawbens, das wyr teylhafftigt sind und geselschafft odder gemeynschafft mit der Göttlichen natur haben . . . Was ist aber Gottes natur? Es ist ewige wahrhey, gerechtigkeit, weysshey, ewig leben, fryd, freude und lust und was man gutt nennen kan. Wer nu Gottes natur teylhafftigt wird, der uberkompt das alles.” (*WA* 14/1. 19. 3–15), citation from *ibid.*, 10. The same train of argument also appears in Eeva Martikainen, “Die Unio im Brennpunkt der theologischen Forschung,” in *Unio: Gott und Mensch in der nachreformatorischen Theologie*, ed. Eeva Martikainen (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 1996), 13–18.

10. What makes Mannermaa’s claim unique—and controversial, especially within the established canons of German Luther interpretation—is the idea that Christ’s presence is “real-ontic,” not just a subjective experience (*Erlebnis*) or God’s effect (*Wirkung*) on the believer, as the neo-Protestant school has held. Mannermaa’s student Risto Saarinen in his philosophical-methodological work, *Gottes Wirken auf uns*, demonstrated how the “transcendental effect” orientation, originated by the nineteenth-century German philosopher Hermann Lotze, obscured the meaning of the real presence of Christ in Luther research, whether neo-Protestant, Luther renaissance, or even dialectical theology. Wilhelm Herrman, Otto Ritschl, and especially Albrecht Ritschl understood Luther’s theology as a new kind of *theologisches Erkenntnisprinzip*: They argued that Luther was moving beyond the old scholastic metaphysical idea of “essence” toward a more relational view of knowledge of God. Based on neo-Kantian philosophy, these scholars argued that theology cannot know anything about the “essence” (ontology) of God—only God’s “effects” in us. Risto Saarinen, *Gottes Wirken auf uns: Die transcendente Deutung des Gegenwart-Christ-Motivs in der Lutherforschung (God’s Work on Us: The Transcendent Meaning of the Presence of Christ Motif in Luther Research)*, (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1989). For an English synopsis, see Risto Saarinen, “The Presence of God in Luther’s Theology,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 3 (1994): 3–13.
11. The Finnish school also emphasizes “the happy exchange” between Christ and Christians and that Luther himself, unlike later Lutheranism, does not differentiate between the person and the work of Christ. Christ—his person and his work—is the righteousness of a Christian. In the language of the doctrine of justification, this means that Christ is both *donum* and *favor* (not only *favor*, as subsequent Lutheranism teaches). Tuomo Mannermaa, “In ipsa fide Christus adest: Der Schnittpunkt zwischen lutherischer und orthodoxer Theologie,” in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus: Rechtfertigung und Vergottung. Zum ökumenischen Dialog*, ed. Tuomo Mannermaa, trans. Hans-Christian Daniel and Juhani Forsberg (Hannover: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1989), 11–93. The essay was originally published in Finnish as *In ipsa fide Christus adest: Luterilaisen ja ortodoksisen kristinuskäsitelyksen leikkauspiste (In Faith Itself Christ Is Really Present: The Point of Intersection between Lutheran and Orthodox Theology)*, *Missiologian ja Ekumeniikan Seura R.Y., Missiologian ja Ekumeniikan Seuran julkaisu*, vol. 30 (Vammala: Vammalan Kirjapaino, 1979). It is available in English as *Christ Present in Faith: Luther’s View of Justification*, ed. Kirsi Stjerna (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005). For a recent overview, see Simo Peura,

Advancing Christ's presence in faith itself as the structuring principle of Luther's theology, Mannermaa accents the relationship between faith and love expressed in Luther's claim that the whole of the Christian life consists in faith and love. He also asserts that the theme of love has not been treated as it deserves in Luther scholarship. He also mentions the former president of the Lutheran World Federation, Mikko Juva, who believed that attempts to solve the central problem of world Lutheranism—the relation between the vertical and the horizontal dimension of Christian faith—have been unsuccessful so far. Mannermaa himself reformulates this relation as between faith and love. Faith defines the vertical relation to God; love, the horizontal relation to neighbors.¹²

Mannermaa insists that the main interpretations of Luther's theology deviate from one another exactly on this point.¹³ He contends that the relation between faith and love and the essence of love itself in Luther's theology can be understood only on the basis of "*dem im Glauben real gegenwärtigen Christus*" [Christ who is really present in faith].¹⁴ The missing joint between faith and love and the center that holds them together is the idea that "*in ipsa fide Christus adest*" [in faith itself Christ is present].¹⁵ This argument of Mannermaa is intriguing and persuasive, while the idea of deification seems to be controversial.¹⁶

"Christus als Gunst und Gabe: Luthers Verständnis der Rechtfertigung als Herausforderung an den ökumenischen Dialog mit der Römisch-katholischen Kirche," in *Caritas Dei: Beiträge zum Verständnis Luthers und der gegenwärtigen Ökumene, Festschrift für Tuomo Mannermaa zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Oswald Bayer, Robert W. Jenson, and Simo Knuutila (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft, 1997), 340–63; Peura, "Christ as Favor and Gift: The Challenge of Luther's Understanding of Justification," in *Union with Christ*, 42–69.

12. Tuomo Mannermaa, "Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Liebe in der Theologie Luthers," in *Luther in Finnland*, 99.

13. *Ibid.*

14. *Ibid.*

15. *Ibid.*

16. I will touch on this topic of *theosis* in the Conclusion.

In seeking the basis of the analogous relation between Christ and Christians, Mannermaa argues that there have been three false interpretations of the parallel characteristics of Christ and Christians. The first false view expresses the relation as an ethical one—one of the main trends in Lutheran studies and one heavily dependent on neo-Kantian metaphysical presuppositions since the end of the nineteenth century, especially after Albrecht Ritschl. This position highlights not the ontic or ontological relation between Christ and Christians but a personal–ethical relation. Focusing on the union between the divine and the human will, this position fails to grasp Luther’s understanding that Christians in union with God participate in the divine nature and become gods.¹⁷

The second fallacious interpretation comes from the so-called dialectical theologians who rely on the Word–relation. This position errs in viewing the Word of God merely in terms of the relation between God and human beings rather than in terms of the presence of Christ in Christians through faith and, thereby, the effectiveness of Christ in Christians. The third defective interpretation contains a one-sided consideration of the forensic aspect of the doctrine of justification, which has prevailed in Lutheranism since Philip Melancthon. This forensic interpretation severs justification from the presence of Christ in Christians.¹⁸

17. Mannermaa, “Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Nächstenliebe in der Theologie Luthers,” in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 97–98. See also Mannermaa, “Why Is Luther So Fascinating?” in *Union with Christ*, 4–9.

18. Mannermaa points out that Melancthon’s “outside us” (*extra nos*) view of justification as reckoned, forensic, and juridical is severed from sanctification. Mannermaa attempts instead to emphasize the interwoven relation between justification and sanctification on the basis of Christ, who is present in a believer through faith. Mannermaa argues that the principle of the presence of Christ in a believer through faith overcomes Melancthon’s bifurcation of forensic justification and effective sanctification—between being *declared* righteous and being *made* righteous, which has invited caricature as a forensic fiction with its overemphasis on an exclusively external justification. Mannermaa, “Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Nächstenliebe in der Theologie Luthers,” in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 98.

Opposing these three traditional misinterpretations, Mannermaa insists on a different way of defining the relationship between Christ and Christians, offering four reasons to substantiate his argument.¹⁹ First, Luther, unlike later Lutheranism, does not differentiate the person from the work of Christ. Christ himself, both his work and his person, is the justification of human beings by God. Faith signifies justification because the person of Christ is present: *in ipsa fide Christus adest*.²⁰ Second, unlike the scholastic theologians who argue that love is the form of faith, Luther's conception of Christ present in faith finds its expression also in his idea of *Christus forma fidei*. Christ is the divine reality (form) that forms faith.

Third, Christ is not only the favor of God—the forgiveness of sins and abolition of God's wrath—but also the gift of God—God's presence in the fullness of God's nature and essence. On this account, in faith, a person participates in the divine nature of God through union with Christ.²¹ Fourth, the properties of God are construed as God's nature according to what Luther calls “a Hebrew way of speaking.” On that account, when Christians participate in Christ by faith, they participate at the same time in God's properties and nature, because Christ is none other than God.²²

19. *Ibid.*, 98–100.

20. Mannermaa quotes from *WA* 40/1. 229. 28–30: “Ergo fide apprehensus et in corde habitans Christus est iustitia Christiana propter quam Deus nos reputat iustos et donat vitam aeternam.” (“Therefore, being grasped by faith and dwelling in our hearts, Christ is the Christian righteousness because of which God imputes righteousness to us and gives eternal life.”) *Ibid.*, 98 (my translation).

