5-1-1968

Luther's Hermeneutical Approach and Principles as Determined by an Inductive Examination of his Lectures of Romans

Clifton Bruland

SHORT TITLE:

LUTHER'S HERMENEUTICAL METHODOLOGIES

Bruland/STM/1968

LUTHER'S HERMENEUTICAL APPROACH AND PRINCIPLES AS DETERMINED BY AN INDUCTIVE EXAMINATION OF HIS LECTURES ON ROMANS

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of New Testament in
partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

---

by

Clifton L. Bruland

May 1968

Approved by: Frederick W. Danker
Advisor

Paul M. Bretscher
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General

Karl Holl, recognized Luther scholar, makes this appraisal of Martin Luther and his lectures on Paul's Letter to the Romans:

> In the Letter to the Romans he stands already at his height. For next to the Commentary on Galatians of 1519 this interpretation is his most genius-laden, [and]--I know what I say--until today an unsurpassed achievement.[1]

These lectures, which Karl Holl extols, had been given by Luther in 1515-1516, and only in recent years came to public attention. It was the persistent searching of a professor of church history at the University of Strassburg, Johannes Ficker, that initiated some of the momentum that eventually brought the manuscripts before the public in 1899.[2] Professor Ficker had requested a friend and former student, Dr. Herman Vopel, who was visiting the Vatican Library, to

---

[1]Karl Holl, "Luthers Bedeutung für den Fortschrift der Auslegungskunst," Gessammelte Aussätze zur Kirchengeschichte. I. Luther (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932), p. 550. The translation is the thesis writer's. Im Romerbrief steht er bereits auf seiner Höhe. Denn neben dem Galater Kommentar von 1519 ist diese Auslegung wohl seine genialste; eine--ich weisz, was ich sage--bis heute noch nicht übertroffene Leistung.

[2]Martin Luther, Lectures on Romans, translated and edited by Wilhelm Pauck, The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1961) XV, xviii-xxiv. This dramatic story of Luther's manuscript is related by Professor Pauck in his introduction under the title, "The History of the Manuscript." Hereafter this work will be cited as Pauck.

make a search for Luther's writings.[3] The report came back to Professor Ficker that a copy of the original manuscript was there but not the original. This report spurred Ficker to search all the more for the original; yet in response to a letter that he sent to all libraries possibly holding the original he got only a negative reply.

In 1904, a significant publication intensified and made the search all the more important. This publication was Heinrich Denifle's Luther und Luthertum in der Ersten Entwicklung, Quellenmässig Dargestelt. Denifle, an extremely partisan Roman Catholic writer, in this anti-Luther polemic revealed to the public that a copied manuscript of Luther's Lectures on Romans was in the Vatican Library and that this manuscript provided for him important source material. The impact of Denifle's critical work was a real challenge to German Lutheran scholars. More so, it intensified the search of Johannes Ficker for the original Luther Manuscript.

His search came to an end in a showcase in the entrance hall of the Royal Library of Berlin. There was the autograph on display for its beautiful binding. In fact, it had been catalogued as early as 1688, but no one seemed aware of its great value. In 1905 the Berlin library notified Professor Nikolaus Müller, a professor of church history at Bretten, of the manuscript. But it was Professor Ficker who got the right to use the text, and with study of the Berlin autograph and the

---

[3]Pauck, p. xxiii. Pauck's introductory article states that Professor Ficker was a specialist in the history of handwriting and handwritten texts. Dr. Vopel was in Rome, searching for texts on Melanchthon when given the request by his former teacher.

Vatican copy he published a "quickie" version in 1908.[4] In 1938 a critical version was published as part of the Weimar Edition of Luther's Works, Volume 56.

Enchanting as the story is of the emergence of the lectures to public attention, the content of these lectures are of even greater interest because of their importance for an understanding of Luther as interpreter of sacred Scripture.

Purpose and Nature of the Study

The purpose of this study is not to trace the history of criticism of Luther's lectures on Romans, but rather to undertake an inductive, firsthand study of the material. The method to be used is the one advocated by Louis Agassiz, one of America's great naturalists and a renowned teacher of the last century. The task, according to Agassiz, is to "look, look, look" in order to observe "facts and their orderly arrangement" and then to manifest the realization that "'Facts are stupid things'. . .'until brought into connection with some general law.'"[5]

---

[4]Martin Luther, "Vorlesung über den Römerbrief 1915-1916," Anfänge Reformatorischer Bibelauslegung, Herausgegeben von Johannes Ficker (Leipzig: Dietrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. Theodore Weicher, 1908.)

[5]Lane Cooper, Louis Agassiz As A Teacher (Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Co., Inc., c.1945), pp. 60, 61. The quotations are from an essay written by Samuel H. Scudder that had initially been published in Every Saturday, XVI (April 4, 1874), 369-370. This essay, and others, are included in this short volume on Agassiz. The introductory paragraph of this work begins with this sentence: "When the question was put to Agassiz, 'What do you regard as your greatest work?' he replied: 'I have taught men to observe.'" (p. 1)

The purpose of this study, then, is to observe a Biblical Interpreter at work, and from his writing discover the salient methods with which he worked and those emphases which indicate his basic stance toward the Word.

Of a complementary nature, Chapter Two primarily furnishes background for examination of Luther's lectures on Romans. Since Luther displays such a wealth of convictions, understanding, and breadth of material, he will achieve greater validity when the lectures are seen in terms of his personal development. In the next chapter, therefore, we shall examine first of all Luther's education and intellectual abilities and secondly his penetrating religious and theological experience which preceded his interpretation of Romans.

In Chapter Three the lectures on Romans are examined with specific reference to hermeneutical procedure which in turn reveals the form and exegetical techniques with which Luther worked.

Chapter Four presents the findings which relate to principles of interpretation. Four constants show themselves in these lectures of Luther. Luther's doctrine of man predominates. His constant dialectic with the philosophers follows and points up the limitations and fallacies of Philosophy. Next, Luther sees the Word of God as a totally unique entity. Finally, germane to the whole is the role of the Holy Spirit.

Sources

The primary sources for the investigation of Luther's Hermeneutical ways are the lectures themselves, and these lectures are available in four different forms. The first is a photographic reproduction of the

original handwritten manuscript.[6] The second is the printed Latin edition, the scholarly production of Professor Johannes Ficker.[7] German translations constitute the third source,[8] and the fourth are two English translations. There is the English translation made from the Weimar Edition by Professor Wilhelm Pauck, professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.[9] The other is

---

[6]Martin Luther, Divi Pauli apostoli ad Romanos epistola. (Wittenburgii: Joan. Grunenbergil, 1515). Facsimile edition with the author's comments on the Book of Romans.

[7]Martin Luther, "Der Brief an die Römer," D. Martin Luthers Werke, edited by Johannes Ficker (Weimar: Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1938), LVI. Hereafter, this work will be cited as Ficker. This work represents the autograph of Luther's lectures. A student's copy of the lecture notes is also available: "Die Nachschriften zur Vorlesung über den Römerbrief," D. Martin Luthers Werke, Bearbeitet von J. Ficker. (Weimar: Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1939), LVII, pp. III-LXXXIV, 3-232.

[8]Martin Luther, "Vorlesung über den Römerbrief 1515/1516," Ausgewählte Werke, II, Die Übersetzung von Eduard Ellwein (Vierte Auflage; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957). Another significant and recent publication is a two volume work which includes on parallel pages both the Ficker and Ellwein works. Martin Luther, Vorlesung über den Römerbrief 1515/1516, Lateinishdeutsche Ausgabe (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftenliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960), II. Another work which includes Latin excerpts was used for college study: "Der Junge Luther," Luthers Werke in Auswahl. herausgegeben von Erich Vogelsang (Berlin: Walter de Gruhter & Co., 1955), V, 222-304.

[9]Martin Luther, Lectures on Romans, translated and edited by Wilhelm Pauck, The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1961) Vol. XV.

the translation made by J. T. Mueller of Concordia Seminary of Saint Louis, Missouri.[10]

The inductive examination was done with Pauck's translation, and the Weimar edition was used alongside the translation. However, it is to be noted that in most cases where there might be a question of clarity or of difficulty in translation, Professor Pauck gave the Latin in the text or footnote. Since many of the interlinear and marginal glosses were not translated, these glosses for the most part were examined in the Latin text of the Weimar Edition. Dr. Pauck states, however, that the relevant glosses have been included in his work. J. T. Mueller's work contributed some material from the glosses which were not translated by Pauck. Most notable are portions of the gloss on the sixteenth chapter of Romans.

---

[10] Martin Luther, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, translated by J. Theodore Mueller (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, c.1954). Dr. Mueller in his preface acknowledged that his work "is a digest rather than a complete, scholarly edition." Pauck in his preface writes of the Mueller "digest" as follows: "He translates most of the marginal glosses but omits the major part of the Scholia; moreover, he does not indicate what parts of Luther's work he chooses to include or exclude . . . and significant sections of his translation are not entirely true to the original." (Pauck, p. xv.)

CHAPTER II

PREPARATIONS FOR THE LECTURES

Some appreciation of the pedagogical and personal factors that helped to shape Luther as an interpreter is pertinent in order to understand the approach taken by him in his lectures on Romans and to evaluate more readily the theological and exegetical claims he makes.

Academic Training

In an article titled "The Analysis of Genius" in the magazine Wisdom, Martin Luther was one of three hundred men, active in more recent history, selected for analysis. The estimate given is that his "I.Q." level was in the area of one hundred seventy.[1] This endowment of native intelligence was well nourished with a thorough education for his day, and produced in Luther a good measure of self-confidence. He made value judgments shocking to many and totally unacceptable to others. The reformer could characterize the Occamist species of Scholasticism as pig-theologians (sautheologen).[2] He confidently asserted in his lectures:

---

[1] Bruce Bliven, "The Analysis of Genius," Wisdom, III, No. 25 (May 1958), 42.

[2] Martin Luther, Lectures on Romans, translated and edited by Wilhelm Pauck, The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1961) XV, 129. Hereafter this work will be cited as Pauck.

> Indeed, I believe that I owe this duty to the Lord of crying out against philosophy and turning men to Holy Scripture. For, perhaps, if someone else who had not been through it all were to do it, he would either be scared to do it or he would not be believed.
>
> But I have been in the grind of these studies for, lo, these many years and am worn out by it, and, on the basis of long experience, I have come to be persuaded that it is a vain study doomed to perdition.[3]

Nonetheless, what Luther readily claimed for himself found challenge in the writings of the Roman Catholic historian, Hartmann Grisar. Grisar writes:

> His lively imagination interpreted other doctrines of the epistles, which he confidently undertook to explain, despite the fact that his deficient training rendered him incompetent for the task.[4]

Grisar's evaluation prompts one to ask: Is Luther qualified to speak or is he not? Part of the answer must be sought in a study of Luther's life up to the time of his lectures on Romans.[5]

---

[3]Pauck, p. 236. An echo of this self-confidence of Luther is found in Robert H. Fife's The Revolt of Martin Luther (New York: Columbia University Press, c.1957). Professor Fife quotes from Luther's "Address to the Christian Nobility": "Dear Friend, I know well what I am talking about. I know Aristotle just as well as you and your sort do. I have read him and heard lectures on him with a better understanding than St. Thomas or Scotus did. I can say that of myself without boasting, and I can prove it if need be." (p. 59)

[4]Hartmann Grisar, S.J., Martin Luther, His Life and Work. Adapted from the 2nd German edition by Frank S. Eble, cited by Arthur Preus (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, c.1955), p. 72.

[5]Fife, pp. 1-244. Rudolf Thiel, Luther, translated by Gustave K. Wienke (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1955), p. xi. The idea and value of a chronology found in Thiel's book, pp. xx-xii. The details were gleaned from Fife.

The following chronological sketch is suggestive of Luther's qualifications.

Age	Year	Place	Accomplishment
	1483	Eisleben	born on November 10
5-13	1488	Manfield	began Primary school
14	1496	to Magdeburg	for study in the school of the Null bruden, the Brethren of the Common Life
15	1497	to Eisenach	for continued secondary schooling
18	1501	to Erfurt	at end of April for Bachelor's degree
19	1502	at Erfurt	to pursue course for Master's degree
22	1505	at Erfurt	on January 7 received Master's degree
	1505	at Erfurt	on July 17 entered Augustinian Monastary
			on December 19, 1506, ordained a sub deacon
			on February 27, 1507 ordained a deacon
23	1507	at Erfurt	on April 4 ordained a priest
24	1508	to Wittenberg	as Lecturer in Philosophy
25	1509	to Erfurt	in October; became Sententiarius. Lectured on "Sentences"
	1510	to Rome	departed Erfurt in November, 1510; returned April, 1511

Age	Year	Place	Accomplishment
28	1511	to Wittenberg	in fall; studied for lectures
29	1512	to Erfurt	on October 4 received degree of Doctor in Biblia
		at Wittenberg	became cloister preacher and then the town preacher; also sub prior, then vicar over ten Augustinian Cloisters
	1513-15	at Wittenberg	lectured on The Psalms
	1515-16	at Wittenberg	lectured on Romans

The long period of primary and secondary education and the year's work for the bachelor's degree equipped Luther with a substantial grasp of Latin grammar and rhetoric.[6] Logic was introduced during his first year at Erfurt,[7] and the three and a half years of master's study deepened his understanding of logic and encouraged the practice and function of disputation and the elements of proof and method. About one-half his study time was spent with moral philosophy of the Occamist school of the Via Moderna. At this point he was saturated with the works of Aristotle.[8]

On entering the monastery, and after the first year of his novitiate, Luther had Biblical and dogmatic courses, the latter based

---

[6] Fife, pp. 14-31.

[7] Fife, pp. 32-46. Fife states: "the university records show that Martin won his way at Erfurt with increasing success. He received his bachelor's degree and his master's . . . in the briefest time permitted by the statutes. In the list of bachelors he appeared as thirtieth among fifty-seven candidates; in that of the masters as second among seventeen." (p. 45) Cf. also Heinrich Böhmer, "Luther as a Scholar and Author," Luther in Light of Recent Research, translated by Carl F. Huth, Jr. (New York: The Christian Herald, 1916), pp. 176-204.

[8] Fife, pp. 47-65.

on Peter Lombard's Sentences. The Biblical Studies were in the traditional exegesis of the Glossa Ordinari of Strabo, the Glossa Interlinearis of Anselm of Laon, the Postilla of Lyra, and Annotationes of Paul of Burgos.[9]

Nor did Luther halt his exposure to matters academic after becoming a priest. In 1508 Luther changed roles from student to teacher when he was called to teach Moral Philosophy at Wittenberg. This course centered on Aristotle's Niomachean Ethics, and involved four full hours a week of lecturing, and the supervision three evenings a week, of student disputations.[10] In 1509 he was called to return to the University of Erfurt, where he passed within a short time the examinations for Sententiarius, and thus became qualified to teach dogmatics at Erfurt, using Peter Lombard's Sentences.

Subsequent to his return from Rome and in the year 1512 at the age of 29, he received his doctorate which was no small achievement even for his day.[11]

---

[9]Fife, pp. 66-127. "Melanchthon says that Martin almost knew Lombard's work by heart." pp. 113-114.

[10]Heinrich Boehmer, Road to Reformation, (Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1946), p. 52.

[11]Cf. Fife, where he reports: "Martin had by no means undergone the training usually required of one called to such a responsible office. His alma mater, Erfurt, set the minimum for the doctorate in theology at ten years of study in that subject, and cases occur in the records of candidates who studied eighteen years before promotion to the highest degree. In Heidelberg the master of arts had to study twelve years before he might advance to the final degree in theology; in Paris studies lasted a few years longer. Wittenberg, a younger university, had a more liberal policy in such matters and the faculty of theology was authorized to make concessions in the case of religious persons, with the reservation that it should promote no one 'disgracefully weak in letters and reflecting discredit on the standing of the

There is no question that Luther had the ability and the knowledge to meet the academic demands placed upon him. The way in which he quoted the Fathers, the classics, and medieval theologians gives ample evidence that he had applied himself diligently.[12]

Along with the material that he mastered in response to demands made upon him by his own teachers, Luther constantly read and enlarged his reading background. In the year following his formal schooling in the monastery he read the devotional works, Vitae Patrum, Cassian's Collations, and the Dialogues of Vigilius. He read the writings of the mystics, Bernard, Bonaventura, Zerbolt, Tauler, and the important Theologia Germanica. Augustine's writings were especially significant to Luther, and the discovery of Augustine's On the Spirit and the Letter rendered special service to Luther's study of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans.[13]

Capitalizing on the Renaissance contribution of renewed interest in and use of the original Biblical languages, Luther, in 1511, had

---

university.' Andreas Carlstadt, who came to Wittenberg in 1504, slipped into theology by the back door of philosophy and attained the doctorate after only five years of the divine sciences. He was now dean of the faculty. In form at least Martin had been a student and teacher of theology five and a half years when he took his doctorate. Contemporaries, as he recalled, were astonished at his youthfulness, twenty-eight years, when, 'compelled by Staupitz,' he received the coveted degree. 'At Erfurt,' he declares, 'only men of fifty years of age were promoted to be doctors of theology.'" (p. 180)

[12] Infra, pp. 44-52.

[13] Warren A. Quanbeck, "Luther's Early Exegesis," in Luther Today, The Martin Luther Lectures (Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, c.1957), I, 39. See Fife, for the full content and quality of Luther's educational background and early experiences, pp. 3-202.

begun the study of Greek. Earlier, in 1509, he began to work to some degree on his own with Hebrew, using John Reuchlin's Rudimenta.[14]

Concomitant with his training in the medieval university system and with the new linguistic tools offered by the Renaissance there was a constant exposure to the Scriptures. Endowed with a phenomenal memory, Luther was able through this constant exposure to store up a vast knowledge of the Scripture. Fife summarizes his acumen:

> The earliest statutes of the German Augustinians, dating from the thirteenth century, had expressly commanded that it should be "read eagerly, heard devoutly, and learned zealously," . . . . He plunged into the study of it with such zeal that he claimed afterwards that he was able to turn up the page and exact location of any verse from purely mechanical memory. The enthusiasm that drove him to read and reread the Bible in those days, aided by a memory highly trained through the discipline of an age still so poor in books, gave him later on the extraordinary command of the Bible text which flows constantly into his lectures, sermons, and other writings. His statement that he knew the Psalms by heart is scarcely an exaggeration.[15]

On become a "sworn doctor of the Holy Scriptures," Luther lectured in no other field but that of Biblical Exegesis.[16]

---

[14]Fife, pp. 150-152.