21. See *WA* 21. 458. 11–24.

22. See *WA* 17/1. 438. 14–28; *WA* 10¹/1. 157. 14. The same argument also appears in Mannermaa, “Why is Luther So Fascinating?” in *Union with Christ*, 15. The property/essence identity thesis is developed by many of the Finnish commentators. Peura points to *WA* 3. 189. 13–14: “In hiis laudatur Deus, ut quando veritatem, sapientiam, bonitatem loquimur, quia hec omnia est deus,” and to *WA* 3. 303. 20–21: “Nomen domini non dat sanctis bonum aliud quam est ipsummet: sed ipsummet est bonum eorum.” Peura, *Mehr als ein Mensch*, 51ff. See also Mannermaa, “Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Nächstenliebe in der Theologie Luthers,” in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 99–100; Peura, “Participation and Love in the Theology of Martin Luther,” in *Philosophical Studies in Religion, Metaphysics, and Ethics: Essays in Honour*

Mannermaa suggests a resolution of the relation between faith and love in the following formulation: love is the fulfillment of the law; faith offers the fulfillment of the law. One of the properties of God's nature, in which Christians can participate by faith, according to Mannermaa, is love. Christ, who is present in faith, brings love with himself because Christ is God in his nature and God is love. Mannermaa makes a similar point on the basis of a different Luther text, a 1525 sermon on Ephesians 3:14–21, which is printed under the title “Ein Sermon von Stärke und Zunehmen des Glaubens und der Liebe.”²³ According to Mannermaa, this text displays that faith entails participation in the being and the properties of God and, since love is one of the properties that Christ brings with himself as *donum*, the believer participates in the love of God as well.²⁴

The same argument reappears in Mannermaa's “Participation and Love in the Theology of Martin Luther,” where he mentions Luther's recognition of the notion of love as *agapē* in its relation to participation in God. According to Mannermaa, Christ Himself is the incarnate *agapē*. Here Mannermaa emphasizes Christ as both favor of God (forgiveness of sins, atonement, abolition of wrath) and *donum* (gift, God Himself present), and also as the form of faith (*Christus forma fidei*).

Mannermaa's interpretation of the relationship between faith and love in connection with the theme of participation in Luther's theology can be summarized in the following three ways: (1) Christ is the incarnate *agapē*. Christians are united with Christ by faith. Therefore, Christians participate in the divine *agapē* through their

of Heikki Kirjavainen, *Schriften der Luther-Agricola-Gesellschaft* 38, ed. Timo Koistinen and Tommi Lehtonen (Helsinki: Luther-Agricola-Society, 1997), 308–309.

23. See *WA* 17/1. 428–38.

24. Mannermaa, “Why Is Luther So Fascinating?” in *Union with Christ*, 16. Mannermaa claims that “[t]he idea of participation in Christ and in his divine properties was thus the content of his so-called reformatory insight and at the same time the foundation of his criticism of scholastic theology.” *Ibid.*, 17.

participation in Christ, the incarnate agapē, by faith. (2) Christ is God. Christians are united with Christ by faith. Their being united with Christ who is God means their participation in God. Christians participate in God's being and properties. Love is one of the divine properties. Therefore, Christians participate in the divine love through their being united with Christ by faith. (3) Christ is present in faith. Christ in his divine nature and properties is God. God is love. Christ who is present in faith brings love with him.²⁵ Therefore, Christians participate in the divine love through their participation in Christ by faith. As a consequence, even though faith itself is not the fulfillment of the law, it brings the love that is the fulfillment of the law.²⁶

On the basis of this relation between faith and love, Mannermaa also finds a solution to the problem of the analogous relation between Christ and Christians, which he depicts as a real analogy involving the two natures of a Christian. According to Mannermaa, just as Christ has two natures, human and divine, so a Christian has, in a certain sense, two natures through participation in Christ by faith. The divine nature of a Christian is Christ himself. It is no longer merely a Christian who lives in her, but Christ. In Christ or in his divine nature, a Christian has all the treasure and goods of the divine nature. She does not need anything else for salvation. Really and ontically/ontologically she becomes like God (*conformis Deo*).²⁷

25. Mannermaa, "Participation and Love in the Theology of Martin Luther," in *Philosophical Studies in Religion, Metaphysics, and Ethics*, 303–11.

26. See *WA* 17/2. 98. 13–24.

27. Mannermaa, "Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Nächstenliebe in der Theologie Luthers," in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 101. Luther's exegesis (*WA* 17/2. 74. 20–75. 11) of Psalm 81 (82) is one of the most frequently cited biblical passages in discussions of the Finnish scholars' concept of divinization—being divine by participating in the divine nature and being a god to others. For instance, see Mannermaa, "Participation and Love in the Theology of Martin Luther," in *Philosophical Studies in Religion, Metaphysics, and Ethics*, 306–307.

Also citing Psalm 82:6, Antti Raunio shows that, for Luther, love is not an extrinsic human quality of the Christian that fulfills the Golden Rule by external acts alone. Rather, love is God's own love, which is received by faith and in which Christians participate by cooperating with

At the same time, by means of this divine love, a Christian gives herself to her neighbor and takes upon herself the neighbor's burden, misery, sins, poverty, and weakness as if they were hers. In this way, a Christian takes on, figuratively speaking, a human nature, namely, the misery and burden of a neighbor. A Christian lives not in or for herself but in Christ and for her neighbor. Conversely, it is Christ and the neighbor (not she herself) who live the life that a Christian lives; hence, Christians are to become Christs to their neighbors.²⁸

Taking the parallelism between Christ and a Christian as real, Mannermaa analogically explicates the relationship between the relation of Christ to Christian and that of faith to love in Luther's theology as follows: (1) Christ is begotten by the Father continuously in eternity as true God. In a like manner, Christians are also born in faith as "God's children and gods, lords and kings." (2) Christ has "broken out" through pure love and stepped into the position of human beings in all their miseries. Likewise, Christians, who participate in the divine and human nature of Christ, must step into the position of their neighbors and take their burdens on themselves. (3) Just as Christ did not earn his divinity out of his works of love, so Christians do not gain their justification or righteousness as the result of their works of love. They are justified only through faith.

God as God loves the neighbor through them. Raunio, "Natural Law and Faith: The Forgotten Foundations of Ethics in Luther's Theology," in *Union with Christ*, 96–124. See *WA* 10¹/1. 100. 16–19: "da geht den der spruch ps. 81: Ich habe gesagt, yhr seyt Gotter und kinder des allerhochsten allesampt. Gottis kinder sind wyr durch den glawben, der unsz erben macht aller gottelichen gutter. Aber gotte synd wyr durch die liebe, die unsz gegen unszernn nehisten wolthettig macht . . ."

In similar fashion, Simo Peura points to Luther's comment on Romans 5:5 from the Romans lectures, which argues that love or charity is the only gift of God that requires that the giver Himself, the Holy Spirit, be present as the gift is made. To have love, therefore, means that Christians give not only of themselves but also of the Spirit and love of Christ which is in them. Peura, "Christ as Favor and Gift (*donum*): The Challenge of Luther's Understanding of Justification," in *Union with Christ*, 48–49. See also, *WA* 56. 308. 15–309. 5.

28. Mannermaa, "Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Nächstenliebe in der Theologie Luthers," in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 102.

For this reason, the relation of faith to God is understood as an analogy of the relation of divine Logos to God the Father before His incarnation. The Logos is continuously born of the Father. Christians, likewise, are continuously born in their faith as “gods and children.” As the Logos takes on human nature and becomes incarnate in human flesh out of pure love, so Christians out of love step into the position of their neighbor and become like the poorest of the poor. However, as the Logos does not need to be incarnate in order to be God, so Christians do not need to perform works of love in order to be justified.²⁹

Mannermaa also explains that a Christian confronts the commandment of love in two forms: one in the example of Christ; the other in the example of a Christian herself, namely, the Golden Rule. First, just as there is a joyful exchange between Christ and a Christian, so there should be a joyful exchange between a Christian and her neighbor. Everything that a Christian possesses on grounds of faith must become properties of her neighbor, while all the sins, condemnation, death, weakness, and brokenness of her neighbor must become her properties.³⁰

Second, the commandment of love is materialized not only in the example of Christ but also in the example of a Christian’s own heart. All people have the capacity to put themselves in another’s place,

29. In reference to both *Operationes in Psalmos* (Ps 1: 2-3 in *WA* 5. 38. 27–39. 12) and *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen*, Mannermaa treats this issue again in “Freiheit als Liebe: Einführung in das Thema,” in *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther*, 17–18. This relation between Christ and the Christian in light of the relation between faith and love appears also in Mannermaa’s “Participation and Love in the Theology of Martin Luther,” in *Philosophical Studies in Religion, Metaphysics, and Ethics*, 307–309. Citing the same passage from Luther (*WA* 17/2. 74. 20–75. 11), Mannermaa argues that it shows a paradigmatic model of Luther’s understanding of participation (*theosis*) and love. According to Mannermaa, the relation between faith and love in this text is determined christologically. Perceiving that Luther portrays Christ and the Christian as having exactly parallel characteristics, Mannermaa claims that Christ and Christians seem to have analogous constitutions. *Ibid.*, 307.