[15]Fife, p. 86. Cf. Rudolf Thiel, who in his Luther, states: "Daily he (Luther) experienced the divine effect of Holy Scriptures. It had taken possession of him, had become part of his soul. His speech rang with Biblical phrases. Quoting Scripture was so natural in his letters that following generations could not track them all down. Two times a year he read the whole Bible systematically and searched every one of its twigs for hidden fruit. 'Once I had so mastered the Bible that I knew the contents of each chapter by heart, but studying Hebrew has wrecked my memory'. . . ." (p. 86) Infra, see pp. 35-38 for the way Luther used the Scripture in his Lectures on Romans.

[16]Willem J. Kooiman, Luther and the Bible, translated by John Schmidt (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1961) p. 22. In later years Luther found encouragement in the recollection of his doctoral oath. The oath in part was this: "he swore 'never to preach strange doctrine, condemned by the church and offensive to pious ears; but

Religious Experience

Along with his marvelous native endowment and thorough academic preparation, a dynamic and dramatic religious experience reigned supreme and ultimately shaped and ruled the man who was to have great influence on the course of history as a Biblical Interpreter.

Luther himself speaks of his religious experience in his Preface to the Latin edition of his works (1545):

> For I hated that word "righteousness of God," which, according to the use and custom of all the teachers, I had been taught to understand philosophically regarding the formal or active righteousness, as they called it, with which God is righteous and punishes the unrighteous sinner.
>
> Though I lived as a monk without reproach, I felt that I was a sinner before God with an extremely disturbed conscience. I could not believe that he was placated by my satisfaction. I did not love, yes, I hated the righteous God who punishes sinners, and secretly, if not blasphemously, certainly murmuring greatly, I was angry with God, and said, "As if, indeed, it is not enough, that miserable sinners, eternally lost through original sin, are crushed by every kind of calamity by the law of the decalogue, without having God add pain to pain by the gospel and also by the gospel threatening us with his righteousness and wrath!" Thus I raged with a fierce and troubled conscience. Nevertheless, I beat importunately upon Paul at that place, most ardently desiring to know what St. Paul wanted.
>
> At last, by the mercy of God, meditating day and night, I gave heed to the context of the words, namely, "In it the righteousness of God is revealed, as it is written, 'He who through faith is righteous shall live.'" There I began to understand that the righteousness of God is

---

all my life long to study diligently and preach the Holy Scriptures, and maintain the Christian faith by disputation and writing against all heretics. So help me God.'" (Henry Worsley, The Life of Martin Luther [London: Bell and Daldy, c.1856], I, 62.)

> that by which the righteous lives by a gift of God, namely by faith. And this is the meaning: the righteousness of God is revealed by the gospel, namely, the passive righteousness with which merciful God justified us by faith, as it is written, "He who through faith is righteous shall live." Here I felt that I was altogether born again and had entered paradise itself through open gates. There a totally other face of the entire Scripture showed itself to me. Thereupon I ran through the Scriptures from memory. I also found in other terms an analogy, as, the work of God, that is, what God does in us, the power of God, with which he makes us strong, the wisdom of God, with which he makes us wise, the strength of God, the salvation of God, the glory of God.
>
> And I extolled my sweetest word with a love as great as the hatred with which I had before hated the word "righteousness of God." Thus that place in Paul was for me truly the gate to paradise. Later I read Augustine's The Spirit and the Letter, where contrary to hope I found that he, too, interpreted God's righteousness in a similar way, as the righteousness with which God clothes us when he justifies us.[17]

The prominent Luther scholar, W. J. Kooiman, comments that "Luther in contrast to tradition, exegetes in view of his own theological experience";[18] and Warren Quanbeck in a lecture titled "Experience Transforms Exegesis" stated:

> Luther's studies in the Bible and his spiritual development are so intimately connected that it is impossible to understand either apart from the other. It was by prolonged, earnest, and anguished study of Scripture that his eyes were opened to the meaning of the Gospel; and it was the discovery of the Gospel which transformed his approach to Scripture.

---

[17]Martin Luther, "Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings," translated by Lewis W. Spitz, Vol. XXXIV in Luther's Works. Edited by Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehman (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, c.1960), pp. 336-337. Cf. p. 326 for dating of this discovery. Lewis W. Spitz had edited another work in which the significance of Luther's religious experience is discussed. Cf. Lewis W. Spitz, editor, The Reformation, Material or Spiritual (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, c.1962).

[18]Kooiman, p. 57.

> Thus in order to understand Luther's principles of interpretation, it is necessary to set forth the inner development which was instrumental in forming them.[19]

Sin and Grace, which will prove to be the theme of the lectures, is the theme of Luther's life experience and the heart and center of the Reformation Movement.[20] Pauck sums it up this way:

> In the end he overcame both Scholasticism and Humanism because, in the last resort, he depended for the understanding of the Scripture upon the insights of his own deeply penetrating mind and upon the judgments of his conscience. Thus he was to inaugurate an entirely new phase in the history of exegesis in general and of Biblical exegesis in particular.[21]

Conclusion

The following appraisals capsule in brief the experience and personal equipment Luther brought to his task as interpreter.

1. Scientific investigation, as well as the judgment of history, has shown that Luther is a man of remarkable intellectual endowment. He would be known today as a highly "gifted" person.

---

[19] Quanbeck, p. 37. See also Lewis W. Spitz, Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, c.1963), pp. 240, 241. He writes: "Luther's struggle for religious certainty which became the determinative influence on his life had nothing fundamental to do with humanism. His new insight, when it came, was that of a prophet and not that of a scholar resolving a fine point in philology."

[20] Cf. Hermann Sasse, Here We Stand, Nature and Character of the Lutheran Faith, translated by Theodore G. Tappert (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, c.1938), p. 61. Dr. Sasse writes: "The Reformation was a renovation of the church brought about by the rediscovery and renewed proclamation of the pure doctrine of the Gospel of the forgiveness of sins." See also Werner Elert, The Structure of Lutheranism, translated by Walter A. Hansen (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1962), I, N.B. The Introduction and Part One, "The Impact of the Gospel."

[21] Pauck, p. xxiv.

2. Luther's gifted mind enjoyed the stimulus of a thorough education, especially in philosophy and certain areas of Scholastic Theology. The cultivation of his analytical and critical skills accompanied development in rhetorical proficiency.
3. The thorough grasp of certain material was aided by teaching experience. Certain philosophical and scholastic subjects that Luther had studied at the University and in the monastery he later taught as a young monk. The teaching experiences deepened his grasp of the material and enhanced the critical evaluations he made in the lectures on Romans and throughout his career.
4. As a student and teacher he was the beneficiary of the fresh interest in the original languages stimulated by the Renaissance. Luther was alert enough to use these linguistic tools even though he had to do so, at least at first, as a self-taught scholar.
5. Scholarly judgment shows that Luther had applied himself with success to an enviable mastery of the content of the Scripture.
6. Finally, Luther brought to his task a profound and history producing religious experience.

CHAPTER III

THE AWAKENED SCHOLAR AND NEW METHODS

The foregoing exposition has been necessary to demonstrate that the young professor of thirty-two brought to his task eminent qualifications. Examination of his lectures bears this out.

It has served to indicate that a goodly portion of time was spent in monastery training, in study for university lectures on philosophy and theology, and preparation for and the giving of lectures on the Psalms. The lectures on Paul's letter to the Romans, 1515-1516, indicate that Luther had been conditioned throughout these preparatory years to the methodology of his day. He lectured by using the traditional format, the Gloss and the Scholion. He disciplined his interpretation, as well as presentation, by the Quadriga, a fourfold method used to bring out textual meaning and application. A rich reading background, imbedded in his mind, was ready for quick recall. His early university training in composition and dialectic had made him aware of structure and logic. However, the new offerings from Renaissance scholars aided him greatly in exegeting the Biblical text and in arriving at fresh and more accurate interpretations. The new tools of Greek and Hebrew grammars and lexicons, the Greek text of Erasmus, and the new translations of others opened up an entirely new world for Luther and effected a considerable change in methodology for the Wittenberg reformer.

With this as background, we may go on to examine the lectures with a view to discover the forms and exegetical skills with which he worked.

The Format of the Lectures

The lectures of Luther on Paul's letter to the Romans were given in three semesters, and the church historian Ficker concludes that about ninety hours of class time were involved.[1] The lectures began in the summer semester of 1515, specifically at Easter time. They continued during the winter semester of 1515 to 1516, and the summer semester of 1516. The latter semester ended in September, 1516. The first semester covered Romans 3:5 to 8:39, and the third covered Romans 9:1 to 16:27. The classes met twice a week, on Mondays and Fridays, for a one hour period of class each day. The summer lectures were at 6:00 A. M., and the winter at 7:00 P. M.

The specific format of presentation was disciplined by the continued use of the traditional Interlinear Gloss, the Marginal Gloss, and the Scholion. But Luther's creative approach to teaching showed itself early in his career. In his earlier lectures on the Psalms, the reformer arranged for the printer who produced the printed text for classroom use to have a two-fifths inch space between each line. This wider space allowed room for the interlinear notations. A wider margin than the usual one was also adopted by Luther for classroom use so that there would be more room for the marginal comments. The more ample

---

[1]Martin Luther, Lectures on Romans, translated and edited by Wilhelm Pauck. The Library of Christian Classics, Vol. XV (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1961). Hereafter this work will be cited as Pauck. These and related details are found in the General Introduction under, "The History of the Manuscript," pp. xviii-xxiv, and "Luther's Exegesis of the Letter to the Romans in the Light of the Hermeneutical work of his Ancient and Medieval Predecessors," pp. xxiv-xxxiv. Cf. also Martin Luther, "Der Brief an die Römer," D. Martin Luther's Werke, edited by Johannes Ficker (Weimar: Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1938), LVI, pp. xxvi-xxx. Professor Ficker deals with this in "Die Äuszeren Daten der Vorlesung."

blank space on the printed page which Luther initiated with the Psalms he now used with Romans.[2]

The Interlinear and Marginal Glosses exactly fit their nomenclature.[3] They are written between the lines and all over the margin, and sometimes every margin. The Glosses seem to represent a paraphrase or synonymous language. Parallel passages are often cited. Sometimes there is a brief exegesis or comment on grammar. Not infrequently what is found in the interlinear gloss is found also in the marginal notations, and what is found in one or both of the Glosses is found on a larger scale in the Scholia. The last is a more detailed, more explicit echo of the two Glosses. However, there is no slavish consistency in Luther's use of glosses or scholia.[4]

A long and authoritative tradition usually allowed for the rote dictating and copying of traditional and ecclesiastically approved notations. Such procedure was normative pedagogical practice. However, manifesting intellectual integrity and independence, Luther in his lectures on Romans was singularly on his own in all his notations, and what he had written in the glosses of his own printed copy of Romans he

---

[2]Pauck, pp. xix, xx. See Appendix A for illustration.

[3]See Appendix B for illustration.

[4]Luther had used this format in his lectures on the Psalms in 1513 to 1515. WA 3 and 4: Romans WA 56 and 57; Galatians, 1516 to 1517, WA 57, and Hebrews, 1517 to 1518, WA 57. The Psalms of 1519 to 1520 represent a change of form. Cf. WA 5. The procedure of Gloss and Scholia resulted in a considerable redundancy, and perhaps this is one of the reasons why Luther, in 1519, stopped using the device. An additional device used constantly by Luther throughout the lectures is the Corollary, which Pauck defines: Corollarium (garland), an appendix stating a conclusion implied in a foregoing exposition (p. 15). See Appendix C for an illustration.

dictated word for word for his classes to copy. From his own handwritten Scholia he was selective in that which he gave to his classes, omitting for the most part controversial material.[5]

The Textual Concern of Luther

It must be recognized that in the lectures on Romans one will not find Luther searching, as do modern exegetes, for a reliable text. It is apparent, however, that Luther growingly senses the inadequacies of what he calls "our translation," the Vulgate. Earlier lectures on the Psalms and the preparation for the lectures on Psalms made the Vulgate Old Testament quite a suspect item with Luther. His studies in the New Testament added to Luther's discontent, and set in force a gravitational pull towards the Greek text and the primary source.[6]

---

[5]See Pauck, pp. xxiv-xxxiv, "II Luther's exegesis of the Letter to the Romans in the light of the hermeneutical work of his ancient and medieval predecessors."

Pauck also comments: "It is astonishing to see how much of the material of his own notebook he left out in his classroom teaching. Passages in which he discloses his own deepest thoughts or in which he attacks either the Scholastics or the secular and ecclesiastical powers for their failure to live up to the gospel are not directly reflected in the students' notes." (p. lxii)

Pauck further observes with respect to Luther's lectures: "This evidence of the direction of Luther's thought and of the power of his mind is all the more impressive because he wrote the documents that contain it for his own personal use and not for publication. He that reads them now encounters Luther as he got ready to teach an academic course on Paul's letter to the Romans. To be sure, he himself seems to have attributed considerable significance to this work of his, for his own manuscript (which has come down to us) is written with great care. The major part of it appears to be the final clean copy which Luther himself prepared from notes that he had put on loose slips of paper (called by him schedae or schedulae). It was this carefully prepared manuscript which he used in the classroom." (p. xviii)

[6]Cf. M. Reu, Luther's German Bible (Columbus, Ohio: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1934), p. 117.

Primary and secondary texts

Pauck surmises that when Luther began his lectures on Romans in 1515, he used a text of the "Vulgate according to the Basel Edition of 1509, printed by Froben."[7] A Greek text, also printed by Froben of Basel, finally came into Luther's possession in 1516 during the last semester of his lectures on Romans. The title, Novum instrumentum omne, diligenter ab Erasmo Roterdamo recognitum et emendatum.--una cum annotationibus, hints at the fresh critical directions taken by Erasmus in this edition.[8]

Two secondary sources were used by Luther throughout his lectures. The one was the work of Faber Stapulensis, "Epistolae Pauli Apostoli, Paris 1512; 2nd Ed. Paris 1515."[9] A second was the work of Laurentius Valla, a mid-fifteenth century expositor, which Erasmus edited, "Adnotationes in latinam Novi Testamenti interpretationem, edidit Erasmus, Paris 1505."[10] These were independent Latin translations of the Greek, and displayed the frequent discrepancies that existed

---

[7]Pauck, p. xix, xx.

[8]M. Reu, p. 120. Concerning the Erasmus text, M. Reu writes: "Besides the Greek text it contained an independent Latin translation, that differed on many points from the Vulgate, and short annotations in which the deviations from the accustomed phraseology were justified, certain difficult passages were explained, and on occasion apostolic conditions and admonitions were compared with the existing situations, with the result that the arrogance and ignorance of the theologians and monks were exposed." (p. 120)

[9]Reu, p. 344.

[10]Reu, p. 344.

between the Vulgate and the Greek.[11]

In addition to the Greek text and translations made directly from the Greek, Luther also used the Hebrew text and translations made directly from the Hebrew in connection with Old Testament passages which Paul cites in Romans 4.[12] The secondary works on the Old Testament included two publications by Faber Stapulensis: Dictata super Psalterium and Quincuplex Psalterium Gallicum, Romanum, Hebraicum, vetus conciliatum, Paris, 1509[13]; and two by John Reuchlin: Vocabularius breviloquus (Strassburg, 1504)[14] and Joannis Reuchlin Phorcensis il. doctoris in septem psalmos poenitentialis hebraicos interpretatio de verbo ad verbum et super eisdem commentarioli sui, ad discendum linguam hebraicam ex rudimentis. Tubingae apud Thomam Anshelmum Badensem M. D. XII.[15] The last of these works included the Hebrew text of the seven penitential Psalms as well as "a literal Latin translation, and a grammatical explanation."[16]

---

[11]Cf. Reu, p. 120, where he indicates that Faber's work facilitates his own translation by printing it parallel to the Vulgate. Annotations based on the Greek were added. Further, it is recognized that no judgment has been made concerning the original Greek text used by several translators.

[12]Infra., p. 35 and p. 48.

[13]Pauck, p. xxx, also p. 425; M. Reu, p. 115. Infra, p. 48

[14]Pauck, p. 426.

[15]M. Reu, p. 340.

[16]Reu, p. 115.

The Vulgate and difficulties with the Vulgate translation

The Latin, Greek, and Hebrew sources cited, both primary and secondary, stimulated and finally convinced Luther that the Vulgate was not always an accurate translation.[17] Moreover, he showed a growing appreciation for the way the original languages helped one to understand the Scriptures better. He makes frequent comparisons of the Greek, and even the Hebrew, text with the Latin, the Vulgate. The latter he identifies as "our translation," and he often notes words in the Latin that are not in the Greek or the Hebrew.

At Romans 4:17, Paul quotes the Old Testament according to the Vulgate this way: "I have made you a father of many nations before God." Luther in the Scholia counters: "This 'before God' is not to be found in the Hebrew Bible," and he adds, "but it can be elicited from the text."[18]

To Paul's statement in Romans 4:18, "so shall thy seed be," the Vulgate added, "as the stars in the heaven and the sands in the sea." Luther retorts, "It is not in the Greek, because it is neither in the Hebrew or the Biblical text. It is hardly near this place."[19]

---

[17]The Septuagint is within the cognizance of Luther, and is cited, e.g., Ficker, pp. 34:20-25; 139:10-12; Ficker, p. 228:5-8 (Pauck, p. 78); Ficker, p. 411:12-18 (Pauck, p. 283); Ficker, p. 412:26-28 (Pauck, p. 285); Ficker, pp. 521:28-522:1 (Pauck, p. 413).

[18]Ficker, p. 294:7-9. Pauck, p. 148. According to Ficker, Luther is dependent upon Faber, and from Romans 9, Faber and Erasmus.

[19]Ficker, p. 47:5-6 non est in Greco, quia nec in Hebreo nec in texto Bible, saltem luxta hunc locum.

Twice when Paul speaks of "adoption" (Romans 8:15 and 23), the Vulgate adds "of the sons of God." Luther observes that it does not belong to the original text.[20]

Not infrequently he comments in the following ways: "The Greek text is much better";[21] "Here the Greek is most helpful";[22] "It is the same word in the Greek";[23] "Better yet, as in the Greek";[24] "The Greek version . . . is more appropriate";[25] and "The translator displays a strange inconstancy."[26]

In his discussion of Psalm 32 which Paul uses in Romans 4:6, Luther indicates real disgust. As he contrasts the Hebrew and the Vulgate, Luther writes:

> So there is an irksome confusion of terms in the psalm. . . . our text reads wrongly . . . the translator wrongly uses the plural. . . . so he uses here the wrong singular. . . . Here the translator should have said . . . .