30. Mannermaa, “Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Nächstenliebe in der Theologie Luthers,” in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 102–103.

knowing what that person would want to be done. By using this capacity, a Christian ought to love her neighbor. This is the principle of the Golden Rule. According to Mannermaa, Luther connects this principle of the Golden Rule to the way he interprets Jesus Christ's commandment to "love your neighbor as yourself." This principle is observed in the nature of Christ's love for human beings, because when God the Son became a human person, he followed the principle of the Golden Rule. A Christian also complies with the Golden Rule when she takes the place of her neighbor. Mannermaa emphasizes that this idea is crystallized in Luther's view that a Christian is a Christ to her neighbor.³¹

In sum, Mannermaa claims that faith and love are not merely a special theme in Luther's theology, but rather "the total main-content of the Christian belief" (den gesamten Hauptinhalt des christlichen Glaubens).³² Christ has two natures and so does a Christian through participation in Christ by faith. Mannermaa explains these two natures of a Christian in terms of faith and love.³³ This means that Christian teaching has two main points: faith and love.

Consequently, Mannermaa insists that the traditional view that justifying faith is the center of Luther's thought requires revision. Justifying faith is, according to Luther, an abstract faith (*fides abstracta*). It is not the content of the whole of a Christian life and teaching. It finds its expression in concrete faith (*fides concreta*) or incarnate faith (*fides incarnata*) through love. Only *fides concreta* is the center of Christian belief. *Fides concreta*, in which faith and love are united by virtue of Christ who is present in faith, has been neglected, Mannermaa argues, as the presence of Christ was separated

31. Ibid., 103–104.

32. Ibid., 104.

33. Ibid., 101–102.

from justifying faith, and faith was viewed only as the reception of forgiveness through the merits of Christ.³⁴

Other Researches

In addition to the insights that the Finns have brought into the discussion of Luther's teaching on love and the relation of faith to love, other studies enrich the discourse with a wide range of research subjects and emphases. First, Anders Nygren's *Agape and Eros* deserves attention, though his treatment of St. Augustine needs to be critically approached.³⁵ Nygren, a leading representative of the so-called Lundensian school of theology, properly recognizes and appreciates the radical nature of Luther's teaching on love as *agapē*.

Utilizing "motif-research," Nygren claims that Christianity, Hellenism, and Judaism differently express characteristic motifs in their thought and cultus: the motif of Judaism is the law; of Hellenism, *eros* (an acquisitive and egocentric love); of Christianity, *agapē* (a self-sacrificing and unconditional love). This motif-research induces Nygren to declare that St. Augustine synthesized *agapē* and *eros* into *caritas*, a divinely inspired love for God. According to

34. Mannermaa, "In ipsa fide Christus adest," in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 55; *Christ Present in Faith: Luther's View of Justification*, 46.

35. Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, trans. Philip S. Watson (New York: Harper & Row, 1969). When we read Nygren's *Agape and Eros*, it becomes obvious that Nygren's labor to make Luther a hero led him to make some overstatements and an overly stark contrast between the medieval church's teaching on love and Luther's. Nygren's view that Augustinian *caritas* is a combination of self-sacrificing *agapē* and self-seeking *eros* has been critically reassessed and replaced by new interpretations. Concerning critical evaluations and new interpretations of St. Augustine's conception of love, see, among many, Raymond Canning, *The Unity of Love for God and Neighbour in St. Augustine* (Heverlee-Leuven: Augustinian Historical Institute, 1993); John Burnaby, *Amor Dei: A Study of the Religion of St. Augustine* (Norwich: Canterbury, 1991); Oliver O'Donovan, *The Problem of Self-Love in St. Augustine* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980).

For an analysis of the history of the concepts of love, see Irving Singer, *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*, vol. 1 (New York: Random House, 1966). See also Pierre Rousselot, *The Problem of Love in the Middle Ages: A Historical Contribution*, trans. Alan Vincelette, reviewed and corrected by Pol Vandeveldel (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2001; 1908).

Nygren, the Augustinian idea of *caritas* was the predominant Christian idea of love for more than a thousand years, until Luther finally rejected this synthesized notion of *caritas* allegedly because of its egocentrism and returned to the pure New Testament idea of *agapē*.³⁶

Agapē has the following features, according to Nygren: (1) it is a sacrificial and unconditional divine love; (2) it is not motivated by the value of the object of its love; (3) it is creative, in that it does not recognize a value or worth in the object it loves but creates the worth or value in it; and (4) it initiates fellowship with God, that is, *agapē* is God's way to human beings. In contrast, Platonic *eros* is characterized as follows: (1) it is an egocentric and acquisitive love; (2) it is motivated by the value of its object; (3) it seeks the possession of an object that is recognized as valuable and good to have; and (4) it is a human way to God. Nygren certainly exaggerates Luther as a hero who reintroduced a purified, biblical conception of *agapē*. Furthermore, he does not do justice to St. Augustine's teaching on love. Nonetheless, Nygren provides a rare study of Luther's concept of love in detail.

At the core of Nygren's explication of Luther's view of love is the contention that, in opposition to all egocentric forms of religion, Luther insists on a purely theocentric relation to God.³⁷ Nygren elaborates on this argument as follows:

What is to be broken down and destroyed is everything 'that is in us,' all our righteousness and wisdom, absolutely everything in which we take a selfish delight. What is to be built up and planted is 'everything that is outside us and in Christ.' The righteousness by which God wills to save

36. It is true, as Nygren admits, that "Luther himself did not use these terms [*eros* and *agapē*], nor does he consciously seem to have considered the problem of love from this point of view." Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, 692. Notwithstanding, Nygren is determined to employ *eros* and *agapē* to probe Luther's stance on love because he is convinced that this is the problem with which Luther is essentially wrestling.

37. *Ibid.*, 681 (*italics original*).

us, is not produced by us, but has come to us from elsewhere; it is not derived from our earth, but has come to us from heaven.³⁸

Nygren underscores that there is “an inner connection and an exact correspondence between Luther’s doctrine of justification and his thinking on love. *The very same thing which made him a reformer in the matter of justification, made him also the reformer of the Christian idea of love.*”³⁹ In reference to Luther’s depiction of his exegetical discovery of Romans 1:17 in *Table Talk*, Nygren contends, “Just as justification is not a question of the ‘iustitia’ in virtue of which God makes His demands upon us, but of the ‘iustitia’ which He bestows, so Christian love is strictly not concerned with the love with which we love God, but essentially with the love with which God Himself loves. Luther himself clearly saw this parallel between his view of justification and of love.”⁴⁰

Nygren stresses that Luther’s idea of love is to be set apart from a moralistic love because Luther’s idea of love is fundamentally construed in terms of God’s love for us, not our love for God. Likewise, it is differentiated from a eudaemonistic inclination that is not unconnected with an egocentric, acquisitive love. Nygren illustrates how Luther’s idea of love can be designated as a theocentric love. In Luther’s model, fellowship with God is not conceived of as fellowship on the level of God’s holiness but as fellowship on our human level, namely on the basis of sin, not of holiness.⁴¹ When Christ came from heaven to earth, he was given for sinners.⁴² When a person toils to become holy and godly to gain standing for herself

38. *Ibid.*, 682.

39. *Ibid.*, 683 (italics original). Nygren claims that when Luther realizes that the righteousness involved in the justification of sinners is not a righteousness from us or in us, but righteousness from God, this puts Luther on an “entirely new Way of salvation, for ‘righteousness from God’ is equivalent to God’s Agape.” *Ibid.*, 693.

40. *Ibid.*, 683–84.

41. *Ibid.*, 684.

42. *Ibid.*, 686.

before God, this aspiration instead makes her yet more insusceptible to God's grace and leads her even further away from God. In opposition to human endeavor, God's will teaches differently. God wants us to entirely rely on God's free bestowal of the divine love—God's *agapē* in Christ—and become its beneficiary without any merit on our part.⁴³ Thus, “every attempt to make one's way to God by self-sanctification runs counter to the message of Christ's self-offering.”⁴⁴ Every attempt rooted in works- or self-righteousness is rejected. Such an attempt or even the natural disposition towards it is not godly but godless.

Nygren proceeds to demonstrate how Luther breaks down the *caritas*-synthesis and builds up *agapē*-love. According to Nygren, Luther finds it necessary to deconstruct the union of the two motifs of *eros* and *agapē* and put in its place a doctrine of love that Nygren reckons to be wholly determined by the *agapē* motif. Nygren sets forth three features that mark the medieval *caritas*-synthesis. The first feature is the notion of heavenly ladders, that is, the upward tendency. This tendency asserts itself no less in the moralistic piety of popular Catholicism (works-righteousness based on the system of merit through works) than in the rational theology of Scholasticism and the ecstatic religiosity of Mysticism. Despite all dissimilarities, Nygren detects an upward tendency as a common feature among them.⁴⁵

In contrast to this upward tendency, Nygren distinguishes a descending movement in his understanding of the *agapē* motif in Luther's view of love, claiming that “if Christ is *our way to God*, that is only because He is first and foremost *God's way to us*.”⁴⁶ Hence,

43. *Ibid.*, 685.

44. *Ibid.*, 688.

45. *Ibid.*, 700. “They all know a Way by which man can work his way up to God, whether it is the Way of merit known to practical piety, the ἀναγωγή of mysticism, or the Way of speculative thought according to the ‘analogy of being’ (*analogia entis*).” *Ibid.*

God's way of salvation is not our ascent to God in heaven but God's descent to us on earth in Christ.⁴⁷ According to Nygren, the sharp contrast between the upward and downward movements is what differentiates eros from agapē, namely, "the Platonic, Hellenistic" from "the specifically Christian Way of salvation. Eros is man's way to God, Agape is God's way to man. Eros is egocentric, Agape theocentric fellowship with God. Luther himself was fully aware that his ultimate concern was with these opposites."⁴⁸

The second feature is laid bare in Luther's battle against self-love, which the medieval tradition interpreted as a separate commandment of love. Nygren pays attention to Luther's disapproval of any kind of self-love and his divergence from the traditional interpretation of

46. *Ibid.*, 708 (italics original).

47. Nygren indicates that Luther's serious problem concerns the idea of *caritas* and the tension it involves. He considers how this issue is bound up with Luther's personal development and illustrates its significance for Luther's thought with an example—that of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Lord's Supper. Nygren claims that it was "the refinement of the *Caritas* doctrine by Mediæval theology, which brought Luther to the point where this doctrine had to be broken down. He found this sublimated idea of *caritas* in Occam and Biel, with their demand for a penitence and contrition based not merely on fear and acquisitive love, but on a pure and unselfish love of God. This demand becomes the more pointed when the authors mentioned affirm that man is able 'ex puris naturalibus,' by his natural powers alone, to love God above all things. It was this theory which Luther in the monastery tried to put into practice in his own life." *Ibid.*, 694.

However, as Nygren points out, the more seriously Luther takes the commandment to love God and the demand that his love for God should be pure and unselfish, the more impossible it becomes. *Ibid.* By realizing that human beings cannot fulfill the commandment of love, Luther holds that we are justified not by ascending to God in *caritas*, but solely by receiving in faith God's love, which has descended to us in Christ. According to Nygren, this is one of the ways in which the *caritas*-synthesis falls to pieces, vanquished by God's agapē. *Ibid.*, 695.

Nygren finds the same pattern in the Lord's Supper. Primarily designating Luther's approach to the Lord's Supper as receiving Christ's gift and the Catholic approach to it as our giving a sacrifice to God, Nygren contrasts the two: The former comes from God to us, the latter comes from us to God. In the Lord's Supper, Christ has instituted his testament and it is God who in Christ descends to us. In it, there is given to us the forgiveness of sins; there we are met by God's self-giving love, God's agapē. In the Sacrifice of the Mass, we strive to ascend to God; hence, it gives expression to the false way of salvation. The same logic is applied when Luther criticizes the spiritualizing idea of the Lord's Supper. Nygren focuses on the question of what is it that impels them to deny the real presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It is chiefly the idea that this would conflict with the glory of Christ. At the celebration, they strive for a fellowship with the glorified Christ, while also seeking to mount up to God in His majesty. *Ibid.*, 697.

48. *Ibid.*, 708.

self-love with the conviction that even one's seeking fellowship with God is polluted by this inborn egocentricity. The third feature is identified in Luther's campaign against the scholastic formula *fides caritate formata*, which Nygren reckons as the "culmination of Luther's attack on the *caritas*-synthesis."⁴⁹ In this campaign, Luther removes love and places it outside the locus of justification, declaring that justification takes place *sola fide*, by faith alone.

Focusing on this position of Luther, Nygren puts forward a compelling argument that the "contrast between Luther and Catholicism, which at first appears to be the contrast between faith and love, is just as much a contrast between two fundamentally different conceptions of love."⁵⁰ Nygren asserts that "'fides caritate formata' constitutes a threat not only to faith, but equally to the purity of Christian love."⁵¹ Luther had no intention to dismiss or depreciate love itself. The reason Luther was so anxious to keep love apart from the matter of the justification of sinners was that "*to do the contrary would mean a depreciation of love, a denial of Christian love. To speak of love in loco iustificationis is to preach another and lower kind of love than the Christian.*"⁵² Accordingly, it can be said that Luther's intention was not to banish or minimize love in his theology but to retrieve what he believed to be the pure Christian love that is nothing other than God.

After affirming that Luther succeeded in building up the theocentric agapē-love, Nygren handles the question of whether or not this idea of agapē is merely an ideal picture drawn from God's love, having no relation whatever to human life as it actually is. Nygren's answer is that, while the subject of Christian love,

49. *Ibid.*, 716.

50. *Ibid.*, 719.

51. *Ibid.*

52. *Ibid.*, 720 (*italics original*).

according to Luther, is not a human person but the very God, divine love employs a Christian as its instrument and organ. Being placed between God and her neighbor, in faith she receives God's love and in love she passes it on to her neighbor; hence, Christian love is the extension of God's love.⁵³

Second, instead of dealing with individual topics, Gerhard Ebeling concentrates on the inner dynamic of Luther's thought or the process of his thinking and calls our attention to this inner dynamic by selecting and treating ten thematic pairs. Ebeling's ten thematic pairs are: "theology and philosophy, the letter and the Spirit, the law and the gospel, the double use of the law, person and works, faith and love, the kingdom of Christ and the kingdom of the world, man as a Christian and man in the world, freedom and bondage, God hidden and God revealed."⁵⁴ These ten thematic pairs, Ebeling asserts, should not be studied separately from one another, since a true appreciation of the structure of Luther's thinking can be grasped only when all these themes are put into perspective together. They originate from a single pattern of thinking but are presented in different forms; thus, they are organically related to one another by an integrated thinking process.

Ebeling's deliberate selection of faith and love as one of the ten complementary thematic pairs in Luther's theology deserves special attention.⁵⁵ Ebeling's explicit pairing of faith and love is quite valuable, since it visibly demonstrates the importance of faith and

53. *Ibid.*, 737.

54. Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther—Einführung in sein Denken*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006; 1964), 16; ET *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, trans. R. A. Wilson (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 25.

55. Ebeling, *Luther—Einführung in sein Denken*, 178–97; ET *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, 159–74. The chapter on "Glaube und Liebe" was reproduced as "Faith and Love" in *Martinus Luther: 450th Anniversary of the Reformation*, ed. Helmut Gollwitzer (Bad Godesberg: Inter Nationes, 1967), 69–79. See also Ebeling, "Einfalt des Glaubens und Vielfalt der Liebe: Das Herz von Luthers Theologie," in *Lutherstudien III* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985), 126–53.

love as a thematic pair in Luther's theology. However, Ebeling's intentional focus on faith and love turns out to carry even more weight in his scrutiny of the underlying dynamics between faith and love than in his presentation of faith and love as a thematic pair because of his method of interpreting the dynamics.

This method examines "the tension that runs through the whole of Luther's thought, the play between the harsh opposition of opposing theses and the spirit of compromise which reconciles both sides of an issue,"⁵⁶ namely, "an antithesis, tension between strongly opposed but related polarities."⁵⁷ Accordingly, the relationship between faith and love is characterized by the tension that emerges from both the opposition and the connection between them; faith and love are both opposed and related. Ebeling perceives this paradoxical relationship between faith and love especially in the relationship between the doer and the deed.

In Ebeling's understanding of Luther's doctrine, the Word of God or the proclamation of the Word, by which a Christian is confronted, plays a crucial role. The Word, which has created the universe *ex nihilo*, has the power to lead sinners to justification and justified Christians effectively to works of love. The direct address of the gospel, the essence of which is the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins available by reason of Christ's merit, sets a sinner free from anguish of conscience and motivates loving service. It is the active, deed-generating power of the word of faith, as it initiates a new personal existence in assurance and freedom, which connects faith

56. Ebeling, *Luther—Einführung in sein Denken*, v: "der durchgehenden Spannung in Luthers Denken nachzugehen, die zwischen schroffer Gegensätzlichkeit und beruhigendem Kompromiß, zwischen Entweder-Oder und Sowohl-Als-Auch zu schillern scheint.;" ET *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, 11.

57. Ebeling, *Luther—Einführung in sein Denken*, 16: "in antithetischer Spannung, in sehr verschiedenartigen, aber doch zueinander in Beziehung stehenden Polaritäten.;" ET *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, 25. See also *Luther-Einführung in sein Denken*, 157–58, 161–62; ET *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, 141–42, 144–48.

to love. The certainty of faith sets Christians free to serve their neighbors without any trace of calculating, self-interested piety.

Third, in addition to the treatment of faith and love in Luther by the modern Finnish Luther scholars, Nygren, and Ebeling, Luther interpreters also have focused on freedom as love and love as freedom, undoubtedly inspired by Luther's well-known tractate *The Freedom of a Christian*. Rudolf Mau's article, "Liebe als gelebte Freiheit der Christen," is very helpful in exploring Luther's teaching on love as the lived freedom of a Christian in Luther's 1519 Galatians commentaries.⁵⁸

In *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther*, Mannermaa reclaims Luther's understanding that freedom is never to be attributed to human beings but only to God.⁵⁹ In Luther's *De servo arbitrio*, for instance, freedom is exclusively a divine property (Eigenschaft).⁶⁰ Here again applying his argument that Christ is present in a Christian through faith, Mannermaa claims that freedom, as the name or property of God, is identical with the divine nature and that a Christian can participate in this divine nature of freedom through union with Christ in justifying faith. Only by acknowledging and confessing their lack of freedom, and by emptying themselves, can sinners participate in Christ and thereby in God, through the word of the gospel. According to Mannermaa, when Luther treats the problem of free will, it is a matter of a person's capability of fulfilling the divine commandments—the twofold commandment of love of God and love of neighbor. Only through participation in the divine love that is freedom can a person fulfill the commandments.⁶¹

58. Rudolf Mau, "Liebe als gelebte Freiheit der Christen," *Lutherjahrbuch* 59 (1992): 11–37.

59. Tuomo Mannermaa, "Freiheit als Liebe: Einführung in das Thema," in *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther*, 9–18.