---

[20] Ficker, p. 78:11, filiorum dei: non est in Greco; 81:15, filiorum dei non est de textu. Cf. also Ficker, 41:14-15; 42:5; 43:21; 81:7; 87:8-9; 105:8; 109:15; 122:5; 134:7-8.

[21] Ficker, 59:13.

[22] Ficker, 167:6 (Pauck, p. 13).

[23] Ficker, 106:8. The Vulgate in 8:26 uses Spiritus postulat pros nobis and in 11:2 uses quemadmodum interpellet. Luther wants postulat used in both places as in the Greek, e.g., 8:26 Τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει and in 11:2 ἐντυγχάνει.

[24] Ficker, 444:2 (Pauck, p. 323).

[25] Ficker, 498:29-499:3 (Pauck, p. 386).

[26] Ficker, 435:10-11 (Pauck, p. 313). Cf. also 174:14 (p. 20); 361:6 (p. 224); 379:18 (p. 245); 395:10 (p. 266); 400:14 (p. 271-272). Supra, p. 35. The context of this statement (p. 313) is given. The Greek in Romans 11:20 reads: μὴ ὑψηλὰ φρόνει. The Vulgate reads: Noli altum sapere.

> In the Hebrew text, these distinctions are consistently maintained, but in our translation every word stands for everything, and so there is plain confusion.[27]

Luther in other places expresses a like concern for appropriate and accurate use of grammar in translation. In one instance a more appropriate translation, for Luther, chooses the neuter accusative rather than the ablative in order to reflect the Greek case ending.[28] Also, Luther, through Faber's help, discerns that the Greek text uses a singular, and the Vulgate the plural in Romans 8:28 where Paul speaks of the Spirit working together for good.[29]

The illustrations so far in regard to the Vulgate show Luther's concern for appropriate and accurate translations, a concern that implies a sober respect for the original text. However, he wants more. Like a true interpreter, he wants translations to reflect well the author's meaning, and for that reason he scores Jerome on the art and responsibility of translating:

> The text shows that the translator has exercised the function not only of a translator, but at the same time also that of an expositor. The translator cannot commit a greater fault than to transmit to others a meaning which does not lie in the text he has to translate but

---

[27]Ficker, 285:1-26 (Pauck, p. 139, 140). Cf. also for grammatical differences: Ficker, 6:23-25; 83:6,16: 90:15; 120:12; 121:23; 141:15; 397:7 (p. 268).

[28]Ficker, 90:15 Milius 'in semen' quam 'in semine'. εἰσ σπέρμα (Romans 9:8). This is one of three places that Luther uses Greek script. The other two are: Ficker 95:14, ὑπερ (Romans 9:27) and Ficker, 152:16, Ideo Grece prepositio εἰσ significat motum ad locum, ideo hic 'ad bonum' et 'ad Malum dicendum fuit.' (Romans 16:19)

[29]Ficker, 83:7 and 16. The latter reads: Grecus habet 'Cooperatur' singulariter et melius, Quia refertur ad spiritum. The Vulgate reads 'cooperantur.' Cf. also 90:15; 120:12; 121:23; 141:15; 397:7 (p. 268).

> in his own. We must therefore disagree with Blessed Jerome, who says in his book about Daniel that he could not translate what he had not first understood. This is nothing else than to want to understand and know everything and, to be sure, insofar as this suits his own modesty, Jerome may have spoken the truth.[30]

At those places in translating where ambiguity is faced with respect to the specific meaning of a term or to its particular point of reference, Luther calls for a translation reasoned out on the basis of a total context rather than just a rigidly literal translation that might not make sense. He writes: "we think it is better to translate according to meaning rather than literally . . . ."[31]

In a final illustration Luther indicates that Jerome in his rendering of Romans 15:20 had excised "I am ambitious" out of Paul's statement, "I am ambitious to preach." It reads in the Vulgate: "And I have so preached the gospel." For Luther this was manifestly a subjective translation, and he cogently remarks: "The translator seems to have feared that what the apostle actually said would sound offensive."[32]

---

[30]Pauck, pp. 184, 185 (Ficker, p. 59:12). Pauck includes the following in his footnotes on p. 185: "Cf. Jerome, contra Rufin., II, 32: 'I know how difficult it is to understand the prophets, and that no one can have a ready judgment about how they must be translated unless he has first understood what he has read.' This passage (at the end of Jerome's prologue to Isaiah, just preceding the prologue to Daniel) is quoted by Lyra in his comments on Jerome's De Daniele."

[31]Pauck, p. 15 (Ficker, p. 169:8-10). Cf. also pp. 412, 413 (Ficker, pp. 521:23-522:6).

[32]Pauck, pp. 416, 417 (Ficker, p. 524:12). Luther gives a transliteration of the Greek term which Jerome failed to translate, "philotimoumenos," and a definition, "i.e., desirous of glory and honor."

Variations in versions

With regard to Jerome and his translation, Luther expresses critical concern. However, in two places Luther, faced with variations in Biblical versions, drawn some perceptive conclusions which are in accord with his view of the art and responsibility of translating. Luther had noted that the Old Testament, the Septuagint, and Paul's quotation of the Old Testament varied, but he perceived that each was in harmony of thought with that of the original author:

> Futhermore, we must examine how the translations agree with one another. Blessed Jerome says: "who stands as an ensign of the peoples"; the Septuagint reads: "who shall arise in order that he be a prince of the nations." Paul says: who shall rise up to rule the Gentiles. But he that stands is certainly risen, and he that is an ensign for the peoples certainly directs the peoples. For he is an ensign in order that the nations should be led thereto. Herein the nature of Christ's Kingship is expressed, for it is the exercise of royal authority in faith, in a symbol, in what is not apparent, and not in tangible reality. But the princes of this world rule their peoples tangibly, namely, by their physical presence and by physical means. Moreover, the phrases "they shall beseech him" and "in him they shall hope" can easily be reconciled with each other. For he that beseeches is one who hopes.[33]

The second example is more subtle and faces the possibility of discrepancy between the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and the Septuagint text which Paul uses in Romans 9:33. Where Isaiah 28:16 reads, "and he that believes, let him not hasten," the quotation in Romans 9:33 reads, "and he that believes in him shall not be confounded." Luther, as he comments about this, reveals again his aim for translation, namely, get at the mind of the original author and

---

[33]Pauck, p. 412 (Ficker, p. 521:14-22). The passages of concern are Isaiah 11:10,12 and Romans 15:2.

express that. Further, an implicit observation belongs. Luther manifestly trusts the integrity of his texts. He writes:

> The Greek equivalent of the word "confundetur" ("he shall be confounded") does not have this specifically Latin and proper meaning, suggesting, as was stated above, the sense of "confusion" or "being disturbed," etc., but "confundetur" is taken to mean "he will be ashamed" or "he will blush with shame." In this case, the haste we have spoken of and this blushing with shame are brought into accord with one another in this way: one who is ashamed dreads to show himself; he wants to flee and to go into hiding. As the saying goes: "Fall upon us, mountains (Hos. 10:8; Luke 23:30). Thus his confusion causes him to hasten, i.e., to flee in fright. But one who believes in Christ does not do anything of this kind; he is not confounded and he does not blush with shame, because Christ has made him secure.
>
> Either translation has, then, the same meaning, but the Septuagint expresses the cause and the Hebrew version the effect, as it is frequently the case also elsewhere. For upon being confounded and upon being put to shame, there follows hurried flight, because one dreads to be seen.[34]

Multiple Techniques for Interpretation

Luther, aware of and working with the various versions and translations of Scripture, indicates his concern for a responsible text and translation. Likewise, he advocates a basic guideline which is to reflect accurately the original author's intent.

As to the techniques that Luther used for his own interpretation, they were varied and became a part of him through his years of schooling, self-study and earlier teaching experiences with the Psalms, theology and philosophy. The first method to be considered is the Quadriga, the traditional fourfold method of interpretation which Luther used throughout his lectures. The second, and made up of a number of parts, are

---

[34]Pauck, pp. 284, 285 (Ficker, p. 412:18-28).

those exegetical tools which approximate modern exegesis and which in large part came to Luther as a result of the Renaissance.

On the words "separated unto the Gospel of God" (Romans 1:1), Luther comments:

> And it is the holy will of God that, in terms of the allegorical interpretation, you set yourselves apart from evil men and, in terms of moral interpretation, from sins.[35]

At Romans 3:4 under "God forbid" Luther enters into a discussion of faith, interpreting faith not as the faithfulness of God but rather "believing God." Then follows:

> For precisely what according to the literal sense is regarded as the objective truth of faith must be understood according to the moral sense as faith in this truth.[36]

The tropological, or moral rule, stands alone in a number of instances and at times appears to have in the original text an introductory symbol: Reg (ula), Mo (ralis), or Regula. A sample of this appears in Luther's discussion of Romans 2:7, "By patience in well doing":

> Let us therefore observe the following rule: When, in doing the good, we do not suffer persecution, hatred, and evil or adversity, we must fear that our work does not yet please God. For then it has not yet been tested by patience, nor has God approved it because He has not yet tested it. For He approves only what He has first tested.[37]

---

[35] Pauck, p. 11 (Ficker, p. 165:3-5).

[36] Pauck, p. 75 (Ficker, p. 224:24-25).

[37] Pauck, p. 42, 43 (Ficker, p. 194:2-7). Igitur Canonice et regulariter hoc teneamus. Reg(ula): Quamdiu bonus facimus. For other examples cf. Pauck, p. 22 (Ficker, p. 175:20-27); Pauck, p. 33 (Ficker, p. 185:9-14); Pauck, p. 78 (Ficker, p. 228:16-22); Pauck, p. 311 (Ficker, p. 434:5-7).

The Quadriga, the fourfold method

> The letter lets you know what happened,
> an allegory what you must believe;
> the moral sense what you must do,
> and anagogue what you may hope for.[38]

This simple mnemonic statement that Luther on occasion quoted describes the nature of the Quadriga, the fourfold method. As a child of his times Luther used this traditional method which had been practiced by the church for centuries.[39] Although the method is not often used, and never in all its four parts, one or several of the parts are used throughout the lectures.

Of the explicit references made to the Quadriga, only a few are quoted in order to show Luther's use of this method. In the commentary on Romans 1:1, in reference to the statement, "Paul, as servant of God," Luther writes:

> To put it briefly: according to the moral and tropological sense, everyone is a servant of God by and for himself, but according to the allegorical sense, a certain someone is a servant of God for others and over others and for the sake of others . . . .[40]

More frequently Luther employs allegory throughout the lecture

---

[38]Pauck, p. xxviii, cf. Lewis W. Spitz, Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, c.1963), p. 254.

[39]Cf. Reu, pp. 124-133, "Luther repudiates the theory of the manifold sense of Holy Scripture." Reu relates that the beginning of Luther's disenchantment with the Quadriga took place during the lectures on the Psalms, 1513-1515.

[40]Pauck, p. 8 (Ficker, p. 162:17-21).

and varies from being very explicit to very subtle.[41]

Two observations will be helpful with respect to Luther's use of the Quadriga. Even at this early stage of his career the fourfold method is made subservient to the text and to contextual meaning.[42] In view of the fanciful and subjective meanings often read into a text by previous users of this method, this spelled hermeneutical progress. Secondly, Luther felt himself obligated as an interpreter to make a personal application of the text. Therefore he retains on numerous occasions the tropological, or moral, application.[43]

---

[41] Pauck, p. 44 (Ficker, p. 195:10); Pauck, p. 56 (Ficker, p. 206: 11-19); Pauck, pp. 179-180 (Ficker, pp. 322:24-343:4); Pauck, p. 280 (Ficker, pp. 408:28-409:3). This last reference also contains a moral, or tropological interpretation. Ficker, p. 139:14 (Pauck, p. 412, n. 20).

[42] See Reu for development of this. Supra, p. 30, n. 36. Cf. also, Willem Jan Kooiman, "Influence of Medieval Hermeneutics," in Luther and the Bible. Translated by John Schmidt (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1961), pp. 30-42, esp. 34-42.

[43] Cf. Gordon Rupp, The Righteousness of God (London: Hoddard and Stoughton, c.1953). In his discussion of Luther's writings on the Psalms of 1513-1515 Rupp comments in a way that holds true also for Luther's lectures on Romans. Rupp states: "The fourfold method was not rigidly applied, for in fact there were many variations, many schemes of mediaeval exegesis. But it was of undoubted service to Luther in dealing with the Psalms, and at this stage of his development. We must be thankful that he soon abandoned it, but we have reason to be glad that he began by using it. For, of the four tools, two came to be of catastrophic importance. The christological groundwork involved constant preoccupation in study and interpretation, with the person and the work of Christ, that meditation on the 'Wounds of Jesus' which had been the wholesome direction pointed out by Staupitz to his anguished pupil. Second, an emphasis which does not appear at the beginning of the lectures, a growing awareness of the importance of the tropological reference, which relates the divine action in Christ to the work of God in the soul." (pp. 134-135)

Exegetical approaches

The Quadriga represents a long used and traditional form of Biblical exposition; and as Luther more and more broke away from the use of it, other approaches took its place. Luther was not only a child of tradition, he was also a child of his Renaissance times with a growing appreciation for and facility with languages. As a budding philologist he did become restless for an accurate translation of text and meaning. He also became a zealous student of "Word Studies," and many other techniques used in modern exegetical studies such as a concern for the larger context of the total canonical writings and the more immediate structural and grammatical relationships.

Word studies

Word studies for Luther show themselves to be of two types. Frequently and easily he gives what is similar to a dictionary definition of a word. Often he also attacks a word in a composite or conceptual manner which indicates the use of languages, be it Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and at times German. This composite treatment includes the use of contextual reasoning, theological appraisal, parallel or contrasting passages, and the contribution of other writers. As this composite presentation is made, there is a real fulness of thought that goes into the opening up of the meaning of a word or expression.

In his comment on Romans 1:29, "Being filled with unrighteousness," Luther offers definitions to a considerable number of terms:

> We can therefore make the following simple definition: iniquity consists in this, that you fail to live up to what you are bound to do, and do instead what seems

> right to you, while uprightness, by contrast, consists in this, that you do what you ought to do, regardless of what seems right to you.[44]

With the familiar verse of Romans 3:23, "For all have sinned and do need the glory of God," Luther gives this definition of "need:"

> "need" must be understood as referring to persons in the sense that they are empty or in lack of something . . . .[45]

The next is the famed definition and discovery of Luther with respect to "the righteousness of God:"

> "the righteousness of God" is that righteousness by which he makes us righteous, just as the wisdom of God is that by which he makes us wise.[46]

With logical coherence and insistence on correct definition, Luther examines the Vulgate's choice in Romans 1:4 of the word "predestined" (predestinatus) and writes:

> in view of the fact that the Greek text reads "oristhentos," i.e., "designated," in the sense of "designation" and "determination." So also in the schools, orismos means the "designation," "delineation," and "determination" of something that is declared manifested, and indicated as something to be held and believed. For a "designation" is an indication that "denotes" something. So then, this passage must be understood as follows: In the gospel, Christ is by the Holy Spirit declared and manifested to be the Son of God in power over all things. Before the resurrection this was not revealed and manifested but was, rather, hidden in the flesh of Christ.[47]

---

[44] Pauck, p. 35 (Ficker, p. 186:30-32). Here Luther also defines malice, goodness, benignity, and malignity, wickedness, dissolute whisperer and detractor (Pauck, pp. 35-36; Ficker, pp. 187:3-188:15).

[45] Pauck, p. 115 (Ficker, p. 261:11-12).

[46] Pauck, p. 117 (Ficker, p. 262:21-23).

[47] Pauck, p. 14 (Ficker, p. 168:21-28).

In the discourse on Psalm 32 in the setting of Romans 4, Luther writes:

> let us consider the three terms . . . "pesha," meaning "crimes"; "heinous deeds" or "actual sins," "crooked actions," "transgressions"; "hata," meaning "tinder of sin," "root-sin," "concupiscence," "sickness of human nature"; "awah," meaning "unrighteousness" or "lack of righteousness" or that one is not righteous before God even though he does many good and righteous deeds . . . . The fourth term is the Hebrew word "rasha," meaning "ungodliness." This is the vice of pride which becomes apparent when one denies God's truth and righteousness, practices self-righteousness and dogmatically asserts one's own wisdom. It makes people godless, heretical, schismatic, eccentric, and individualistic or particularistic . . . .[48]

Luther's interpretation of Romans 11:20, "Be not high-minded," provides an example of the conceptual or composite, yet brief and rather comprehensive word study. He objects to the Vulgate's use of "sapere" for the Greek equivalent, "phronein." Then he says:

> Now this word means something else than what is commonly called "wisdom" (Sapientia, in Greek, sophia) and "prudence" (prudentia), which in Greek is called euboulia or prometheia. Its correct significance is "to be mindful of something with a certain self-complacency"; hence, it means in Greek sometimes "to be minded," sometimes "to glory in," and sometimes "to exalt." It has reference to an inward disposition rather than to the intellect. It is commonly applied to persons "who think themselves to be something they are not" (Gal. 2:6; 6:3). Hence, phronesis means a complacency of this sort; phronema, the sense and actualization of this phronesis; and phronimos means one who feels complacent. Hence, if one wants to translate "sapere" in a uniform way, it would be better to use the translation of "to feel" (sentire) and this would have to be understood as describing an attitude of mind. We have the common expression "to do as one likes" or in German: gutdünken. This is commonly said of the proud.

---

[48] Pauck, p. 138 (Ficker, pp. 283:13-284:8). It is interesting to note that within his presentations Luther works with these four terms in three other settings. Cf. Pauck, pp. 131-132 (Ficker, p. 277:9-20); Pauck, pp. 139-140 (Ficker, pp. 285:20-286:10); Pauck, pp. 143-144 (Ficker, p. 290:1-14).