60. See *WA* 18, 636, 27–637, 1.

61. His explication of Luther's concept of freedom as love in this essay, though very insightful, focuses on "freedom to" not "freedom from," which is primarily connected to Luther's doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone. Furthermore, Luther's concept of freedom as love is

A fourth classification of research on faith and love in Luther focuses on Luther's teaching on neighbor-love, which highlights the Christian's metaphorically paradoxical roles as simultaneously a lord and a servant, and also as a Christ to her neighbors. This research also deals with the role of the Golden Rule in Luther's concept of love, especially as the principle of neighbor-love. Donald C. Ziemke's *Love for the Neighbor in Luther's Theology: The Development of His Thought 1512–1529* is one example.⁶² Ziemke aims to clarify Luther's understanding of love for the neighbor by tracing his work on it during the years 1512–1529. Bearing in mind that theology and ethics are closely tied to each other in Luther's cogitation, Ziemke explores Luther's understanding of the biblical concept of neighbor-love and its relation to his theological ethics.

Gustaf Wingren treats the nonmeritorious nature of horizontal Christian love in Luther's theology in light of his concept of vocation.⁶³ Helmar Junghans inquires into the relationship of love as the content and the fulfillment of the law, and faith as the condition of making such love available to Christians.⁶⁴ He explicates Luther's notions of the person who performs works of love, the way to perform works of love, the object (field or area) of love, and the example of the works of love.

delineated in three relational dimensions: to God, to neighbors, and to oneself. Mannermaa's explanation highlights only two of these: to God and to neighbors.

62. Donald C. Ziemke, *Love for the Neighbor in Luther's Theology: The Development of His Thought 1512–1529* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963). See also Ziemke, *The Hermeneutical Basis for Luther's Doctrine of Love for the Neighbor* (PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1960).

63. Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, trans. C. C. Rasmussen (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004; 1957), esp. 37–50. See also Eberhard Jüngel, *Zur Freiheit eines Christenmenschen: eine Erinnerung an Luthers Schrift* (Munich: Kaiser, 1991), 91–115; ET *The Freedom of a Christian: Luther's Significance for Contemporary Theology*, trans. Roy A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988), 68–87.

64. Helmar Junghans, "Martin Luther über die Nächstenliebe," *Luther: Zeitschrift der Luther-Gesellschaft* 62, no. 1 (1991): 3–11.

Mannermaa also treats the issue of neighbor-love in relation to Luther's concept of faith.⁶⁵ Many of Mannermaa's arguments are taken up by Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen.⁶⁶ Drawing on modern Finnish Luther studies, Kärkkäinen also brings to the fore the meaning of Christ's real presence in Christians as the gateway for expressing Christ's love toward neighbor and the Christian's role as Christ to neighbors. He finds the Golden Rule to be Luther's guiding principle for understanding the Christian's relationships to both God and neighbor.

He also underscores important ecclesiological implications of Luther's ideas about God's love and neighbor-love: church members as Christs to each other and the church as a hospital. For Luther, human love is no less valuable than divine love. The relationship between faith and love is integral and necessary in Luther's doctrine of justification.⁶⁷ Kärkkäinen holds that faith is the reception of God's gifts—primarily the greatest gift, love. Christ as gift inhabits the Christian and makes the believer act as Christ acts, loving and caring. The works of the Christian are in a sense not the believer's own but rather the works of Christ present in faith. This is the fulfillment of the law.⁶⁸

Another Finnish scholar, Antti Raunio, scrutinizes Luther's teaching on love, especially from the vantage point of the Golden Rule and its theological and ethical implications.⁶⁹ His research offers

65. Tuomo Mannermaa, "Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Liebe in der Theologie Luthers," in *Luther in Finnland*, 99–110; Mannermaa, "Das Verhältnis von Glaube und Nächstenliebe in der Theologie Luthers," in *Der im Glauben gegenwärtige Christus*, 95–105.

66. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, "The Christian as Christ to the Neighbor: On Luther's Theology of Love," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 6, no. 2 (2004): 101–17.

67. *Ibid.*, 103.

68. *Ibid.*, 116.

69. Antti Raunio, *Summe des christlichen Lebens: die "Goldene Regel" als Gesetz der Liebe in der Theologie Martin Luthers von 1510–1527* (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 2001). Originally published in *Helsingin yliopiston systemaattisen teologian laitoksen julkaisuja* 13 (Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1993). See also *idem*, "Die 'Goldene Regel' als theologisches Prinzip beim jungen Luther," in *Thesaurus Lutheri* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Teologinen Kirjallisuusseura,

an elaborate treatment of Luther's idea of God's love as formulated in the Golden Rule, its relationship to human love and neighbor-love, and its implications for Luther's theology of the cross and of suffering.

Fifth, as previously sketched research already discloses, the Golden Rule plays an important role in Luther's teaching on faith and love. However, in terms of Luther's concept of the role of the law for justified Christians, the Ten Commandments, in particular, play a role no less significant. Considering that the Decalogue is encapsulated in Christ's two ultimate love commandments (Matthew 22:37–40), it is no surprise to find research on the issue of the law—or, more precisely, the Decalogue—in Luther's teaching on faith and love, which can be classified as a fifth area of scholarship on faith and love in Luther. For instance, there are studies on this issue by Klaus Schwarzwäller, George W. Forell, and Christoph Burger.⁷⁰ Bernhard Erling treats the question of how to understand freedom within the context of Anders Nygren's *agapē*-motif.⁷¹ Placing Luther's concept of the role of law within the *agapē*-motif, Erling contends that, before coming to faith, one does not have freedom to obey the law, according to Luther. Yet once Christians receive a new heart through the Holy Spirit's gift of divine love, they do have freedom to obey the law of love.

In a sixth classification of research on faith and love in Luther, many recent works have examined the socio-ethical implications

1987), 309–27; Raunio, “Die Goldene Regel als Gesetz der göttlichen Natur: Das natürliche Gesetz und das göttliche Gesetz in Luthers Theologie 1522–1523,” in *Luther und Theosis*, 163–86.

70. Klaus Schwarzwäller, “Verantwortung des Glaubens Freiheit und Liebe nach der Dekalogauslegung Martin Luthers,” in *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther*, 133–58; George W. Forell, “Freedom as Love: Luther's *Treatise on Good Works*,” in *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther*, 79–83; Christoph Burger, “Gottesliebe, Erstes Gebot und menschliche Autonomie bei spätmittelalterlichen Theologen und bei Martin Luther,” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 89, no. 3 (1992): 280–301.

71. Bernhard Erling, “The Role of Law in How a Christian Becomes What He/She Is,” in *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther*, 63–78.

of Luther's teaching on faith and love. For instance, Bernd Wannewetsch treats Luther's concepts of faith and love in terms of Luther's moral theology,⁷² and William H. Lazareth focuses on the biblical norms of Luther's theological ethics in order to argue that the chief features of Luther's theological ethics are determined by his christocentric reading of Scripture.⁷³ He accents the dramatic and dialectical twofold rule of the Triune God against Satan through Caesar and Christ. God preserves creation and renews redemption by the intersecting functions of the law and the gospel for Christian salvation and service. The law has not only a judging function before God but also a corollary preserving function within society. This strange work of God is also complemented by the two interpenetrating functions of the gospel: carrying out Christ's proper work by effecting his justification of sinners before God and the Holy Spirit's accompanying sanctification of Christians within society.

Svend Andersen argues that Luther's ethics is an ethics of neighbor-love.⁷⁴ Pointing to Luther's view that the world cannot be governed by the gospel, Andersen claims that this remark has too often been misunderstood. Andersen interprets Luther's concept of love first and foremost as neighbor-love. It is a spontaneous expression of the Christian's joy and gratitude for the beneficence

72. Bernd Wannewetsch, "Luther's Moral Theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Martin Luther*, 120–35, esp. 128–29. See also, David Wright, "The Ethical Use of the Old Testament in Luther and Calvin: A Comparison," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 36 (1983): 463–85, esp. 467–68; Mark T. Totten, "Luther on *unio cum Christo*: Toward a Model for Integrating Faith and Ethics," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 31, no. 3 (2003): 443–62; Bayer, *Living by Faith*.

73. William H. Lazareth, *Christians in Society: Luther, the Bible, and Social Ethics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001). Lazareth clearly indicates his strong interest in prompting and contributing to unprecedented ecumenical developments that have been taking place since the end of the twentieth-century, such as the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* (1999) and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America's affirmation of a relation of full communion with the Episcopal Church USA in 1998 and with three churches of the Reformed tradition: the Presbyterian Church (USA), the Reformed Church in America, and the United Church of Christ in 1997. *Ibid.*, viii–ix.

74. Svend Andersen, "Lutheran Ethics and Political Liberalism," in *Philosophical Studies in Religion, Metaphysics, and Ethics*, 292–302.

bestowed by Christ, namely, freely granted salvation. Luther's teaching on neighbor-love, according to Andersen, opens a door to the notion that the world can be governed on the basis of Christian neighbor-love. This neighbor-love sends Christians into the secular domain, that is, the socio-political sphere; hence, neighbor-love can be practiced in the exercise of political power and can assume the nature of justice.

In addition to these studies, a classic examination of Luther's teaching on faith and love and its socio-ethical ramifications is detected in George W. Forell's *Faith Active in Love*. Forell opposes the assertion that Luther had no social ethics because he placed society outside the influence of the Christian gospel. He also disapproves of the claim that Luther's social ethics was purely pragmatic, accepting the social order of his day and consequently promoting the growth of capitalism and nationalism. Suspending any judgment that Luther's utterances about social ethics sound meaningless or contradictory, Forell maintains that there is a framework for Luther on social ethics, comprising four principles: methodological, ethical, practical, and limiting.

In the interest of probing Luther's teaching on faith and love, Forell's perception of "faith active in love" as the bedrock of Luther's social ethics is no less engaging than his advancing of the four principles themselves. According to Forell, Luther's ethical stance proceeds from his theological method, the kernel of which is the forgiveness of sins by God's gracious justification through Christ.⁷⁵ Luther's ethical treatment is built upon his doctrine of justification by faith in Christ alone. For Luther, "justification is the basis for all Christian ethics."⁷⁶ With this view of justifying faith, Luther

75. George Wolfgang Forell, *Faith Active in Love: An Investigation of the Principles Underlying Luther's Social Ethics* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999; Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1954), 47-48.

76. *Ibid.*, 84.

postulates that actions are measured as good or evil commensurate with the function they fulfill in helping or hindering the establishment of the saving relation between God and human beings.⁷⁷ Forell designates Luther's implementation of his theological core to his social ethics as its methodological principle.

On the basis of this methodological principle, a claim ensues: faith guarantees ethical action, not actions motivated toward self-righteousness, rewards, or happiness.⁷⁸ More fundamentally, the motivating force springing from faith for Christian ethics is God's love. The one justified receives God's love in faith and passes it on to her neighbor; therefore, the Christian life is a life of faith and love.⁷⁹ Here Forell puts forward an apposite formulation: "If the principle of Luther's ethics can be defined in relation to its source in God as 'justification by faith,' it can be described in relation to its outlet as 'faith active in love.'"⁸⁰ According to Luther, Forell contends, "all ethics, individual as well as social, must be understood from the key-principle of love."⁸¹ This principle of love is bound to have widespread social-ethical implications: the works of love must benefit fellow individuals, especially those in greatest need, and society.⁸² The Christian service resulting from faith is to be rendered to not only individuals but also the world.

Luther's concern for society as reflected in the service of Christians through faith active in love leads to Forell's understanding of the practical principle of Luther's social ethics, which is characterized by its pragmatic approach to the problems of society. For Luther, Forell

77. *Ibid.*, 62–65, 69.

78. *Ibid.*, 79–81, 83.

79. *Ibid.*, 89.

80. *Ibid.*, 90. Forell features Luther's concept of Christian love as diametrically opposed to all human acquisitive desire. Love, insofar as it is truly Christian, is modeled after the love of Christ. *Ibid.*, 95. This Christian love as a gift of God is self-giving, spontaneous, overflowing as the love of God, and does not ask after the worthiness of the object. *Ibid.*, 98–99.

81. *Ibid.*, 101.

82. *Ibid.*, 103.

argues, the natural orders are “the practical realm of social ethics.”⁸³ Although Luther differentiates the secular from the spiritual realm, the secular realm is also God’s realm. On that account, social ethics is practiced within the framework of the natural orders that are divinely ordained and have their source in the preserving will of God.⁸⁴ Forell finds in Luther’s social ethics a point of contact between the secular and the spiritual realms in the justified Christian living in society:

A point of contact between the secular realm and the spiritual realm exists in the person of the individual Christian. In this point the spiritual realm penetrates the secular, without, however, abolishing it. The Gospel itself cannot be used to rule the world, because it is the Gospel and demands a voluntary response from man. It would cease to be the Gospel if it became a new law. But through the person of the believer, who is related to Christ through the Gospel and who is at the same time a member of the natural orders, the faith active in love penetrates the social order.⁸⁵

Through the justified Christian, the ethical principle penetrates the practical principle in Luther’s social ethics, and the Christian faith finds its social relevancy.⁸⁶

83. *Ibid.*, 145.

84. *Ibid.*, 146. A person as a member of society is a part of certain orders or collectivities such as the family, the state, the empirical church, and her calling. This membership in the natural orders is part of God’s design to preserve the world and to contain the creative forces within a person that, under the influence of sin, might lead to disorder and destruction. *Ibid.*, 113. See also *ibid.*, 123, 127, 153.

85. *Ibid.*, 148–49.

86. *Ibid.*, 154. This point of view is also well expressed in Martin Marty’s “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), 199–227. Marty denounces the allegation that Luther’s ethics and Lutheran ethics teach that the secular order is abandoned because the gospel is irrelevant to it, or that it is autonomous because God’s law alone is operative in it, which has nothing—except in its theological function—to do with Christian salvation and freedom. This opinion falsely accuses Luther of severing the temporal and spiritual spheres and generating a dichotomy between personal ethics and participation in public and official life. Marty criticizes this dualistic interpretation for viewing Luther’s two-kingdom approach too statically, isolating the temporal order from the spiritual one. This way of thinking obscures the dynamics constituting Luther’s and Lutheran social ethics.

On the other hand, Forell also claims that this very concept of faith active in love, which functions as the underpinning of Luther's social ethics, curbs the desire for any drastic or thoroughgoing social revolutions or changes. Faith "made it impossible for Luther to take any social reform ultimately seriously. Faith was the 'motive' and the 'quietive' of his social ethics," Forell articulates.⁸⁷ An indispensable characteristic of Luther's faith is the expectation of the immediate advent of the Kingdom of God. All the problems of individual and social existence can ultimately be solved only with the coming of God's kingdom. Until that time, all human efforts are merely attempts to eliminate "proximate evils."⁸⁸ Forell construes this eschatological outlook or "this firm belief in God's impending solution of all human problems" as "the limiting principle of Luther's social ethics."⁸⁹ However, "this practical conservatism does not imply a principle of static acceptance of all existing orders," Forell clarifies.⁹⁰

Finally, due to its limited scope, this dissertation does not analyze Luther's lectures on Genesis as a whole. These lectures were written between 1535 and 1545 (one year before Luther's death) and can certainly be claimed as representative of the so-called "older" Luther.⁹¹ Nevertheless, the sheer volume of the lectures covering

Marty then claims, "Given the 'water over the dam' of Troeltsch-Holl and the many sad historical episodes by Lutherans who misused the [two-kingdom] teaching, it seems more advantageous to begin with the concrete view of love and the neighbor on the part of the free and serving Christian as the first word in Lutheran ethics. After it is understood, a discussion of the spheres or orbits or situation-complexes of ethics can be expounded as regulative so that no word of ethics keeps 'the Gospel from being heard as Gospel.'" Ibid., 214. Luther's ethics and Lutheran ethics were "born in faith" and "Faith-ethics does not remain idle." Ibid., 224. Faith bears fruit in love for neighbors who await the Christian's service, not only in the spiritual sphere but also in the temporal sphere. Christian freedom is inextricably connected with Christian servanthood in Luther's and Lutheran ethics, which, Marty contends, can be recapitulated as neighbor-oriented ethics of freedom. Ibid., 202.

87. Forell, *Faith Active in Love*, 162.

88. Ibid., 176.

89. Ibid., 182.

90. Ibid., 135–36.

91. For the young Luther's notions of faith and love, see Reinhard Schwarz, *Fides, spes und caritas beim jungen Luther, unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der mittelalterlichen Tradition* (Berlin:

a span of over ten years has necessitated postponing their close examination from this particular angle. Indeed, a good resource already exists, addressing Luther's concepts of faith and love in the Genesis lectures, which is Scott Hendrix's "The Reformer of Faith and Love: Luther's Lectures on Genesis."⁹² According to Hendrix, faith and love are constitutive of the Christian life,⁹³ and Christian love is always united to faith in Christ.⁹⁴ He concludes that, "[a]lthough it is not dominant as an explicit theme, the references to faith and love in the Genesis lectures show that the so-called older Luther is just as much a theologian of faith and love as the young reformer."⁹⁵

Walter de Gruyter, 1962). In this book, Schwarz investigates Luther's ideas of faith, hope, and love in his early career in three distinctive periods: the first period, between 1509 and 1510, when he delivered Peter Lombard's *Four Books of Sentences* (*Libri Quatuor Sententiarum*); the second period, between 1513 and 1515, when he offered his first Psalm lectures; the third period, between 1515 and 1518, when he lectured on Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Galatians, and Hebrews. According to Schwarz, one of the critical changes in Luther's thoughts on faith and love by the time he was engaged in glossing Paul's Epistle to the Romans was the abandonment of the Aristotelian-scholastic conception of virtue as a habitual quality ontologically inhering in one's soul. This change already had begun to appear in Luther's first Psalm lectures. *Ibid.*, 241–44. See also Arthur S. Wood, "Theology of Luther's Lectures on Romans, I," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 3, no. 1 (1950): 1–18.