> But sometimes it is taken in a good sense, as when we say: "This is how I feel, this is what I have a mind to do." But this does not fully express the forcefulness of the Greek word, as is shown in the passage before us: "Do not be wise in your own conceit," i.e., do not be self-complacent in your thinking, do not feel yourselves superior.[49]

The following, and final, example shows how the examination of the Greek opened up the meanings of words for Luther. It again illustrates his frequent irritation with the Vulgate:

> And where, in our translation, we have "loving" (diligentes), we read in the Greek text ("philostorgoi"; philos-amor). Now storge means "affection" or "sympathy" as we say in common speech. Philostorgos, therefore, is one who is tenderly affectioned toward someone else whom he is to love with philadelphia. The apostle speaks, then, with great emphasis, by quasi superfluously putting together these two words that mean love, saying "philadelphia estote philostorgoi," i.e., "in brotherly love be tenderly affectioned one to another."[50]

The Interpretation of Scripture by Scripture

Along with showing interest in the single, smallest unit of thought, the term, Luther is concerned for context, and not just the context surrounding a term in a sentence or in a paragraph, a paragraph within a chapter, or even a chapter within a book, but a term, or any unit of thought, within the context of the whole of the Scripture, Scriptura sui ipsius interpres. Scripture does interpret Scripture,

---

[49]Pauck, p. 313 (Ficker, pp. 435:16-436:5). Supra, p. 25, n. 26.

[50]Pauck, pp. 343, 344 (Ficker, p. 462:5-10). A similar study is found on Pauck, pp. 416-419 with philotimoumenos (Ficker, pp. 524:1-528:5). A notable but somewhat lengthy example of the composite, conceptual word study of "power" (Rom. 9:17) used Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German terms along with seven Scriptural passages, all built around the historical experience of Israel with Pharaoh in Egypt. Cf. Pauck, pp. 273-275 (Ficker, pp. 401:29-404:19).

and Luther continually demonstrates this. In a full analysis of these lectures by Luther, Jacob W. Heikkinnen submits these findings and conclusion:

> That Luther knew his Bible very well at this time, and that he employed the principle of analogia Scripturae is revealed by the fact that in the Romans lectures he makes 1,293 references to various books of the Bible, with citations from 40 books of the Old Testament and from 23 in the New Testament. The most frequently used book is Psalms, with 249 references. The other most frequently quoted books are: Isaiah 85, Genesis 43, Jeremiah 35, Exodus 23, Job 18, the Gospel of Matthew 103, I Corinthians 91, Galatians 41, II Corinthians 31, and I Peter 25. "Luther must have virtually lived his Scriptures" (Barth).[51]

A specific section of the lectures, the Scholia under Romans 4:7, was examined. This particular Scholia involved a lengthy dialetic with the Scholastics. As the verse quotes Psalm 32:1, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven," Luther gives the Psalm considerable attention. From this Psalm Luther draws some of his terminology for sin,[52] with specific definitions in three different places in this part

---

[51]Jacob W. Heikkinnen, "Luther's Lectures on the Romans (1515-1516)," Interpretation, vii (April 1953), p. 194, n. 4. This work is one of a series of twelve essays on "The Bible Interpreter at Work." Kooiman in his Luther and the Bible says this: "Ficker has been able to locate no fewer than sixteen hundred citations from other books of the Bible . . . . That these quotations are mostly given from memory is apparent from the fact that Luther frequently refers to a wrong chapter. His memory for figures was not dependable, but his mind was permeated with Biblical material. The quotations themselves are usually a literal rendition of the Vulgate. This translation was so firmly imbedded in his mind that even later when his own translation of the Bible had become the common possession of all Germany, he himself usually quoted from the Vulgate and continued to use that form of the Psalms in his private devotions." (p. 59).

[52]Supra, p. 34.

of his lectures.[53] Luther also uses Psalm 51. He leans heavily on Romans 7, and throughout this part of his lectures uses a variety of other verses from twenty-seven Biblical Books.[54] In one place in which he discusses men as sinners, he states: "Let us now gather up the words of Scripture in which it is asserted that all men are sinners." He then submits twelve passages, broad in their range, each of which develops the thought that "all men are sinners:" Genesis 8:21, Exodus 34:7, I Kings 8:46, II Chronicles 6:36, Ecclesiastes 7:20, Job 7:20, Psalms 32:6, Isaiah 64:6, Jeremiah 30:11, from Paul, I Timothy 1:15, James 3:2, I John 1:8, and Revelation 22:11.[55]

Luther had discerned that the Scripture interprets "quite differently from the way the philosophers and jurists do," and for this reason his own exegetical approach was altogether Scripturally centered and derived. A good case in point which shows the extent of his dependence on the Scripture can be determined from instances in which Luther berates the Scholastics as "fools" and "pig-theologians." Two passages, Romans 4:5, and 8:13, clinch the argument as far as Luther is concerned:

---

[53]Pauck, pp. 131-132 (Ficker, p. 277:2); Pauck, p. 138 (Ficker, p. 284:3); Pauck, pp. 143-144 (Ficker, p. 290).

[54]Genesis 4:4, 8:21; Exodus 20:17; 34:7; Deuteronomy 6:5; Ruth 3:7, 9; I Kings 8:6, 21, 46; II Chronicles 6:36; Job 1:8, 7:20, 9:2, 15, 28, 27:6; Psalms 2:11, 36:1, 2, 38:18, 45:1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 68:35, 72:14, 80:13, 121:2, 130:8, 143:2; Proverbs 1:29, Song of Solomon 1:4; Ecclesiastes 7:20; Isaiah 41:23, 64:6; Jeremiah 30:11; Ezekiel 16:8; Hosea 10:3, 13:9; Ecclesiasticus 39:7; Matthew 6:12; Luke 10:27; Romans 3:10, 4:15, 8:32; I Corinthians 1:30, 2:7, 5:17; Philippians 3:13; Colossians 3:3; I Timothy 1:15; James 3:2; II Peter 3:13; I John 1:8, 5:18; Revelation 22:11.

[55]Pauck, pp. 141-142 (Ficker, pp. 287:25-288:32).

> For if we can fulfill the law by our own powers, as they say, grace is not necessary for the fulfillment of the law but only for the fulfillment of a divinely imposed exaction that goes beyond the law. Who can tolerate such sacrilegious opinions! Does not the apostle say that "the law works wrath" (Rom. 4:15) and "that it was weak through the flesh" (Rom. 8:3) and that it can absolutely not be fulfilled without grace?[56]

Structural relationships

The lectures which deal with all of Paul's letters to the Romans demonstrate also Luther's grasp of structural relationships. At the very outset, after a one sentence introduction to the theme of Paul's letter, Luther states:

> And he does this until chapter 12, yet from this point to the end, he teaches the quantity and the quality of the good works we ought to do, on the ground of Christ's own Righteousness received (ex ipsa Iustitia Christi accepta)."[57]

In his comment on Romans 1:24, he writes:

> It seems that the first part of the second chapter of this letter turns against these same people, as if they had set themselves up as judges over the others despite the fact that they had committed crimes similar to theirs, though, to be sure, not all of them.[58]

On Romans 3:21, Luther writes: "In this sense it is said farther on in the letter in Ch. 9:6";[59] or "This is why the apostle says farther on in Ch. 15:8f. of this letter . . . ."[60] and in connection with 3:4,

---

[56] Pauck, p. 129 (Ficker, pp. 274:15-275:2).

[57] Rupp, p. 161. Rupp offers this translation which Pauck does not include. (Ficker, p. 3:11-13).

[58] Pauck, p. 32 (Ficker, p. 184:17-18).

[59] Pauck, p. 62 (Ficker, p. 210:33-34).

[60] Pauck, p. 62 (Ficker, p. 211:9-10).

"The answer to this is given farther on in chapters 9 and 11 of the letter. Here he touches the matter only briefly in order not to get too far afield from his topic."[61]

In a corollary statement Luther asserts that the "sins" mentioned in Romans 4:7 Paul later "defines in Chapter 7."[62]

At times, however, in these earlier chapters, it is true that Luther concentrates on passages in isolation from context. Yet the whole epistle is never really absent from his mind as the references given in the preceding paragraph indicate. Furthermore, the whole of the Scripture is alive for Luther as is evident from the ubiquitous quotation of Scripture. Very likely the use of the Scholia fosters this isolation from context, for the Scholia were often arbitrarily imposed on the thought expressed in a given verse, or phrase, or term.[63] Beginning with chapter 12, however, a larger awareness of the

---

[61]Pauck, p. 63 (Ficker, p. 212:6-8).

[62]Pauck, p. 126 (Ficker, p. 271:3).

[63]Cf. Willem Jan Kooiman, Luther and the Bible, translated by John Schmidt (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1961). Kooiman describes this very well: "Ahtough he still clings to the tradition in distinguishing between the philological and theological exposition in the glosses and scholia, he is beginning to strike out on his own path in this regard. Instead of a dry, impersonal summing up of the conventional commentaries, one finds here an original and living confrontation with the text. It is noticeable that now, much more than was the case with the Psalms, the scholia vary greatly in length. Theologically significant passages receive extended treatment. Chapter 3:1-5 is discussed twice. In Ficker's edition chapter four receives twenty-eight pages of comment and of these twenty are devoted to verse 7. This is clear evidence that Luther, in contrast to tradition, exegetes in view of his own theological experience." (p. 57). Kooiman also observes: "It appears that in the last years . . . he left the classical method of glosses and scholia far behind. In contrast to such niggling studies, he now placed deliberate emphasis upon the need to understand each biblical book as a whole, to seize it in a single grasp." (p. 194).

overall structure becomes more consistently apparent. In his commentary on Romans 12:1, Luther writes: "From here to the end of the letter his (Paul's) chief concern is, therefore, the uprooting of man's own prudence and self-will."[64]

In the marginal gloss, Luther writes:

> In the preceding chapters, the apostle laid "the true foundation which is Christ" (I Cor. 3:11), or "the first rock," upon which the wise man builds (Matt. 7:24), and he destroyed the false foundation, namely, man's self-righteousness and merits, which are as "the sand" upon which the foolish man builds (Matt. 7:26). Here now he proceeds to "build upon this foundation gold, silver, and precious stones," (I. Cor. 3:12). Good works, which are the building, must above all have a sure and dependable foundation on which the heart can purpose to stand and to rely forever . . . .[65]

Then Luther adds:

> So far as the apostle has spoken about what it means to become a new man, and he has described the new birth which bestows the new being . . . . But now he speaks about the works of the new birth . . . .[66]

On Romans 12:6, Luther writes:

> So far the apostle has shown how we must behave toward God, namely, by the renewing of our mind and the sanctification of our body so that we may prove what is the will of God. But from here on to the end of the letter, he teaches us how we must behave toward our neighbor and he explains the commandment of the love of the neighbor in great detail.[67]

In the marginal gloss to chapter 13, the Reformer writes:

> In the preceding chapter, he taught that one must not disturb the order of the church; in this chapter, he teaches that also the secular order must be maintained.

---

[64] Pauck, pp. 320-321 (Ficker, p. 440:20-21).

[65] Ficker, pp. 116:21-117:8 (Pauck, p. 320, n. 1).

[66] Pauck, p. 321, n. 1, continued from p. 320 (Ficker, p. 117:25-29).

[67] Pauck, p. 333 (Ficker, pp. 451:31-452:2).

> For both are of God: it is the purpose of the former to give guidance and peace to the inner man and what concerns him, and it is the purpose of the latter to give guidance to the outer man in his concerns. For, in this life, the inner man cannot be without the outer one.[68]

Luther's awareness of contextual relations appears vividly in his interpretation of the single verse, Romans 13:13. The Scholion for the latter part of the verse, "Not in contention and emulation," reads:

> In the foregoing the apostle instructs man with respect to himself: he should be temperate, watchful, and chaste. But here he instructs him with respect to his neighbor: they should live with one another in peace, amity, and love.[69]

The marginal gloss at the beginning of chapter 4 begins: "In this chapter the apostle commands two things . . . ."[70] Luther then relates these two points.

These examples indicate that Luther understood to some degree Paul's structural development of his theological thought in Romans, and these suggest Luther's realization of the importance of the "bird's-eye-view" in approaching a document.

Use of logic

Luther's academic training displays itself also in his use of logic. At one time, he can speak of "particulars";[71] another time, of

---

[68] Pauck, p. 353 (Ficker, p. 124:9-14).

[69] Pauck, p. 375 (Ficker, p. 490:6-8).

[70] Pauck, p. 378 (Ficker, p. 129:8).

[71] Pauck, p. 51 (Ficker, p. 202:21).

the "practical syllogism" with its "major" and its "minor";[72] of "form"[73] or "intrinsically" and "extrinsically";[74] or a "sequitur"[75] or a proposition . . . proved";[76] or "a causal sense" and a "consecutive sense."[77] Luther also recognizes that "the apostle's manner of argument is contrary to the metaphysical or moral method of reasoning."[78] He also applies the concept of "communio idiomatum" ("communion of proper qualities") to the two natures of man wherein "the parts communicate their individual qualities to the whole."[79]

Luther qualifies with a "terminus ad quem" and a "terminus a quo."[80] He speaks of arguing from "the lesser to the larger,"[81] of juxtaposition[82] and of "general terms" and "particular cases."[83]

---

[72]Pauck, p. 24 (Ficker, p. 177:14-15).

[73]Pauck, p. 102 (Ficker, p. 249:9).

[74]Pauck, pp. 124, 125 (Ficker, p. 268:27-28).

[75]Pauck, p. 146 (Ficker, p. 293:24). The English translation almost hides this particular use of logic. The Latin vividly points it up with "Si ergo . . . sequitur . . . ."

[76]Pauck, p. 48 (Ficker, p. 293:24).

[77]Pauck, p. 175 (Ficker, p. 319:8).

[78]Pauck, p. 193 (Ficker, p. 334:14-15).

[79]Pauck, pp. 204, 205 (Ficker, pp. 343:18, 344:16-17).

[80]Pauck, p. 281 (Ficker, p. 409:24).

[81]Pauck, p. 305 (Ficker, p. 428:29).

[82]Pauck, p. 357 (Ficker, p. 475:20-29).

[83]Pauck, p. 367 (Ficker, p. 483:16-17).

In his polemics with the scholastics Luther uses logic as a weapon, for he challenges their "invalid arguments," their "conclusion," and "that which is subsumed under it."[84] He negates their "contingent" argument with an argument based on "necessity."[85]

Possibly Luther's flexibility and genius show their greatest strength and deserve widest appreciation at those points where he describes the structure of human or Christian experience. In the face of relating justification to sanctification, and in trying to describe the duality of man's nature, Luther is not given to oversimplification, nor does he duck the phenomenon of paradox. Consistently he shows awareness of, and the ability to delineate sharply, the "complex" of human and Christian existence. For this reason Luther speaks of "two such opposite entities."[86] He speaks of something that is "simultaneously minimized and magnified, simultaneously filled

---

[84] Pauck, p. 222 (Ficker, p. 359:18-19).

[85] Pauck, p. 248 (Ficker, p. 381:28-29).

[86] Pauck, p. 214 (Ficker, p. 352:7-8). "In the light of this we can see that the metaphysical theologians deal with a silly and crazy fiction when they dispute about the question whether there can be opposite appetites in one and the same subject, and when they invent the notion that the spirit, i.e., reason, is something absolute or separate by itself and in its own kind an integral whole and that, similarly, opposite to it also sensuality, or the flesh, constitutes equally an integral whole. These stupid imaginations cause them to lose sight of the fact that the flesh is a basic weakness or wound of the whole man which grace has only begun to heal in his reason or spirit. For who can imagine that there are two such opposite entities in a sick person?--inasmuch as it is the same body that looks for health and yet is forced to conform to weakness: it is the same body that does both of these things. (Against Julian, Book 3, Chapter 20: 'Concupiscence is an evil to such an extent that it must be overcome in actual combat, until, like a wound in the body, it will be healed by a perfect cure.')"

and emptied."[87] He comments: "This contrariety astounds the philosophers, and men do not understand it."[88] Luther lives with and accepts this "contrariety" and constantly delineates it. A classic illustration is the well-known statement: "Sin remains and simultaneously does not remain in us."[89]

Luther's grasp of complexities and his rejection of oversimplification may be further demonstrated by the manner in which he faces a difficult phrase. His comments on "the wisdom of the flesh" in Romans 8:16 are a fair sample of his method. With the help of eight categories he structures the manner in which the "prudence of the flesh" projects itself.[90] These categories are in turn broken down. Then he says:

> All this, God has given to us men, clothing us, as it were in a garment of many folds. And the "prudence of the flesh" clings to all these gifts. To be sure, not all men range over all of them, nor are all equally interested in the same one of them, but one is more, and

---

[87]Pauck, p. 282 (Ficker, p. 410:15-16). "And who has seen . . . a becoming perfect that is at the same time a being diminished, something that is simultaneously minimized and magnified, simultaneously filled and emptied. Yet here it happened: What is wonderfully clothed and covered is yet almost entirely naked and bare. What God has promised is fulfilled and yet at the same time cut off from nearly everything. But where it is fulfilled, it is overflowingly consummated in righteousness."

[88]Pauck, p. 327 (Ficker, p. 447:19-20).

[89]Pauck, p. 125 (Ficker, p. 270:10-11). The key to the paradoxical expression is "simul" and it is often used in the commentary, e.g. Pauck, p. 7 (Ficker, p. 161:21-22); Pauck, p. 125 (Ficker, p. 270:13); Pauck, p. 136 (Ficker, p. 282:9-10); Pauck, p. 141 (Ficker, p. 287:4); Pauck, p. 213 (Ficker, p. 350:27).

[90]Infra, p. 104.

> another less, versed in one and the same; and one in several of them, and the other in only a few. Man, I say, turns all of them to himself, seeks his own good in them, and horribly makes an idol out of them.[91]

Truly the context is varied in which these logical categories are found. For example, Luther does not hesitate to use logic in his dialectic with the logicians.[92] He uses logical categories to communicate his thoughts to his students.[93] At times with the help of the discipline of logic, he subjects to scrutiny the thinking of the apostle Paul.[94]

Opinion of others

Frequent reference to other commentators and their viewpoints are to be found in Luther's comment on the text of Romans.

---

[91] Pauck, p. 226 (Ficker, p. 362:12-17). Another good illustration that parallels this same group of complexity and avoidance of oversimplification is found on Pauck, pp.31-32 (Ficker, p. 184:4-15).

[92] Supra, pp. 42-43.

[93] For example, "'a working or an action is proof that there is a form'" (Pauck, p. 102: Ficker, p. 249:8-9), "'in an absolute and general sense'" (Pauck, p. 122: Ficker, p. 267:9-11), "invalid argument" and "The conclusion . . . that which is subsumed under it" (Pauck, p. 222: Ficker, p. 359:12-21), "opposites . . . next to each other" (Pauck, p. 357: Ficker, p. 475:20-29), and "general terms . . . particular cases" (Pauck, p. 367: Ficker, p. 483:15-18).

[94] For example, "interpretation will prove tenable if one grants . . . reference to particulars . . . ." (Pauck, pp. 51-52: Ficker, p. 202:20-33). "The apostle meets this objection," (Pauck, p. 74: Ficker, p. 224:2-12), "a king of reiteration that leads up to a climax" (Pauck, p. 93: Ficker, p. 241:9-14), "understood conjunctively as well as separately," (Pauck, pp. 146-148: Ficker, pp. 292:28-294:5), "not in a casual but in a consecutive sense," (Pauck, p. 175: Ficker, p. 319: 7-12), and "he argues from the lesser to the larger," (Pauck, p. 305: Ficker, p. 428:28-29).

Classification

About one hundred primary sources appear in his class notes. The sources fall into five classifications: the Early Church Fathers, the mystics, the scholastic philosophers, exegetical theologians, and the classics.

The Early Church Fathers are spoken of with respect by Luther:

> Many have the gift of teaching, though they do not possess great learning. Others have both, and they are the best teachers, as, for example, Saints Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome.[95]

Other Early Church Fathers used by Luther are Montanus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Hilary, Dionysius, and the writer of Vitae Patrum.[96]

Of the writings of men often identified as Christian mystics, Luther displays a preference for those of Bernard of Clarivaux, Hugo the Victor, John Gerson, John Tauler, Gerard Zerbolt (or Gerard Groote), and the author of Theologia Deutsch.[97] Their writings are chiefly devotional.

---

[95] Pauck, p. 336 (Ficker, p. 454:25-26).

[96] See Pauck's index on "Proper Names," pp. 431-433, and his "List of Ancient and Medieval Works Quoted by Luther or Referred to in the Explanatory Notes," pp. 423-426. (Cf. Ficker, "Quellen und Nachschlagewerke," pp. xxxiii-xxxvii, and his "Literarisches Register: Von Luther genannte Schriften und Namen. Die Finklammerung bedeutet allegemeine, indireckte oder fehlende Bezeichnung," pp. L-LX). Luther refers to Vitae Patrum (twice), Montanus (once), Gregory the Great (five times. In one locus Luther quotes him, but credits Hugh of St. Victor. In another the quotation cannot be located.), Ambrose (eleven times. Two are in the Glosses. Four are direct quotations.), Chrysostom (five times, three of which are quoted by Augustine and one is a reference to him by Augustine which is used by Luther), Hilary (three times, one of which is a direct quotation), and Jerome (fifteen times: ten refer to his writings; three to the Vulgate; one to correspondence; and one as to his abilities as a teacher).

[97] See Indexes (Cf. Supra, n. 96). Infra, pp. 80-97 for the way Luther referred to them.

The third group consists of the Scholastics and Nominalists who represent a synthesis of exegesis, theology, and philosophy. Among their number are Pierre d'Ailly, Thomas Acquinas, Gabriel Biel, William Ockham, Duns Scotus, and Jacobus Trutvetter, and Peter Lombard.[98] Their master, Aristotle, also appears as one of Luther's authorities.[99]

The fourth classification includes exegete-theologians who had little or no philosophical content in their material, but who were primarily Biblical expositors, such as Paul of Burgos, Stapulenis Faber, Nicholas de Lyra, Laurentius Vala, Erasmus and John Reuchlin.[100] Lyra at times introduced some scholastic thinking, but the accent is more exegetical than philosophical.[101] Within this classification also belongs the Glossa ordinaria described by Wilhelm Pauck:

> In the Bibles published by John Froben of Basil in six-folio volumes (in 1498 and in 1509) the interlinear gloss of Anselm was printed on top of the text of the Vulgate. The Glossa ordinaria was placed on the left margin of the page, and the Postil of Nicholas of Lyra

---

[98] Infra, pp. 80-97.

[99] Infra, pp. 80-81. Cf. also p. 63, n. 7.

[100] Supra, p. 23 for the bibliography Luther used in preparing for the lectures. Cf., also, Supra, pp. 10-13 for Luther's earlier studies from their writings. Luther referred to Paul of Burgos (four times), Reuchlin (fifteen times), Erasmus (twenty-four times), and Faber (in the Glosses he is identified by name four times, and by "alii" twice; but there are over two hundred textual references that Ficker notes. In the Scholia there are thirty-six references). See Indexes, Supra, p. 47, n. 96.

[101] Lyra is identified by name three times in the Glosses. In the Scholia there are 48 references attributed to him directly or indirectly, cf., Infra, pp. 50 and 54.

> on the right margin. On the lower margin of the page, there appeared the corrections added to Lyra's Postil by Paul of Burgos and by Mathias Doring. This publication was a veritable mine of information. We know that the young professor M. Luther used it thoroughly.[102]

A fifth classification includes such sources as: Aesop's Fables, Greek myths, Virgil's Aeneid and Bubolic, Pliny's Natural History, Velerius Maximus, Persius, Horace, Terence, Cicero, Ovid, Juvenal, Seutonius, Catullus, and Seneca.[103]

Luther's constructive critique

The broad sweep taken in by Luther suggests that he had been a diligent student. As a teacher, however, he frequently stood opposed to something he had read. His main opposition was toward the Scholastics. In that this opposition is so vital to Luther's principles of interpretation, it will be discussed in the following chapter in detail. At this point three other classifications will be considered.

First, in the Scholia from Romans 1:17 an illustration will be given as to how Luther opposes and then reconstructs. Secondly, from Romans 1:3-4 and Romans 3:4 two samplings of language and comment will be presented. These samplings account for Luther's frequent

---

[102] Pauck, p. xxix, n. 17.

[103] See Indexes, Supra, p. 47, n. 96. In the lectures there are twenty-seven quotations of or references to the classics from fourteen different sources. The references are: Aesop's Fables (once), Catullus (once), Cicero (three times, but one reference is suspect), Horace (three times), Juvenal (once), Ovid (twice), Platus (once), Pliny (four times with one quotation used twice), Teutonis, Lives of the Caesars (once), Seneca (twice but one reference is questionable), Terence, the "comic poet" (three times), Virgil (twice), and Valerius Maximus (once).

dissent. Moreover, they indicate methods which Luther used to reinforce his contrariness. Thirdly, Luther receives constructive help from a variety of sources which are of a supplementary or supportive nature. The chief of these is Augustine.

Luther's critique of commentary on Romans 1:17

In his approach to Romans 1:17 and the problem of the phrase "from faith to faith," Luther cites the positions of Lyra, the Glossa ordinaria, Augustine, and Paul of Burgos. To several interpretations he gives a rebuttal and then works in his own views concerning the phrase.

Lyra concludes that it means "from unformed faith to formed faith." Luther responds in part:

> At any rate, I do not think that it is possible for anyone to believe by unformed faith--all that one can accomplish by it is to get an insight of what one must believe and thus to remain in suspense.[104]

The Glossa ordinaria speaks of the passage in the following manner: "from the faith of the fathers of the old law to the faith of the new law."[105] A portion of Luther's reaction reads:

> The fathers had the same faith as we; there is only one faith, though it may have been less clear to them, just as today the scholars have the same faith as the laymen, only more clearly.[106]

Augustine's comment is this: "from the faith of those who confess it by word of mouth to the faith of those who prove it by their obedience."

---

[104] Pauck, pp. 18, 19 (Ficker, pp. 172:21-173:2).

[105] Pauck, p. 19 (Ficker, p. 173:2-3).

[106] Pauck, p. 19 (Ficker, p. 173:6-7).

Burgos, as Luther says, "offers this interpretation: 'from the faith of the synagogue' (as the starting point) 'to the faith of the church' (as the finishing point.)" To these two, Augustine and Burgos, Luther responds:

> But the apostle says that righteousness comes from faith; yet the heathen did not have a faith from which, in order to be justified, they could have been led to another one.[107]

Luther's interpretation, which takes into account also 2 Cor. 3:18, Psalm 84:7, Rev. 22:11, and Philippians 3:12, reads as follows:

> the righteousness of God is entirely from faith, yet growth does not make it more real but only gives it greater clarity . . . so that no one should think that he has already apprehended and thus ceases to grow, i.e., begins to backslide.[108]

Luther's critique of commentary on Romans 1:3-4

> Romans 1:3-4 in the Vulgate reads:
>
> Concerning his Son who was made to him of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was predestined the Son of God in power according to the spirit of sanctification by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.[109]

And, in connection with these verses Luther writes:

> As far as I know, this passage has not been adequately and correctly interpreted by anyone. The ancients were blocked by an inadequate interpretation of it, and the moderns because they lacked the Spirit. Nevertheless, making use of the work of others, we are so bold as to

---

[107] Pauck, p. 19 (Ficker, p. 173:16-18).

[108] Pauck, p. 19 (Ficker, p. 173:8-13).

[109] Pauck, p. 12 (Ficker, p. 166:15-17).

> test our intellect at it, avoiding any infringement of the spirit of true piety.[110]

Immediately following a brief summation of the meaning of the Gospel, Luther gives a contrasting translation which includes a brief introduction:

> Here the Greek text is most helpful; it reads as follows: "Concerning his Son, made of the seed of David, who was selected or designated, declared, ordained to be the Son of God in power according to the spirit of sanctification by the resurrection from the dead, even Jesus Christ our Lord."[111]

As to Luther's claim for making fresh contribution, there is no clear indication as to what it might be, but it is to be found somewhere in the following Christological discussion which is an elaboration of his earlier summation of the Gospel:

> The gospel deals with "his Son," not with the Son of God as such, but with the incarnate One who was born of the seed of David. This means that he emptied himself and became weak. He who was before all, and who made all, now has himself a beginning and was made.

In contrast to this Luther writes:

> Yet the gospel speaks not only of the humility of the Son of God by which he emptied himself but, rather, of the glory and power which after his humiliation he received from God in his humanity; in other words: as the Son of God by his humbling and emptying himself was made the son of David in the weakness of the flesh, so by contrast the son of David, who is weak according to the flesh, is now in turn established and declared to be the Son of God in all power and glory; and, as according to the form of God, he emptied himself into the nothingness of the flesh by being born into the world, so, according to the form of a servant, he fulfilled himself unto the fullness of God by ascending into heaven.

---

[110] Pauck, p. 12 (Ficker, pp. 166:18-167:2).

[111] Pauck, p. 13 (Ficker, p. 167:6-10). The Greek term that Luther discovers is mistranslated in the Vulgate is oristhentos. Supra, p. 33.

Luther continues to develop the preceding:

> Note how very appropriately the apostle chooses his words: he does not say: "who was the Son of God in power," in the same way in which he says: "who was made according to the flesh." For from the very moment of Christ's conception it was correct to say, in view of the union of the two natures: This Son is the son of David and this man is the Son of God. The first is true because his divinity is emptied and hidden in the flesh. The second is true because his humanity is fulfilled and translated into divinity. And though he was not born as the Son of God but as a human son, he was nevertheless always the Son and is even now the Son of God. But men did not recognize his designation and appointment as the Son of God. Though he was endowed with power over all and was indeed the Son of God, he did not yet exercise it and was not acknowledged as the Son of God. This happened only through the spirit of sanctification. For the Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified. "He shall glorify me" (John 16:14), he said. Through the apostles, the Holy Spirit designated and declared him to be the Son of God with power over all, to whom everything should be subject because God the Father had made him Lord and Christ.[112]

Luther's critique of commentary on Romans 3:5

Under the rubric, "But if our righteousness (Si autem iniquitas), Romans 3:5, Faber says that

> God's righteousness is proved by our unrighteousness when he punishes it, because then it becomes apparent that he is righteous in that he does not let the unrighteous go unpunished.[113]

To this Luther bitingly retorts: "This opinion is correct. But it has nothing to do with the topic the apostle treats in this context."[114]

---

[112] Pauck, pp. 13-14 (Ficker, pp. 167:10-168:13).

[113] Pauck, p. 66 (Ficker, p. 214:23-25).

[114] Pauck, p. 66 (Ficker, p. 214:25-26). N. 5 in Pauck; p. 66 and n. 23 in Ficker identify Faber as the source that Luther identifies only as "some" (Aliqui).

Dependent upon Psalm 51, "against thee, thee only, have I sinned," Luther gives this rebuttal:

> For he who humbly puts all righteousness away from himself and confesses himself a sinner before God thus glorifies God who alone is righteous. Therefore, not our unrighteousness, which God hates evermore as the enemy of his glory, but the acknowledgment and confession of our unrighteousness give him glory and praise because they show how needful to salvation his righteousness is.[115]

Under this same rubric Lyra is chided for his erroneous views of righteousness and unrighteousness in that he says:

> our unrighteousness incidentally commends God's righteousness, just as opposites placed next to each other shine all the more brightly--like colors and shadows in a picture.

For this remark, Luther chides:

> But the apostle absolutely denies that our unrighteousness can in any way set off God's righteousness. Only carnal men can find such a meaning . . . .

As through all his argument, here Luther is still dependent upon Psalm 51, and on the basis of the Psalm, he sets forth his own view of righteousness and unrighteousness:

> Our unrighteousness, if it really has become our own (i.e., if it is acknowledged and confessed), greatly sets off his divine righteousness, for it makes us humble; it makes us throw ourselves down before God and causes us to ask for his righteousness. And when we have received it, we glorify, laud, and love God as the giver. Conversely, our righteousness reproves God's righteousness; indeed, it suspends it and denies it and declares it to be a falsehood and a lie--and this happens whenever we resist the words of God, saying that we do not need his righteousness and believe that our own is sufficient. One must, therefore, speak as follows: "Against thee,

---

[115] Pauck, pp. 66-67 (Ficker, p. 215:5-9).

> thee only, have I sinned, that thou mayest be justified" (Psalm 51:4) (i.e., that thou mayest be proclaimed with praise and glory as the only righteous one who justifiest us "in thy words," i.e., as thou hast promised and testified.)[116]

Luther's use of others as supporting or supplemental exposition

Though Luther not infrequently dissents, he often summons other authorities to render assistance in clarifying the text. Augustine is his favorite, and he refers to him or quotes him directly over one hundred times from twenty-two different writings.[117] Luther cites Augustine in every chapter except the last,[118] and in only two references are there any even slightly negative comments.[119]

---

[116]Pauck, p. 67 (Ficker, p. 215:9-11, 11-13, 17-19). N. 6 in Pauck, p. 67 and n. 9 in Ficker state that Lyra is the source which Luther identifies only as "others" (Aliqui). Ficker traces Lyra's thought through Aegidius Romanus to Thomas Acquinas to Aristotle.

[117]Cf. Pauck, pp. 423-424, "List of Ancient and Medieval Works, Quoted by Luther or Referred to in the Explanatory Notes" and his index of "Proper Names" where he lists twenty anti-Pelagian writings. Cf. also Ficker, pp. xxxiii and Ll. Ficker takes note of thirty-two references to Augustine in the Glosses. Pauck observes: "Augustine is frequently quoted at considerable length. Luther shows himself acquainted with almost the whole body of Augustine's work . . . but in these writings . . . . On the Spirit and the Letter (he quotes this work twenty-seven times apparently from memory.)" (p. xliii). Gordon Rupp states: "Next to the Bible, Saint Augustine is his major authority (there are upwards of one hundred and twenty direct quotations) Rupp refers to Adolf Hamel, Der Junge Luther und Augustin, Gütersloh, 1934-35, 2 Vols. (p. 160).

[118]The number of times Luther refers to Augustine occurs in each chapter of Romans as follows: 1 (5 times), 2 (12), 3 (4), 4 (6), 5 (18), 6 (7), 7 (29), 8 (13), 9 (2), 10 (1), 11 (4), 12 (3), 13 (1), 14 (2), 15 (2).

[119]Luther does not really accept St. Augustine's interpretation of "from faith to faith" (Pauck, p. 19: Ficker, p. 173:14-15). Cf. Infra, p. 49. In the second, Luther claims "we can find a still profounder meaning . . . ." (Pauck, p. 209: Ficker, p. 348:13-14). There is a third aimed at Augustine as well as Peter Lombard. (Pauck, p. 406. See also Pauck, pp. xlv-xlvi).

Besides Augustine he uses Jerome, Ambrose, Montanus, Chrysostom, Hilary, Dionysius.[120] In connection with Romans 11:23-27 Luther shows his confidence toward the Early Fathers in general:

> This text is the basis of the common opinion that, at the end of the world, the Jews will return to faith. However, it is so obscure that, unless one is willing to accept the judgment of the fathers who expound the apostle in this way, no one can, so it would seem, obtain a clear conviction from this text.[121]

A definite objective

What Luther implied in his rather varied but very disciplined approach to the Scriptures, he constantly and explicitly expressed on almost every page of his lectures.

Throughout his writing on Romans, expressions like the following occur:

> It seems to me that what the apostle means to say is as follows . . . .[122]
>
> Note how very appropriately the apostle chooses his words.[123]
>
> The meaning of the passage appears, then, to be as follows . . . .[124]
>
> For the sake of a clearer understanding we must note that the apostle . . . .[125]

---

[120] Infra, pp. 87-96.

[121] Pauck, p. 315 (Ficker, pp. 436:25-437:2).

[122] Pauck, p. 12 (Ficker, p. 167:2).

[123] Pauck, p. 13 (Ficker, p. 167:22).

[124] Pauck, p. 19 (Ficker, p. 173:3-4).

[125] Pauck, p. 21 (Ficker, p. 174:26).

> But in order that the apostle may be more clearly understood in his arguments, I shall try my hand at explaining what I think he means . . . .[126]
>
> The lesson to be learned from this text is, then . . . .[127]
>
> It is to be noted, however, that in the opinion of the apostle . . . .[128]
>
> It is the purpose of the apostle to show . . . .[129]
>
> This, then, is obviously what the apostle had in mind . . . .[130]

The apostle . . . the apostle . . . the apostle . . . is a constant, insistent, and revealing refrain used by Luther, and indicates what Luther wants to accomplish, namely, to understand what the apostle, not the commentators, is saying, and to communicate that understanding to his students. It is evident that Luther aims to surrender to the authority of the apostolic writing, in order to ascertain as well the word of Christ. His own comment on Paul underscores this attitude:

> The apostle wants to say that it is not he that speaks and acts in whatever he is speaking and doing . . . but Christ . . . . Hence he says that he does not dare speak anything that Christ does not speak in him.[131]

---

[126]Pauck, p. 23 (Ficker, p. 176:23-24).

[127]Pauck, p. 30 (Ficker, p. 183:5).

[128]Pauck, p. 31 (Ficker, p. 184:4).

[129]Pauck, p. 32 (Ficker, p. 184:13).