As to Luther's teaching on faith and love in his 1519 Galatians lectures, see Rudolf Mau, "Liebe als gelebte Freiheit der Christen: Luthers Auslegung von G 5, 13–24 im Kommentar von 1519" *Lutherjahrbuch* 59 (1992): 11–37; Eric W. Gritsch, "Martin Luther's Commentary on Gal 5, 2–24, 1519 (WA 2, 574–597) and Sermon on Gal 4, 1–7, 1522 (WA 10 I 1, 325–378)," in *Freiheit als Liebe bei Martin Luther*, 105–11.

92. Scott Hendrix, "The Reformer of Faith and Love: Luther's Lectures on Genesis" ("Luther als Theologe des Glaubens und der Liebe," Helsinki, September 2000) This paper was delivered at a conference celebrating the retirement of Tuomo Mannermaa. In the following discussion, this hitherto unpublished document is quoted according to its numbered paragraphs.

For a summary of the arguments for authenticity and reliability, Hendrix refers to Ulrich Asendorf, *Lectura in Biblia: Luthers Genesisvorlesung (1535–1545)*, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 33–39. Hendrix also states (endnote, 33) that texts dealing with faith and love are not explicitly mentioned by Peter Meinhold in the section of his study that distinguishes the theological emphases of Luther from those of his editors. However, Hendrix continues to say that related themes dealt with in his paper—the kingdom of Christ and the Christian life as continual purgation and sanctification—are judged by Meinhold to belong to the authentic thought of Luther. For a further reference, see Peter Meinhold, *Die Genesisvorlesung Luthers und ihre Herausgeber* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936), 370–428, esp. 413–15

93. Hendrix, "The Reformer of Faith and Love," par. 6.

94. *Ibid.*, par. 45.

To inquire into Luther's treatment of faith and love in the Genesis lectures, Hendrix aptly pays attention to Genesis 15:6, where Luther discusses the justification of Abraham.⁹⁶ The figure of Abraham plays a central role, according to Hendrix, in Luther's elaboration of faith and love in the Genesis lectures. Abraham is extolled not only as the example of justifying faith but also as the model of faith and love in Christian life. The Genesis lectures contain a continual polemic against monasticism, while Abraham is portrayed as a true monk and a genuine saint who practices faith and love in the correct way.⁹⁷

Hendrix highlights that the "liberated Christian lives in what Luther calls the kingdom of promise"⁹⁸ that is wrought by union with Christ, declaring that the goal of Luther's theology (Luther's "Reformation agenda") is "to describe, recover and install this new reality in the society of his day."⁹⁹ This "focus on real change in the kingdom of Christ gives Luther's theology of faith and love a dynamic, historical quality which it would not otherwise have if it were understood only as *Tugendlehre* or as one locus in a system of doctrine."¹⁰⁰ For this reason, Hendrix argues that both faith and love belong not only to the heart of Luther's theology in analytical terms but also to the center of his agenda of reform in practical terms.¹⁰¹

This survey of recent Luther research on the subject of faith and love exhibits some changes, though as yet insufficient, of landmarks in Luther scholarship. Behind these changes, the contributions of the

95. *Ibid.*, par. 30. Hendrix acutely perceives that most of the main texts cited by the modern Finnish Luther scholars in support of their interpretation of Luther's doctrine of faith and love come from Luther's writings of 1525 and before. Considering this, Hendrix's treatment of Luther's doctrine of faith and love in the Genesis lectures certainly extends the scope of research on faith and love in Luther.

96. *Ibid.*, pars. 25–26. See *LW* 2:399; *WA* 42. 549. 21–23, *LW* 3:24; *WA* 42. 565. 32–34, *LW* 3:25; *WA* 42. 566. 35–40, *LW* 4:38; *WA* 43. 162. 28–31, *LW* 4:41; *WA* 43. 165. 8–14.

97. Hendrix, "The Reformer of Faith and Love," par. 27.

98. *Ibid.*, par. 32.

99. *Ibid.*, par. 41.

100. *Ibid.*

101. *Ibid.*, par. 31.

modern Finnish Luther scholars need to be acknowledged, though not all of their arguments are accepted. Luther's teaching on love or sanctification is beginning to be appreciated more appropriately in relation to his teaching on faith or justification. This growing cognizance of the significance of Luther's teaching on faith and love has led Luther scholars into divergent areas of research on the subject, as sketched above, producing research with various foci and results and thereby enriching and widening the scope of this subject.

My Research

This dissertation shares many of the concerns of previous research on Luther, but it also has distinctive features, which will be illustrated in the following.

1. While other research focuses primarily on the specific aspects of Luther's teachings on faith and love, this dissertation strives to achieve a macroscopic perspective by advancing faith and love as the overriding theological thematic pair in his major commentary on Galatians (1535). Although the main analysis is confined to the Galatians commentary, I labor to put into perspective the extent of these teachings in Luther's theology by drawing on other texts in the footnotes.

Among the existing studies on this subject, George Forell insightfully elucidates how faith and love uphold Luther's social ethics. However, in my understanding, Luther does not draw a clear division between Christian social ethics and Christian theology proper. Rather, Luther's teachings on faith and love seem to undergird the whole of his theology, not merely his social ethics or, more precisely, a reading of his theology through the projection of the modern category of social ethics. Forell himself seems to be aware of this aspect when, in his treatment of the methodological principle of Luther's social ethics, he contends that Luther's ethical

methodology corresponds to his theological methodology. Still, this argument might be more accurate if we say that our reading of Luther's ethical methodology corresponds to his theological methodology. This is because his ethical methodology is already integrated into his theological methodology, not because his ethical methodology is distinct from but fortuitously correlative to his theological methodology.

So my desideratum is that a reader would not approach Luther's teaching on faith and love with the prejudice that this topic is primarily pertinent to his social ethics and not to his theology as a whole. I would also suggest that, even while dealing with Luther's teaching on faith and love in individual texts, a reader apply a broad perspective in order to consider it in the context of his whole theology, not merely as isolated incidents.

2. This dissertation pays attention to certain personal, exegetical, ministerial, and polemical contexts that impelled Luther to develop and elaborate on his concept of love in relation to faith. Among many others, the following facets can be illustrated: his own spiritual disquietude (especially centering on the concept of the righteousness of God), his exegesis of the Pauline Epistles, his ministerial sense of accountability to God concerning his sheep's spiritual and material well-being, and his polemical disputes.¹⁰² My introduction already touched on some of these elements under "Method" and "Plan of the Dissertation."

Here the following observation is apposite: some conceptual and structural traits of Luther's teaching on faith and love in the 1535 Galatians commentary reflect the decisive impact Paul had upon him, starting with his lectures on Paul's Epistle to the Romans. The

102. Luther often mentions that his opponents helped him cogitate more intensively and deeply, enabling him to articulate and clarify his positions on various issues under fervent debate. See *LW* 54:273–74 (no. 3793, dated 25 March 1538); *WA*, *TR* 3:617–18.

Romans lectures (1515–1516) already show Luther applying his critical acumen to the church’s excessive legalism reflected in the sale of indulgences and his gradual appropriation of a prophetic role against the abuse of the penitential system by the Roman Church in Europe. In 1517, deeply sympathetic toward the incremental complaints of the poor in an era of escalating poverty, Luther made public his ninety-five theses, intending to provoke scholarly discussion on the ongoing and highly controversial indulgence sales. Going beyond mere appearances, Luther began to intuit what was fundamentally wrong in the whole nexus of underlying systems—theological, ecclesiastical, and practical. This 1517 event is one example that implies that the spirit of Luther’s teaching on faith and love cannot be fully appreciated without grasping the ethos of his ministerial service in doing theology.

3. While the categories of justification and sanctification are conventionally well established, this dissertation finds that a rigid application of these two categories without clear qualification is not very effective in accurately analyzing Luther’s theology. I have come to have the firm conviction that the categories of faith and love are much more suitable than those of justification and sanctification to discuss Luther’s thoughts on what are usually germane to justification and sanctification. Furthermore, Luther’s doctrine of faith is about receiving not only alien, passive, and perfect righteousness but also alien, passive, and perfect holiness. On the other hand, his doctrine of love is about increasing proper, active, and progressing righteousness and holiness. Luther unveils his teaching on faith and love, utilizing the two dimensions of righteousness and holiness (alien, passive, and perfect vis-à-vis proper, active, and progressing).

4. To give prominence to the two dimensions as an interpretive framework for Luther’s teaching on faith and love, this dissertation calls attention to Luther’s treatment of Paul’s topical shift from faith

to love in his Epistle to the Galatians. This will be set out at the beginning of chapter 2.