[130]Pauck, p. 46 (Ficker, p. 197:27).

[131]Pauck, p. 415 (Ficker, p. 523:18-21).

Conclusion

Luther's progress as an interpreter encountered various hurdles. He found it necessary to break away from traditionally accepted methodology, such as the format of the Gloss and Scholion. The corruption of the Vulgate text, and errant interpretations handed down by his contemporaries and forerunners required a fresh approach to the exegetical task. The study thus far has demonstrated how Luther discharged some of his responsibilities as an interpreter in his developmental period.

1. He sought the best available text.
2. Luther's special printing arrangement, his occasional use of German, and his concern to open up meanings show that he was student-centered as well as context-centered. He wanted to communicate to someone as well as from something.
3. He brought to his exposition a broader skill in exegetical procedure, including the following:
   a. Grammatical analysis
   b. More precise definition of terms
   c. Stress on the Scripture itself as a hermeneutical device
   d. Awareness of the context
   e. Integrity in the use of logic
   f. Submission to the author and the author's purpose.

CHAPTER IV

FOUR CONSTANTS IN LUTHER'S PREPARATION

The previous chapter presented Luther's exegetical methods and aim, his textual concern, and the format with which he worked. Implicitly and explicitly Luther's methodology reveals his endeavor to discern the intent of the author, rather than reflect schoolmen's, or alien, opinions about what Paul said. Further examination reveals that four constants, or accents, reappear rather consistently in Luther's comment on the text. These constants are the nature of man, the relationship of philosophy to theology, the importance of the Word and man's attitude toward that Word, and the role of the Holy Spirit. In this chapter each of these four constants is examined with an attempt to demonstrate their interrelatedness.

The Nature of Man

Self-will (sensus proprius), pride (superbia), covetousness (concupiscentia), wisdom of the flesh (sapientiam or prudentia carnis), curvedness (curvitas), or tinder of sin (fomes peccatti) are some of the expressions Luther uses to echo Paul and to interpret him to his students. These expressions are all a part of Luther's doctrine of man, and he pursues this study of the nature of man to great depth and detail.

For example, in the Gloss and Scholia with which Luther begins, he gives the aim of the Epistle to the Romans:

> The sum and substance of this letter is: to pull down, to pluck up, and to destroy all wisdom and righteousness of the flesh . . . and to implant,

establish, and make large the reality of sin (however unconscious we may be of its existence).[1]

Here Luther quotes from Augustine's On the Spirit and the Letter to reinforce his point:

> The apostle Paul "contends with the proud and arrogant and with those who are presumptuous on account of their works"; "moreover, in the letter to the Romans, this theme is almost his sole concern and he discusses it so persistently and with such complexity as to weary the reader's attention, yet it is a useful and wholesome wearying."[2]

Two further examples appear at the beginning of Luther's lectures:

> For God does not want to save us by our own but by an extraneous righteousness which God does not originate in ourselves but comes to us from beyond ourselves, which does not arise on our earth but comes from heaven.[3]

For a second time Luther explains why Paul wrote his letter to Rome.

> I think that he took the opportunity of writing to the believers in Rome in order to make available to them a great apostle's witness to their faith and teaching as they struggled with the Jews and Gentiles of Rome who persisted in unbelief and gloried in the flesh over against the humble wisdom of the believers, for these believers had then no choice but to live among them and thus to become involved in contradictions in all they heard and spoke.[4]

---

[1] Martin Luther, Lectures on Romans, translated and edited by Wilhelm Pauck, The Library of Christian Classics (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1961) XV, 3. Hereafter this work will be cited as Pauck. Martin Luther, D. Martin Luthers Werke, edited by Johannes Ficker (Weimar: Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1938), LVI, 157:2-6. Hereafter this work will be cited as Ficker.

[2] Pauck, p. 3 (Ficker, p. 157:7-11).

[3] Pauck, p. 4 (Ficker, p. 158:10-13).

[4] Pauck, p. 6 (Ficker, p. 160:4-8).

Luther desires, because he believes that Paul and the Scriptures desire it, that there be a clear, certain, and bold understanding of man in relationship to himself, to God, and to his neighbor. He writes:

> Indeed, the entire Scripture teaches nothing else than humility: we must be subject not only to God but also to every creature. But we want all and everything to be subject to us and we want this out of a perverse tendency of our mind.[5]

Analysis of Luther's repetition of the anthropological theme suggests a pattern of basic sub-themes, some or all of which appear in Luther's comments on each chapter of Romans. This constancy of theme, almost compulsion, is well articulated, and at times eloquent in its persistence and persuasive presentation.[6] For the purpose of orientation, the five sub-themes are first briefly described. In order to demonstrate how persistent and repetitious Luther is, statements and references expressing the themes will be submitted seriatim from each chapter on Romans.

Carnis

1. Man is flesh, that is, he represents a closed universe and his own thinking is limited to his environment, experience, and reason. Therefore he needs external assistance and revelation.

---

[5]Pauck, p. 48 (Ficker, p. 199:30-32).

[6]Pauck, p. lii. Wilhelm Pauck in his introduction remarks on Luther's consistent theme: "he maintains that men are always in need of being made righteous, for, in themselves, they are unrighteous even if they think that they are righteous. It is this view of man's predicament and salvation which in these lectures on Romans Luther presents to his readers almost to the point of tiring them."

Curvitas

2. Man as flesh is turned in upon himself and is altogether self-centered and selfish even with respect to God.

Rebellio

3. Man as flesh is rebellious toward God and His Revelation, and the nature of this rebellion is not static, but agressive.

Superba: Transmutatio, Inflectus

4. Man as flesh is extremely self-confident, in fact, arrogant, with respect to God and His Revelation, to the extent that man as flesh wants to shape things in his own direction; and he will not let God be God. He is an arrogant, self-protecting manipulator.

Sensus Proprius

5. Man as flesh uses even God for selfish ends, and this with an almost naive cunning.

(Romans, Chapter One)

Carnis

In Romans 1:16 Paul speaks of the "power of God." Luther makes a contrast with "power of men," and shows thereby that man is flesh: It is "the potency (potentia) from which man derives his strength and health according to the flesh and by which he is enabled to do what

is of the flesh."[7]

Carnis et Rebellio

In connection with Paul's statement in Romans 1:16, "I am not ashamed of the Gospel," Luther comments that some are ashamed, and for a reason that touches on man's hostility:

> This is because one that finds pleasure and enjoyment in the things of the flesh and the world can necessarily not find taste and pleasure in the things of the Spirit and of God: so not only is he ashamed to bring the Gospel to others but he refuses to have it brought to himself. For he hates the light and loves the darkness; therefore he cannot bear to be told the truth of salvation.[8]

---

[7]Pauck, p. 16 (Ficker, p. 170:7-10). It becomes readily apparent that to Luther a peculiar dynamic is constantly asserting itself in the behavior and thought world of man. In a related statement Luther speaks of this particular phenomenon at considerable length using Aristotle as an authority. Luther uses such terms as "not static" [in quiescere], "in movement" (in movene), "in motion" (in motu). He states that man is "in sin as the terminus a quo and in righteousness as the terminus ad quem." This constant, unending motion Luther applies to natural man: "Just so by contrast, the ungodly who deviate from righteousness hold the middle between sin and righteousness, but they move in the opposite direction. This life, therefore, is a road to heaven and to hell. None is so good that he cannot become better, and none is so bad that he cannot become worse, until at last we become what we are to be (Usque dum ad extremam forman perveniamus)." (Pauck, p. 323: Ficker, p. 442:22-26). The complete discussion is found in Pauck, pp. 321-323 (Ficker, pp. 441:13-443:8). In discoursing on this same phenomenon in connection with Romans 5:12, "As by one man sin entered into the world," Luther decrees: "It is as with a sick man whose mortal illness is due to the fact that not merely one part of his body lost its health, but that his whole body is sick and that all his senses and powers are debilitated, so that, to cap it all, he is nauseated by what would be wholesome for him and consumed by the desire for what harms him. This sin is Hydra, that extremely stubborn monster with many heads with which we fight in the Lerna of this life until death. Here is Cerberus, that uncontrollable barker, and Anteus, who is insuperable when he is left on the earth." (Pauck, p. 168: Ficker, p. 313:7-13).

[8]Pauck, pp. 16, 17 (Ficker, p. 170:28-32).

Superba et Mutatio

In Romans 1:18-30 Paul discusses the perverted, manipulatory worship of God:

> Their error was that in their worship they did not take the Godhead for what it is in itself, but changed it by fitting it to their own needs and desires.[9]

Superba et Carnis

Similarly, in connection with Romans 1:25, where Paul writes: "And worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator," Luther comments on man's arrogant manipulation of God, with accent on the role of flesh:

> But, alas, even today a great many people think of God in a way that is unworthy of him; in bold and daring arguments they define God to be such and such; and not one among them grants God so much honor as to elevate God's all-excelling majesty above his own judgment and comprehension. Instead, they raise their own thinking to such a level that it is no more difficult and terrifying for them to pass judgment on God than it is for a simple cobbler to appraise his leather.[10]

The limitations of man's carnality are brought out in these words of Luther:

> In their presumptuousness they dare assert that God's nature, his righteousness, and his mercy are what they think they ought to be, as if they were filled and, indeed, drunk with the spirit that searches the deep things

---

[9]Pauck, pp. 23, 24 (Ficker, p. 177:8-10). Within this chapter similar statements are found on Pauck, p. 24 (Ficker, p. 177:17-18), Pauck, p. 25 (Ficker, p. 178:4-17), Pauck, p. 26 (Ficker, p. 179:11-18), and Pauck, p. 31 (Ficker, p. 184:4-16).

[10]Pauck, p. 33 (Ficker, p. 185:26-30).

> of God, which in fact they completely lack. Of this sort are the heretics, the Jews, the folk of spiritual pride, and all who are outside God's grace. For no one can think rightly about God unless the Spirit of God is in him. Apart from him, he will speak and judge wrongly about whatever may come under his judgment--God's righteousness or mercy, himself or others.[11]

(Romans, Chapter Two)

Proprius Sensus

In Romans 2:11 where Paul states: "For there is no respect of person with God," Luther contrasts what the Scriptures demand with man's self-seeking:

> Indeed, the entire Scripture teaches nothing else than humility: we must be subject not only to God but also to every creature. But we want all and everything to be subject to us and we want this out of a perverse tendency of our mind.[12]

Superba: Conflantes et Sculpentes

Man's manipulating is brought out in a discussion on the meaning of "sacrilege," a term Paul uses in Romans 2:22:

> First, by withdrawing their heart and mind from the truth and the spirit and by relying instead upon their own understanding; second, and this is much more relevant to the discussion, in the following way: They took the letters and the words of Scripture, which is not only holy but the Holy of Holies, and distorted them by giving them a false meaning, and thus they cast and carved them into a spiritual idol . . . .[13]

---

[11] Pauck, pp. 33, 34 (Ficker, pp. 185:30-186:4).

[12] Pauck, p. 48 (Ficker, p. 199:30-32).

[13] Pauck, pp. 57-58 (Ficker, p. 207:22-26).

(Romans, Chapter Three)

Superbam Contra Dicunt

In chapter three Paul writes: "For if the truth of God has more abounded through my lie unto his glory, why am I also yet judged as a sinner?" (Romans 3:7). Luther, in line with Paul's casuistry, describes man as a hostile and arrogant manipulator.

> Yet in their pride they resent this as if by their own power and initiative they were actually truthful, righteous, wise, strong, and pure. So they speak up against God, set themselves up as judges over him, and try their best to make him appear mendacious, unrighteous, foolish, weak, and sinful. And all this because they want to establish their truthfulness, righteousness, wisdom, power, and purity, not wishing to be regarded as lying, unrighteous, foolish, weak sinners. Therefore, either God or they must be caught in falsehood and be unrighteous, weak . . . .[14]

Luther, following Paul, continues:

> The only resistance against this justification comes from the pride of the human heart through unbelief. For it does not regard the words of God as right but condemns and judges them. It does not believe them, because it does not regard them as true. And it does not regard them as true, because it regards as true only its own understanding, and this contradicts them. In this case, judging God in his words is the same as to reject him or his words and to render them untrue and unjust. And this comes to pass through the pride of unbelief and rebellion.[15]

Proprius Sensus et Curvitas

In Romans 3:21 Paul writes: "Without the law the justice of God is made manifest, being witnessed by the law and the prophets." Luther,

---

[14] Pauck, pp. 68, 69 (Ficker, pp. 216:33-217:7):

[15] Pauck, p. 76 (Ficker, p. 226:6-12).

in turn, illustrates who these particular prophets are, namely, Abraham and Jeremiah, Habakkuk and Hosea, and how they witness to the ineffectiveness of the law. He adds a quotation from Augustine, and then introduces experience, first, as further evidence to support the law's inability to justify, and, secondly, as data concerning man's self-centeredness not only in relation to earthly, sensual things, but to spiritual things, including God:

> If we but pay attention, it is easy to see the perversity of our will in relation to the body, how we love what is bad for us and avoid what is good for us, insofar as, for example, we are disposed toward sensual lust, avarice, gluttony, pride, and honor but shrink back from chastity, generosity, sobriety, humility, and shame. It is easy, I say, to sense how we seek and love ourselves in all this, how we are bent in and curved in upon ourselves, if not in what we do, then at least in what we are disposed to do.
>
> It is very difficult, however, to see whether we seek ourselves also in the things that belong to the realm of the spirit (i.e., in knowledge, righteousness, chastity, godliness). Inasmuch as the love of spiritual values is honorable and good, it very often becomes an end in itself, so that these values are not placed in relation to God and referred to him. And so we pursue them not because they are pleasing to God but because they give us delight and inward satisfaction, and also because we thereby earn the plaudits of men; in other words: we pursue them not for God's sake but for our own.[16]

---

[16] Pauck, p. 112 (Ficker, pp. 258:23-259:4). Similar statements within chapter three can be found on pp. 65 (Ficker, p. 213:16-18); 67 (Ficker, pp. 215:18-216:2); 79 (Ficker, p. 229:24-28); 83 (Ficker, p. 233:5-14); 85, n. 32 (Ficker, p. 33:13ff); 87 (Ficker, p. 235:26-37); 88 (Ficker, p. 236:28-31); 89 (Ficker, pp. 237:30-238:2); 90 (Ficker, p. 238:15-20); 91 (Ficker, p. 239:5-9); 91-92 (Ficker, pp. 239:25-240:19); 94 (Ficker, p. 242:2-5); 98 (Ficker, p. 246:20-22); 99 (Ficker, p. 246:22-33); 106 (Ficker, p. 253:3-6); 109 (Ficker, pp. 255:21-256:4); 110 (Ficker, p. 256:11-23); 111 (Ficker, p. 257:18-33); 113 (Ficker, p. 259:9-10); and 114-115 (Ficker, pp. 260:17-261:9).

(Romans, Chapter Four)

Carnis

In a long corollary developing Paul's quotation of Psalm 32:1, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven," and within one of Luther's attacks upon philosophy, Luther in effect raises a question about man as flesh:

> This wretchedness results from the fact that people do not seek to drive out the internal sin, of which we have spoken, but give consideration only to the actual sin of deed, word, or thought. . . .
>
> These do not know that this internal sin cannot possibly be taken away in this life, but this is precisely what they want.[17]

Here Luther sees man's failure, really, to come to grips with the depth of his predicament as flesh.

In connection with Psalm 32, Luther defines a Hebrew term relating to man's arrogance, thus underscoring his appraisal of man's fleshliness:

> The fourth term is the Hebrew word "rasha," meaning "ungodliness." This is the vice of pride which becomes apparent when one denies God's truth and righteousness, practices self-righteousness, and dogmatically asserts one's own wisdom.[18]

---

[17] Pauck, pp. 136, 137 (Ficker, pp. 282:3-5; 282:34-283:2).

[18] Pauck, p. 138 (Ficker, p. 284:4-6). The Latin is more revealing, Quod est Vitium superbie, Negatio veritatis et Iustitiae Dei, statutio suae Iustitiae, defensio sapientie mentis suae . . . . Similar statements within chapter four can be found on pp. 123-124 (Ficker, p. 268:7-25) and 141 (Ficker, p. 287:1-4).

(Romans, Chapter Five)

Rebellio et Proprius Sensus

In chapter five Luther shows how man's aggressive hostility resists the offerings of God and contrariwise how man shows himself to be the self-seeking person that he is. Luther expands on Paul's "we glory in tribulation" (Romans 5:3) as follows:

> Thus he [God] will not be a Jesus, i.e., a savior, to a man who does not want to be damned. He will not be God and creator for him, because he does not want to be that nothing out of which the Lord can create. He will not be his power, wisdom, and goodness, because he does not want to bear him in weakness, foolishness, and readiness to take punishment.[19]

> This is so because, due to original sin, our nature is so curved in upon itself at its deepest levels that it not only bends the best gifts of God toward itself in order to enjoy them (as the moralists and hypocrites make evident), nay, rather, "uses" God in order to obtain them, but it does not even know that, in this wicked, twisted, crooked way, it seeks everything, including God, only for itself.[20]

(Romans, Chapter Six)

Carnis et Proprius Sensus

Paul, in Romans 6:6, writes, "Knowing this that our old man is crucified with him." Luther develops the theme that man is flesh and terribly self-seeking:

> It is the "old man" in him that makes him use God in all this so that he can enjoy his gifts . . . . This is said

---

[19]Pauck, p. 158 (Ficker, p. 303:13-17).

[20]Pauck, p. 159 (Ficker, p. 304:25-29). A related statement from Romans, chapter five, can be found on p. 163 (Ficker, p. 307:31-33).

> not so much because of the stubbornness of crooked people but chiefly because of the defect that is in man by inheritance and because of the poison that is in him from the beginning of his days and infects the depth of his nature, so that, from his selfish disposition, he seeks even in God only himself and his own.[21]

(Romans, Chapter Seven)

Carnis et Rebellio

From Paul's statement on Romans 7:16, "I consent to the law that is good," Luther deduces the following concerning man as flesh in his hostility against God:

> But he wants to say that he does not do the good as often and to such an extent and as readily as he would like. For he wants to act from utter single-mindedness, freedom, and cheerfulness, unmolested by the resistance of the flesh, and this he cannot do. . . . He that sets out to watch, to pray, and to help his fellow man will always find that the flesh is rebellious and that it plots and desires something else.[22]

Carnis

Paul, in the well-known setting of Romans 7, makes this statement: "Therefore, I myself with the mind serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin" (Romans 7:25). Luther calls the statement "the most telling passage of all," and shows that there is duality in man's nature because he is carnal, or flesh.

---

[21]Pauck, p. 182 (Ficker, p. 325:7-8; 10-13). Related statements from Romans, chapter six, can be found on pp. 180 ("law of sin") (Ficker, p. 323:10-19), and 183 ("body of sin") (Ficker, p. 326:14-26).

[22]Pauck, p. 203 (Ficker, pp. 341:30-33 . . . 342:4-5).

> I, this whole man, this person here, stand in this double servitude.
>
> The saints in being righteous are at the same time sinners; they are righteous because they believe in Christ whose righteousness covers them and is imputed to them, but they are sinners because they do not fulfill the law and are not without sinful desires.[23]

(Romans, Chapter Eight)

Curvitas

Two of Luther's most explicit statements on curvitas are found in corollaries that emanate from Romans 8:3, "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh." The first shows man as self-centered.

> It is said that human nature has a general notion of knowing and willing good, but that it goes wrong in particulars. It would be better to say that it knows and wills the good in particular things, but in general neither knows nor wills the good. This is so because it knows only its own good or what is good, honorable, and useful for itself, but not what is good for God and for others. Therefore it knows and wills mainly a good that is a particular good, indeed, that is good only for the individual self. And this is in agreement with the Scripture, which describes man as curved in upon himself to such an extent that he bends not only physical but also spiritual goods toward himself, seeking himself in all things.[24]

The second, and strongest, comes from another corollary emanating from Romans 8:3, sharply expressive of Luther's thinking concerning man as altogether self-centered in his manipulation of God. Luther is engaged in rebuttal against those who think, as he says, "very highly

---

[23] Pauck, p. 208 (Ficker, p. 347:5-11).

[24] Pauck, pp. 218, 219 (Ficker, pp. 355:28-256:6).

of the light of nature and compare it to the light of grace." He then proceeds to contrast grace and nature by describing the depravity of nature:

> Nature . . . sets before itself no other object than the self, to which it is moved and directs itself; it sees and seeks only itself and aims at itself in everything; everything else, even God himself, it bypasses as if it did not see it, and turns to itself. This is what it means to have a "perverse" and "wicked" heart (Ps. 101:4; Prov. 27:20). . . .[25] so nature . . . puts itself in the place of everything, and even in the place of God, and seeks only its own and not what is God's. Thus it idolizes and absolutizes itself. Then it turns God into an idol for itself, and the truth of God into a lie, and finally also all God's creatures and gifts.[26]

Sensus Proprius

In his comment on chapter eight of Romans, Luther along with Augustine picks up the phrase, "wisdom of the flesh" or as Luther calls it, the prudence of the flesh, and emphasizes throughout the chapter the libidinous-type thrust of this phenomenon of man as flesh. Paul states: "the wisdom of the flesh is an enemy of God (Romans 8:7). On the basis of this statement Luther writes:

> The "prudence of the flesh" chooses what is to selfish advantage and it avoids what is harmful to the self. Moreover, it rejects the common good and chooses what harms the common spirit. This is the prudence that directs the flesh, i.e., concupiscense and self-will. It enjoys only itself and uses everyone else, even God; it seeks itself and its own interests in everything: it brings it about that man is finally and ultimately

---

[25]Pauck, p. 219 (Ficker, p. 356:27-30).

[26]Pauck, p. 220 (Ficker, p. 357:2-6).

> concerned only for himself. This is the idolatry that determines all he does, feels, undertakes, thinks and speaks. God is only what is good for him and bad only what is bad for him.[27]

Superba

The arrogance of the "prudence of the flesh" is well brought out in these words of Luther as he comes to grips with the idea of man's suffering as a part of God's will (Romans 8:26-29). "But they want to be like God and, in their thinking, they want to be, not beneath God, but beside him, as if their minds were perfectly conformed to his."[28] He wrote further: "For this foolish prudence places itself above God and passes judgment on his will as upon something inferior . . . ."[29]

(Romans, Chapter Nine)

Superba et Transmutatio

Paul, in Romans nine, writes of man's difficulty in understanding the will of the Lord, who has "mercy on whom he will have mercy." In anticipation of this difficulty, Paul asks: "Is there injustice with God?" (Romans 9:14,15). Luther's response to Paul ties in with the constant theme of man as arrogant flesh:

---

[27] Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, p. 361:11-18).

[28] Pauck, p. 241 (Ficker, p. 376:19-21).

[29] Pauck, p. 252 (Ficker, p. 385:5-6). Related thoughts from Romans, chapter eight: p. 220 (Ficker, p. 357:9-19); p. 222 (Ficker, p. 359:7-10); p. 226 (Ficker, p. 362:12-19); p. 227 (Ficker, p. 363:23-28); p. 241 (Ficker, pp. 375:22-376:2); p. 248 (Ficker, p. 382:9-21).

> Could it be possible that God is not God? Moreover, inasmuch as his will is the highest good, why are we not ready and eager to see it done, especially in view of the fact that it cannot possibly be evil? And if you say: But the fact that his will cannot be managed and that men cannot cause it to be done, this is an evil to them.[30]

Carnis

The limitation of the flesh of man is stressed in Paul's words in Romans 9:28, "For the Lord shall consummate his word and cut it short in righteousness." Luther writes: "for the flesh and the wisdom of the flesh are in no way capable of comprehending the righteousness and wisdom of God."[31]

(Romans, Chapter Ten)

Superba

Paul speaks of those who "have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge" (Romans 10:2). These words give to Luther another opportunity to repeat his theme of man's arrogance. He writes:

> The Scripture characterizes such people as being of a twisted and bent heart and of a corrupt mind, even though they are not corrupt in the flesh or in corporeal vices. Yet they are spiritually corrupt insofar as they obstinately persist in their own opinion and in their own way in pursuing the spiritual good.[32]

---

[30] Pauck, p. 268 (Ficker, pp.396:16-397:2).

[31] Pauck, p. 278 (Ficker, p. 406:18-19). Related thoughts from Romans, chapter nine, can be found on p. 262 (Ficker, p. 391:19-23); p. 362 (Ficker, p. 392:17-20).

[32] Pauck, p. 286 (Ficker, p. 413:7-10).

Sensus Proprius

In his comment on Romans 10:19, "I will provoke you to jealousy by that which is not a nation; by a foolish nation, I will anger you," Luther says:

> The proud, however, who trust in their own merits and wisdom, become angry and grumble when others, who do not deserve it, are given freely what they themselves have been seeking with so much zeal.

Luther proceeds to show why the proud reasoning of the flesh works as it does:

> Instead of rejoicing in the salvation of others, they advance presumptuous claims in their own behalf. Thereby they show that they were not seeking God for God's sake but for their own sake, namely, from self-love and from a desire for personal advantage (i.e., impurely).[33]

(Romans, Chapter Eleven)

Rebellio

Paul's mention of Baal in Romans 11:4 triggers from Luther a comment which shows how man's willfulness arrogantly asserts itself with respect to God:

> We are dealing here with the fancied piety of a willful mind and with fanatical religiousness; it worships what it has itself established as worshipful; it follows its own leading on God's way; it is its own teacher toward God, toward righteous salvation and every good. It refuses to perform true obedience, does not heed the word of true teaching, and despises God and all who speak, act, and rule

---

[33] Pauck, p. 302 (Ficker, p. 427:9-12; and 14-17). "scil. amore concupiscentiae et proprii commodi (i.e., impure)." Cf. also p. 290 (Ficker, p. 416:14-18).

in his name. It ridicules them as mistaken fools; indeed, it treats them as if they were crazy.[34]

(Romans, Chapter Twelve)

Sensus Proprius

Luther observes the fresh turn taken in Paul's argument in chapter 12:

> The apostle is about to teach a Christian ethic. From here to the end of the letter his chief concern is, therefore, the uprooting of man's own prudence and self-will. And so he deals with this pest right at the start. It is the most noxious of all because, under the artful disguise of bringing forth goods, it alone causes the birth in the Spirit to be undone again; indeed, it gradually brings it to fall by its own good works. He does this not only in this letter but also in all the others, and with greatest care, because he knows that good works are nothing apart from unity, peace, and humility, to all of which this prudence brings instantaneous death.[35]

Thus the unfolding of Luther's interpretation of Paul continues. His articulation of man as flesh has centered on idolatry, the will of God, and anthropology, that is, man's essential spiritual nature. Now man's relationship to the Christian ethic is to be dealt with, and towards this Christian ethic the flesh, or prudence of the flesh, expresses itself.

Rebellio

In the face of Paul's statement, "Serving the Lord" (Romans 12:11), Luther indicates how the flesh relates to these words:

---

[34] Pauck, p. 307 (Ficker, p. 430:15-21).

[35] Pauck, pp. 320, 321 (Ficker, pp. 440:20-441:2).

> i.e., they wear themselves out in their own pursuits and do not let themselves be called to something else by any religious task or even by a divine cause. Hence, they serve themselves rather than the Lord for they are not ready to do whatever God wills unless they can choose what it shall be.[36]

(Romans, Chapter Thirteen)

Curvitas

To Paul's summary statement, "Love therefore is the fulfilling of the law" (Romans 13:10), Luther responds that this statement "can be understood in a twofold way." Concerning man's self-seeking, he writes:

> First, one can take it to mean that both are commanded: we shall love our neighbor and ourselves as well. But another way to understand it is that it commands us to love only our neighbor and this according to the example of our love for ourselves. This is the better interpretation, for because of the defect of his nature, man loves himself above everything else, he seeks himself in everything, and loves everything for his own sake, even when he loves his heighbor or his friend, for he seeks only his own therein.[37]

(Romans, Chapter Fourteen)

Curvitas

Concerning a matter of "situation ethic" Paul writes, "For if

---

[36] Pauck, p. 346 (Ficker, p. 464:19-22). Cf. also, p. 326 (Ficker, p. 446:1-26); p. 338 (Ficker, p. 456:15-16); pp. 338-339 (Ficker, pp. 457:8-458:3); p. 345 (Ficker, p. 464:6-14); p. 352 (Ficker, p. 471: 5-8); p. 353 (Ficker, p. 472:3-7); pp. 353-354 (Ficker, p. 472:15-24).

[37] Pauck, p. 366 (Ficker, p. 482:22-26). Cf. also p. 360 (Ficker, pp. 476:28-477:6); p. 363 (Ficker, p. 479:1-3); p. 367 (Ficker, p. 483: 7-10); p. 369 (Ficker, pp. 484:23-485:1).

because of your meat, your brother be grieved, you do not walk now according to love" (Romans 14:15). This statement of Paul's compels Luther to speak about man's self-seeking in this fashion:

> Thus also today everybody is concerned only for what is his and what he is entitled to and not for what he owes to his neighbor and for that which would be expedient both for him and his neighbor.[38]

Rebellio

A parallel statement by Paul is this: "Destroy not the work of God for meat's sake" (Romans 14:20). Luther's comment reflects his accent on man as hostile flesh.

> Understand, then, what it means "to destroy the work of God for the sake of meat": not merely to offend God, but also to fight against God and to destroy what he builds up, to be constantly engaged in a war with God (like the legendary giants who fought with the gods).[39]

(Romans, Chapter Fifteen)

Curvitas

In Romans 13:9 Paul writes, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." A parallel statement is found in Romans 15:2, where Paul states: "Let every one of us please his neighbor unto good, to edification." Again, the thematic pattern of man as flesh and arrogantly self-centered emerges: "The 'prudence of the flesh' has

---

[38]Pauck, p. 397 (Ficker, p. 509:11-12).

[39]Pauck, p. 400 (Ficker, pp. 511:29-512:2). Cf. also, p. 384 (Ficker, p. 497:14-17), p. 399 (Ficker, p. 510:27-28).

an amazing sense for its own advantage; it is, 'more cunning than any beasts of the earth.'"[40]

The Pauline phrase "as yourself" gives Luther further opportunity to expand on the repeated theme:

> I believe, therefore, that by this commandment "as yourself" man is not commanded to love himself but he is shown the wicked love with which in fact he loves himself; in other words, it says to him: You are wholly bent in on yourself and versed in self-love, and you will not be straightened out and made upright unless you cease entirely to love yourself and, forgetting yourself, love only your neighbor. The evidence that we are crooked is that we want to be loved by all and that we seek our own in everything. But what it means to be upright consists in this, that if you do to everyone else what according to this crooked way of yours you want done to yourself, you do good as eagerly as you used to do evil. This does not mean that we are commanded to do evil; not at all, but we are commanded to have the same eagerness for the love of others as for self-love. In the same way, Adam is "the figure of him who is to come" (Rom. 5:14), i.e., of Christ, the Second Adam. In the same way in which we are evil in Adam, we must be good in Christ. This is said in order to bring out a comparison but not in order to enjoin imitation. The same is true here: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself" does not mean at all: "You shall love your neighbor as you shall love yourself"; if it did, this would be specifically commanded. As a matter of fact, it is so specifically not commanded that what is commanded (namely, the love of the neighbor) is based on what is prohibited (namely, self-love.)[41]

Conclusion

Luther's own statement of the purpose of Paul's letter to the

---

[40] Pauck, p. 407 (Ficker, p. 518:1-2). '<u>Prudentia</u>' <u>enim</u> '<u>carnis</u>' <u>more est sibi sapiens</u>. . . .

[41] Pauck, pp. 407, 408 (Ficker, p. 518:4-16). Cf. also p. 404 (Ficker, p. 515:7-12), p. 414 (Ficker, p. 523:12-14), p. 419 (Ficker, pp. 527:31-528:2).

Romans well summarizes the recurring theme, "to pull down, to pluck up, and to destroy all wisdom and righteousness of the flesh . . . and to implant (or affirm), establish, and make large the reality of sin (however unconscious we may be of its existence.)"[42]

Philosophy and Its Limitations

A criticism of philosophy and its limitations is the second constant in Luther's treatment, and indicates further that his doctrine of man does not stand in isolation. Under special indictment are "scholars and theologians," and he speaks of them as people who are "infected . . . by the same prudences of the flesh."[43]

Identified as "our theologians,"[44] or "scholastic theologians,"[45] those whom Luther criticizes are Pierre d'Ailly, Duns Scotus, William Ockham, Joducus Trutvetter and, to a small degree, Thomas Acquinas and Gabriel Biel, all of whom are in some way indebted to Aristotle.[46]

---

[42] Pauck, p. 3 (Ficker, p. 157:2-6).

[43] Pauck, p. 237 (Ficker, p. 372:14-15).

[44] Pauck, p. 130 (Ficker, p. 276:6).

[45] Pauck, p. 130 (Ficker, p. 273:4).

[46] There are only three references in the glosses of a philosophical nature: Ficker, p. 3:14; p. 80:10-20, especially line 12 (This is translated in Pauck, pp. 257-258. Interlinear gloss 4); and Ficker, p. 116: 17-18. The other references are found in the Scholia. Cf. the indexes: Ficker, pp. L-LV, and Pauck, pp. 431-434. Ficker does not list Pierre d'Ailly in his index, but he cites references to him in his footnotes. See Ficker, p. 278:25-26 (Pauck, p. 133); Ficker, p. 296:23-24 (Pauck, p. 152); Ficker, p. 359:17 (Pauck, p. 223); and Ficker, p. 465:18 (Pauck, p. 347).

Ventilation of feelings

Luther expresses ambivalent feelings toward the philosophers. At times he is a relaxed, appreciative friend, and he uses their skillfully descriptive language in his own delineations. Artistotle,[47] primate of the philosophers, on one occasion receives praise: "Aristotle philosophizes about these matters, and he does it well."[48] At other times Luther is a critical, emotional foe. In one instance he detects a failing on the part of many followers to represent adequately their mentors.

> People, therefore, who want to imitate the works of the saints, and glory in their fathers and forefathers, as the monks do today, are extremely foolish because all they accomplish is to ape them. Fools that they are, they do not look first for their spirit in order to become like them, but, unconcerned for the spirit, they do the same works they did.
>
> The Thomists, Scotists, and other schools display the same kind of rash imprudence when they uphold the writings and sayings of their founders, not only by disdaining to

---

[47]Four works of Aristotle are used as source material for Luther: Categoriae, De anima, Ethica Nicholmachea, and Physics (Cf. Pauck, p. 423; Ficker, p. XXXIII). A fifth source book of Aristotle that comes to Luther via Faber is Historia Anamalium (See Ficker, p. 244:10-11, esp. n. 11; Pauck, p. 96).

[48]Pauck, p. 322 (Ficker, p. 442:13-14). Footnote references by Pauck and Ficker show that Luther also receives some assistance in descriptive language from other men, for example, Trutvetter and Biel, as they are dependent upon Aristotle concerning "moral philosophy"; Pauck, p. 186 (Ficker, p. 328:14-16), Biel and Ockham apparently furnish the expression, "inordinate enjoyment." Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, p. 361:24). A "favorite phrase of Gabriel Biel" is used: "conform to the will of God" (conformitas voluntatis Dei). Pauck, p. 229 (Ficker, p. 365:18-20). See also Pauck, p. 274 (Ficker, p. 402:25-26 and n. 25/26), p. 319 (Ficker, p. 440:17).

> inquire for the spirit behind them but also by extinguishing it in their excessive zeal to venerate them. They believe it to be sufficient to keep only their words, regardless of the spirit.[49]

In another setting his kindly disposition completely disappears, and he expresses his dominant attitude towards philosophy with this cry:

> Indeed, I believe that I owe this duty to the Lord of crying out against philosophy and turning men to Holy Scripture. For, perhaps, if someone else who had not been through it all were to do it, he would either be scared to do it or he would not be believed.
>
> But I have been in the grind of these studies for, lo, these many years and am worn out by it, and on the basis of long experience, I have come to be persuaded that it is a vain study doomed to perdition.
>
> For this reason, I admonish you all as earnestly as I can: Be quickly done with these studies and let it be your only concern not to establish and to defend them, but, rather, to deal with them as with bad skills that we learn only in order to get rid of them or as with errors that we take up in order to refute them. So we understand these studies only in order to reject them, or, at least, for the purpose of getting acquainted with the manner of discourse of those with whom we have to maintain relations. It is high time that we be transferred from other studies and learn Jesus Christ "and Him crucified" (I Cor. 2:2).[50]

Luther warms to the task of criticism by labeling the scholastics and their offerings as "fools," "pig theologians," "sheer madness," "monstrous views."[51] At one point he sums it up:

> Thus philosophy stinks in our nostrils, as if reason

---

[49] Pauck, p. 195 (Ficker, pp. 395:21-396:6).