5. This dissertation argues that Luther's reconceptualization of faith and love entails an exploration of his thought about the law and exposes its functions revolving around faith and love. In the dimension of alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness, the law is handled in two ways. In the matter of justification of the unrighteous, the function of the law, insofar as it claims its jurisdiction over sinners, is completely nullified because of Christ. Nevertheless, Luther ascribes a theological or spiritual function to it, in which it stimulates sinners to faith in Christ as an asylum from the menacing and conscience-binding reign of the law. Luther, in fact, deems this as the primary function of the law, making it an indispensable component of his reconceptualization of faith in Christ.

Yet, if the theological or spiritual function of the law absorbs all the attention and outshines the function of the law that enters the picture in Luther's reconceptualization of love, then the picture of Luther's notion of the law is only partially puzzled out. In the dimension of proper, active, and progressing righteousness and holiness, the law is portrayed as having a different function. The spirit of the whole law contained in the Decalogue is redefined in light of the Christ-given law of love. Luther proclaims that those who consider themselves followers of Christ should not fail to keep the Christ-given law of love. Accordingly, the law or the Decalogue—or, more precisely, the Christ-given law of love—surfaces as divine instruction for justified Christians in the exercising and strengthening of their faith.

At the same time, Luther does not lose sight of the fluctuations of human effort in faithfully observing the law of love. He knows that even justified Christians, whom he calls saints, undergo spiritual temptations and afflictions owing to the residual sin clinging tenaciously to the flesh. In this account, Luther affirms that the

theological or spiritual function of the law in the dimension of alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness still has an impact in the dimension of proper, active, and progressing righteousness and holiness. However, the theological function of the law in the latter dimension needs to be carefully distinguished, in principle, from that in the former dimension. It is no longer for the unjustified sinners; it is for the justified Christians. It is no longer to inspire unjustified sinners to faith in Christ; it is to motivate justified Christians to stay in their faith in Christ, always and entirely, reflecting their imperfection in the unrelenting battle between flesh and spirit.

6. This dissertation also highlights that Luther's notion of the relationship of faith to love is strongly analogous to his understanding of the relationship of Christ's proper function to his accidental function. Here, what draws our special attention is Luther's tendency to stress Christ's divinity in relation to his proper function and Christ's humanity in relation to his accidental function. In this context, Luther puts faith in analogous correspondence to Christ's divinity and love to his humanity. As a matter of fact, this dual correlation can lead us to the hasty judgment that Luther's Christology and teaching on faith and love hint at docetism. Thus, in handling this analogous parallel between the relationship of Christ's proper function to his accidental function and that of faith to love, we need to guard against such a misjudgment.

Being aware of the potential for such a misunderstanding, I accentuate that Luther's emphasis on the divinity of Christ is never severed from the expression of that divinity in human flesh. On the other hand, his notion of Christ's humanity is always tied to divinity in an inseparable but distinguishable relation. I additionally underscore Luther's salient point that only a divine power can conquer the opposing power of Satan for the justification of sinners and bring about new creation in justified Christians. Only in that

context can we suitably appreciate the reason Luther envisages faith as analogically corresponding to the divinity of Christ.

Bearing these agendas in mind, I carefully differentiate my interpretation of this analogous parallel from Mannermaa's, which does not point to Luther's treatment of Christ's proper and accidental functions but narrowly focuses on Luther's remarks about Christ's divinity and humanity. First, I put into perspective Luther's view of Christ's proper and accidental functions, both of which are tied to the incarnate, eternal Son. Only then do I zero in on his use of an analogical parallel between faith and love on the one hand, and Christ's divinity and humanity on the other.

This christologically analogous parallel between the relations of Christ's divine and human natures and those of faith and love in a Christian can be further elaborated in the following way. Just as there is a union in Christ's divinity and humanity, so there is a unity of faith and love in a Christian, because Christ is the content of both faith and love. However, just as the union of Christ's divinity and humanity is not a mingling or confusion between them, so faith and love are not to be mingled or confused with each other. Christ's divinity and humanity are distinguished from each other. Faith and love, likewise, are characterized by their distinctiveness, but they are not separate from each other. Furthermore, just as Christ's divinity always takes priority over his humanity, so does faith over love. On this basis, in Luther's christologically analogous parallel between the relation of Christ's two natures and that of faith and love, the Chalcedonian formula defines the relation of faith and love by analogy. This christological analogy, however, is not to be decoded literally.

7. While many studies of Luther's concept of love feature his notion of neighbor-love, this dissertation undertakes to demonstrate that love, as the pure and tangible fruits of faith, in accordance with

Luther's redefinition, is practiced in three relations: to God, neighbor, and self. Luther portrays loving and honoring God as the supreme fruits of faith, the signs of which are evinced in concrete ways in the relations of justified Christians to their neighbors and themselves. Crucial to the trichotomous direction of love is the dynamic interrelatedness among them.

This dissertation also aims to underscore Christ not only as the source of Christian love but also as the example of how to bear fruits in this three-dimensional love. Luther's love is neither an erotic or romantic love nor a love that strives to climb up a ladder to God. Neither does it yearn for selfish happiness. Luther's love is about the whole of the Christian life that manifests through faith the presence of Christ, who sets free and empowers a Christian to bear fruits of faith in those three relations: to God, neighbor, and self.

8. To capture the essence of Luther's redefined relationship between faith and love, this dissertation elucidates a simile and metaphors, such as the illustrious horticultural metaphor of a tree bearing fruits, and the theologically reformulated metaphor of the relation of a craftsperson to her work, namely, the relation of doer to deed.

9. Finally, this dissertation endeavors to appropriate strengths found especially in Ebeling's model and the work of modern Finnish Luther scholars in their distinctive approaches to Luther's teaching on faith and love.

The strength of Ebeling's model lies in his definition of the relationship between faith and love as an "antithesis, tension between strongly opposed but related polarities."¹⁰³ Explicating the relationship between faith and love in terms of "the harsh opposition of opposing theses"¹⁰⁴ and the spirit of compromise that reconciles

103. Ebeling, *Luther—Einführung in sein Denken*, 16; ET *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, 25.

104. Ebeling, *Luther—Einführung in sein Denken*, v; ET *Luther: An Introduction to His Thought*, 11.

faith and love, Ebeling's model appropriately brings into relief the tension between faith and love. Thereby, the model does not lose its balance in either direction: between faith and love as two inevitably clashing, opposing theses and faith and love as two harmoniously interlocked theses. On this account, Ebeling's model does not slip into a denial of the existence or import of the teaching on love in Luther's theology, especially in conjunction with his teaching on justification by faith in Christ alone.¹⁰⁵

Notwithstanding this strength, one shortfall in Ebeling's model is that Luther's notion of the presence of Christ in faith or in a Christian through faith is not clearly delineated. On that account, even though Ebeling's model describes the relationship between faith and love both as two opposing theses and two compatible theses, it seems to place more weight on the former. From this perspective, the Finnish scholars' interpretation, which sheds light on Luther's thoughts on Christ present in faith and Christ present in a Christian by faith, is worthy of special note. Their interpretation, however, has its own drawback in that it does not sufficiently bring out the tension between faith and love. In addition, the arguments of the Finnish scholars with respect to *theosis* and participation could lead to misapprehension of Luther's intention.

By carefully comparing and contemplating both models, I endeavor to press home the dynamic relation between faith and love in conjunction with the functions of Christ and the law in the two dimensions. In the matter of an unrighteous sinner's becoming

105. Ebeling's model can be contrasted with Albrecht Ritschl's view that separates faith and love as two different centers in an ellipse. Ritschl declares that his theological aim is "to discover the conceptions originally held of the religious relation of Christians to God," which turn out to have two foci in an ellipse: spiritual and ethical. He placed the ethical dimension as an independent center alongside the spiritual center in his elliptical theological system: "Christianity in its genus is religion, in its species it is the perfect spiritual and moral religion." Ritschl, *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, ed. H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002; 1966), 80.

a righteous person in the dimension of alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness, faith unreservedly shuts out any cooperation from or contribution of love. Luther firmly rejects a love that claims its own collaborative role in the matter of justification. Christ, who is present in a Christian through faith, takes sole credit for the justification of sinners. In this context, the keen opposition between faith, which accepts Christ as the only savior for justification, and love, which insists on its synergistic cooperation for the justification of sinners, remains irreducible to any form of compromise. This is true even if love is already present in faith. Luther makes it quite clear that faith always contains love in its concept, but he never views love as causing justification in addition to faith, let alone on its own. Luther consistently declares that Christ is the sole cause and faith is the sole instrument in the matter of a sinner's justification.

However, in the dimension of proper, active, and progressing righteousness and holiness, while faith is still operating as the foundation of a Christian life, love blooms as a seed originally contained in faith, bearing fruits in every area of a Christian's life. In this dimension, the law or, more precisely, the Christ-given law of love is embraced as having a guiding function for justified Christians. Christ is related to Christians not only as the sole justifier but also as the very example to be imitated. Here, by virtue of Christ's presence in Christians as savior and as example, faith and love, which were in rigid opposition in the dimension of alien, passive, and perfect righteousness and holiness, are brought together in reconciliation and harmony in the dimension of proper, active, and progressing righteousness and holiness. Now I invite the reader to study the primary source with me in the following chapters to investigate these matters.