[50] Pauck, p. 236 (Ficker, p. 371:17,27).

[51] Pauck, p. 129 (Ficker, pp. 274:11,14 and 275:17).

> could plead at all times for the best, and we tell tall tales about the law of nature.[52]

Presuppositions

Earlier it was shown that Luther followed the method of letting the Scripture interpret Scripture, Scriptura sui ipsius interpres.[53] Now the particular presupposition behind this practice will be pinpointed. The interpreter, as Rudolf Bultmann has pointed out, cannot avoid presuppositions:

> Reflection on hermeneutics (the method of interpretation) makes it clear that interpretation, that is exegesis, is always based on principles and conceptions which guide exegesis as presuppositions, although interpreters are

---

[52] Pauck, p. 218 (Ficker, p. 355:13, 14). There are eighteen loci in which Luther gives attention to the Scholastic philosophers as they deal with a variety of subjects:

"Righteousness," Pauck, p. 18 (Ficker, pp. 171:26-172:15), Pauck, pp. 293-294 (Ficker, pp. 418:22-419:18).

"syntheresis," "'the natural inclination' of the soul toward the good, as inextinguishable spark (scintilla) of reason, an inborn habitus," Pauck, p. 24, esp. n. 46 (Ficker, p. 177:11-18); Pauck, p. 88 (Ficker, p. 237:2-8); Pauck, pp. 124-125 (Ficker, pp. 268:26-291:14); Pauck, pp. 166-169 (Ficker, pp. 312:1-314:18); Pauck, pp. 196-199 (Ficker, pp. 336:24-339:3); Pauck, pp. 217-220 (Ficker, pp. 355:1-357:26); Pauck, pp. 221-223 (Ficker, pp. 358:24-360:13); Pauck, pp. 347-350 (Ficker, pp. 465:25-469:12).

"Good intentions," Pauck, p. 26 (Ficker, p. 179:11-22); Pauck, pp. 386-392 (Ficker, pp. 498:28-504:7).

"Good wills evil and sin," Pauck, pp. 29-30 (Ficker, pp. 181:23-183:4); Pauck, pp. 325-332 (Ficker, pp. 445:13-451:11).

"Sin taken away," Pauck, pp. 193-196 (Ficker, pp. 334:1-336:17); Pauck, pp. 211-216 (Ficker, pp. 349:22-354:26).

"First grace" and "prayer," Pauck, pp. 244-268 (Ficker, pp. 379:1-381:11).

"Predestination," Pauck, pp. 246-225 (Ficker, pp. 381:12-388:28).

"Ordered love," Pauck, pp. 260-266 (Ficker, pp. 389:1-395:7); Pauck, pp. 406-409 (Ficker, pp. 516:30-519:7).

[53] Supra, pp. 35-38.

> often not aware of this. . . . It will be clear that every interpreter brings with him certain conceptions, perhaps idealistic, or psychological, as presuppositions of his exegesis.[54]

In his dispute with the scholastics, Luther locates the problematic element in the Scholastic's presupposition: "The Scholastics follow the method (modium) of Aristotle in his Ethics." In contrast, Luther perceives that "the ancient holy fathers Augustine and Ambrose dealt, however, with their issues quite differently, namely, according to the method of Scripture."[55]

Luther's particular difficulty is with the Schoolmen's concept of Original Sin, and he disagrees with them because their teaching "conforms to what Aristotle says in the Logic and Metaphysics about the category of quality."[56] This constant concern of Luther for a proper understanding of the nature of man forces him in his conflict with the "theologians" to press for a course of the problem, and for this reason Luther asks:

> So then, is it not true that the treacherous metaphysics of Aristotle and traditional philosophy have deceived our theologians?[57]

Any synthesis of Aristotelian with Biblical concepts simply is not allowed by Luther. He holds to only one criterion, the Scripture.

---

[54]Rudolf Bultman, Jesus Christ and Mythology (London: SCM Press Ltd. c.1958. First British Edition; January 1960), p. 46.

[55]Pauck, p. 128 (Ficker, p. 273:6-8).

[56]Pauck, p. 167 (Ficker, p. 312:4-5).

[57]Pauck, p. 211 (Ficker, p. 349:23-24).

Sola Scriptura

Diagnosing the basic presupposition with which the scholastics work, and totally rejecting any blend of philosophical or metaphysical concepts with those of Scripture, Luther, as readily, demonstrates his own mode of working. He has determined that "the apostle's manner of arguing is contrary to the metaphysical or moral method of reasoning."[58] Luther discerned that

> The apostle philosophizes and thinks about the things of the world in another way than the philosophers and metaphysicians do, and he understands them differently from the way they do.[59]

What Luther proposes in his statements readily finds verification throughout his lectures. A pattern persists, and from this pattern one can deduce Luther's own presupposition, namely Sola Scriptura. This deduction is important since Luther does not spell out in an explicit proposition what determines his own conceptual criteria. However, samplings of this persistent pattern will quickly show how totally Luther is committed to one authority for all his thinking and experience. Luther declares:

> According to him (Aristotle), righteousness follows upon and flows from actions. But, according to God, righteousness precedes works and works result from it.[60]

---

[58]Pauck, p. 193 (Ficker, p. 334:14-15).

[59]Pauck, p. 235 (Ficker, p. 371:2-3).

[60]Pauck, p. 18 (Ficker, p. 172:9-11). Luther cites: "Aristotle in the third chapter of his ethics" N.B. The italics are added to underscore the manifest contrast.

For this reason it is sheer madness to say that man can love God above everything but his own powers . . . . Does not the apostle say that "the law works wrath" (Rom. 4:15) and "that it was weak through the flesh" (Rom. 8:3) and that it can absolutely not be fulfilled without grace?[61]

For they reduced sin as well as righteousness to some very minute motion of the soul . . . . But, according to the law, he should be bare and empty in order to be wholly subject to God. Therefore, Isaiah laughs at them and says: "Do good or evil, if you can!" (Isa. 41:23).[62]

they rely on a word which Blessed Augustine is supposed to have said: "wanting to be righteous is a large part of righteousness." . . . But this "wanting" is not that of which we were just speaking but that which the apostle has in mind when he says: "To will is present with me, but to accomplish I find not" (Rom. 7:18).[63]

The Scripture interprets "righteousness" and "unrighteousness" quite differently from the way the philosophers and jurists do. This is shown by the fact that they consider them as qualities of the soul. But, in the Scripture, righteousness depends more on the reckoning of God than on the essence of the thing itself.[64]

according to the subtle definitions of the Scholastic theologians, it [original sin] is the privation or lack of original righteousness. They say that righteousness is only subjectively in the will and so, therefore, also its opposite, the lack of it. This conforms to what Aristotle says in the Logic and Metaphysics about the category of quality.

but, according to the apostle and in accordance with an understanding that is marked by simplicity in Christ Jesus, it is . . . the loss of all uprightness and of the power of all our faculties of body and soul and of the whole inner

---

[61]Pauck, p. 129 (Ficker, p. 274:11-12 and pp. 274:18-275:2).

[62]Pauck, p. 130 (Ficker, p. 275:18-19 and 24-25).

[63]Pauck, pp. 134-135 (Ficker, p. 280:10-12 and 15-17).

[64]Pauck, p. 141 (Ficker, p. 287:16-19).

> and outer man . . . God hates and imputes not merely this lack (inasmuch as many forget their sin and are not aware of it) but this whole sinful cupidity that causes us to disobey the commandment "You shall not covet" (Ex. 20:17), as the apostle shows in a very clear analysis farther on in the seventh chapter of this letter.[65]

Considering this persistent use of juxtaposition throughout Luther's debate with the Scholastics, one can gain a vital insight into an elementary factor in Luther's makeup as a Biblical interpreter.[66] He will not allow an alien philosophical or metaphysical structure to be projected upon the Scriptures. On the other hand, he exhibits what his own criterion is, Sola Scriptura.[67]

Sola experientia fecit theologum

To stand so diametrically and vehemently opposed to the Scholastics as did Luther brings to the fore a concern for the validity

---

[65] Pauck, pp. 167-168 (Ficker, pp. 312:1-5 and 312:6-313:3).

[66] Cf. for other samplings: Pauck, pp. 193-194 (Ficker, pp. 334:3-6, 14-15, 17-20, 28, and 335:4, 10-11); Pauck, p. 217 (Ficker, p. 355:3-6); Pauck, p. 218 (Ficker, pp. 355:15-18, 19-21, 28-29, and 356:1, 4-5, and 18-19); Pauck, p. 222 (Ficker, p. 391:11-14); Pauck, pp. 235-236 (Ficker, pp. 371:2-9, 9-10, and 17-18); Pauck, p. 253 (Ficker, p. 386:18-19); Pauck, p. 263 (Ficker, p. 392:17-22); Pauck, p. 266 (Ficker, p. 395:4-7); Pauck, p. 293 (Ficker, p. 419:2-7); Pauck, p. 327 (Ficker, p. 447:3-9, 17-20, and 20-23), and Pauck, p. 388 (Ficker, p. 501:5-8).

[67] B. A. Gerrish in a study of Luther's later lectures on Galatians draws this conclusion: "The familiar exegetical principle scriptura sui ipsius interpres ('Scripture is its own interpreter') also, in the last analysis, is closely bound up with Luther's 'experience.' In part, no doubt, it was a corollary of the scriptura sola: if the authority of God's Word is not to be supplemented, neither is interpretation to be governed and determined by some further authority. The principle scriptura sui ipsius interpres is inseparable from the principle scriptura sola. The Scriptures must rule in fact; not merely in theory. Luther would have the Scriptures interpreted neither by his own understanding nor by anyone else's. They must stand by themselves (per sese)." (p. 149) Cf. B. A. Gerrish, Grace and Reason (Oxford: Clarendon Press, c.1962).

of this opposition: How did Luther justify his own convictions? In his running debate with the Scholastics, five separate sources, pragmatic in thrust, serve to reinforce his own belief. He was clear in his own mind as to what made for credibility and for this reason he was attracted to the "ancient Fathers." He cited, also, the saints in their experiences, as well as the mystics. He included his own experience. But most consistently of all, he appealed to common experience as measured by an introspective integrity.

First, however, Luther is concerned as to what constitutes a valid experience, and he sets the tone for his concern in this way:

> Great scholars who read much and abound in many books are not the best Christians. For all their books and their learning are "letter" and the soul's death. But people who do from a free and ready heart what the scholars read in books and teach others to do--they are the best Christians. But they cannot act from a free and ready heart unless they have love through the Holy Spirit. We must therefore dread it when, in our time, through the making of many books, people become learned scholars who do not know at all what it means to be a Christian.[68]

Those who do not know "what it means to be a Christian" are the "ancient Fathers," and in one quotation, especially, Luther shows how he feels about the scholastics, but, in contrast, why he has greater confidence in the reliability of the ancients:

> The modern teachers . . . speak with little authority because they are not supported by the testimony of Scripture. But inasmuch as the ancient teachers say the same thing much more plainly and in line with the apostles, we feel encouraged by the greater comfort they give us, and also the readier help they offer us in the scruples of conscience.[69]

---

[68]Pauck, p. 198 (Ficker, p. 338:6-12).

[69]Pauck, p. 216 (Ficker, p. 354:14-19).

Representing the epitome of Christian life and expression are Augustine and Ambrose, and Luther uses them to back up or guide his own thinking. For example, in order to respond to the Scholastics' claim that sin is what a person does, Luther quotes first Augustine and them Ambrose:

> But Blessed Augustine said most plainly that "in baptism sin (concupiscence) is forgiven, not in the sense that it is no longer there, but in the sense that it is not counted as sin." And Saint Ambrose says: "I am always in sin, therefore I always commune."[70]

Another time, in rebuttal to the Scholastics' view of sin, Luther in support of his convictions about sin states:

> All the saints had this understanding of sin, as David prophesied in Ps. 32. And they all confessed themselves to be sinners, as the books of Blessed Augustine show.[71]

Luther chides the Scholastics for misusing a statement made by Augustine, "wanting to be righteous is a large part of righteousness." The Scholastics use Augustine's statement in support of their own conclusion regarding the "elicited act of the will," namely, righteousness. However, Luther sets Augustine's statement alongside Romans 7:18, "To will is present with me, but to accomplish I find not," and then concludes:

> Our whole present life is a time wherein we will righteousness but never accomplish it; this happens only in the life to come. "To will," therefore, means to demonstrate with all our powers, efforts, prayers, works, sufferings, that we long for righteousness but that we do not yet have what

---

[70]Pauck, p. 128 (Ficker, pp. 273:9-274:2).

[71]Pauck, p. 130 (Ficker, p. 276:3-6).

> shall be (I John 3:2). Read Blessed Augustine who has written about this very beautifully and extensively in many books, especially in the second book against Julian, where he quotes Saint Ambrose, Hilary, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Basil, Nazianzen, Irenaeus, Retitius, and Olympus.[72]

Another quotation from Augustine is cited by Luther immediately after his listing of Bible references that assert all men to be sinners. This particular quotation is a blend of Scriptural references and logic based on realities, and Luther uses it to show the fallacy of Scholastic thinking concerning sin:

> Hence, Blessed Augustine says in the twenty-ninth letter to Jerome: "Love is the power by which one loves what is to be loved. In some it is stronger, in others weaker, in still others it is not at all; but to the fullest extent, so that it cannot be increased, it is in no one as long as man lives here on this earth. But as long as it can be made stronger, that in it which is less than it ought to be comes from a fault. Because of this fault 'there is not a righteous man on earth who does the good and does not sin' (I Kings 8:46). Because of this fault 'no man living will be justified in thy sight' (I John 1:8). Because of this fault 'we deceive ourselves and the truth is not in us when we say that we have no sin.' On account of this fault, it is necessary for us to say, even if we make much progress: 'Forgive us our debts' (Matt. 6:12), even if in baptism everything has been forgiven--all we have said, done and thought."[73]

---

[72]Pauck, p. 135 (Ficker, p. 281:1-4).

[73]Pauck, pp. 142-143 (Ficker, p. 289:1-13). Cf. also, Pauck, p. 168 (Ficker, p. 313:4-13): "Accordingly, the ancient fathers were correct when they taught that it is this original sin which is the 'tinder' of sin, the law of our flesh, the law of our members, the feebleness of our nature, a tyrant, our original disease, etc." For other illustrations of the ancient fathers used against Scholastic reason see Pauck, p. 198 (Ficker, p. 338:1-4); Pauck, p. 213 (Ficker, p. 351:3-13); Pauck, p. 214 (Ficker, p. 352:9-12); Pauck, p. 214 (Ficker, p. 353:5-10); Pauck, p. 215 (Ficker, p. 352:22-30); Pauck, p. 219 (Ficker, p. pp. 215-216 (Ficker, pp. 353:14-354:13); Pauck, p. 252 356:14-16); Pauck, p. 250 (Ficker, p. 384:2-3); and Pauck, p. 252 (Ficker, p. 385:17 and 25).

In addition to the ancient fathers, Luther enlists the support of the saints. As the saints were often cited by the Scholastics in their own behalf, Luther counters with these statements:

> For if the confessions of the saints are to be understood only with respect to their past sins and they show themselves pure in the present, why, then, do they confess not only their past but also their present sins?[74]

> You ask: Why then, is there so much preaching on the merits of the saints? I answer: Their merits are not their own but they are the merits of Christ in them. Because of him God accepts their works; otherwise, he would not accept them. For this reason, they themselves never know whether they deserve or have merits, but they do all their good works only because they want to obtain mercy and escape the judgment. All the while, they pray for forgiveness rather than that they reach presumptuously for a crown. Hence, "God is wonderful in his saints." (Ps. 68:35). He keeps them hidden in such a way that, in being saints, they appear to themselves as common and profane. By the hope of mercy, "their life is thus hid with Christ in God" (Col. 3:3). But by the fear of judgment, their sin and death are manifest all about them and in their own conscience. They always judge themselves in fear because they know that they cannot be righteous before God by their own power. And so they fear the judgment of God in all their doings, as Job says: "I was afraid of all my works, because I know that thou wilt not spare him who fails" (Job 9:28). In order, then, not to despair, they invoke God's mercy in Christ and thus they are heard.[75]

Another group from whom Luther draws counsel and support are the mystics. Most helpful is Gerard Zerbolt whom Luther mistakenly may have identified as Gerard Groote. Luther writes:

---

[74]Pauck, p. 134 (Ficker, pp. 279:32-280:1).

[75]Pauck, p. 144 (Ficker, p. 290:15-29).

> I have found none that treats this theme of original sin so clearly as Gerard Groote in his little tract Blessed is the Man; he speaks there not like a thoughtless philosopher but like a sane theologian.[76]

There are also indications that Luther used John Tauler,[77] Theologia Deutsch,[78] and Dionysius Areopagita[79] and, in taking careful note as to those places within his lectures where Luther gives evidence of mystic influence, the context indicates that it is particularly related to Christian experience, the understanding of it as well as its articulation. Convinced that the mystics describe more accurately Christian realities, Luther profers their devotional material and help to that of a philosophical bent.

Moreover, Luther's confidence is more than aplomb based on the ancient fathers, the saints, and the mystics. In fact the real coup de grace seems to be the accent on experience as measured by personal integrity. Luther had confidence in his own experience, and he asserted that the Christian will "obtain more understanding from life than from doctrine."[80]

---

[76] Pauck, p. 168 (Ficker, p. 313:13-16). See n. 32 in Pauck, p. 168 for the identity of the writer of Blessed is the Man.

[77] Cf. Pauck, pp. 240, 241, and 243, esp. p. 241, n. 47 (Ficker, p. 374:10-11, esp. n. 10; pp. 375:18-19 and 376:22-24).

[78] Cf. Pauck, p. 263, n. 5 (Ficker, p. 391:29-34).

[79] Cf. Pauck, p. 264, n. 9 (Ficker, pp. 392:33-393:3).

[80] Pauck, p. 131 (Ficker, p. 276:19). See A. Skevington Wood (p. 15) who cites Luther: "Experience is necessary for the understanding of the Word. It is not merely to be repeated and known, but to be lived and felt" (p. 15). Wood suggests here a principle of interpretation, namely "experiential interpretation," and goes on to say: "Luther recognizes the Spirit as the sole Interpreter, but he is also aware that the Spirit must communicate Himself to a

To Paul's words, "There is none righteous" (Rom. 3:10), Luther addresses these remarks:

> Here, now, everyone must look out, keep his eyes open, and pay close attention. For the righteous man, whom the apostle here has in mind, is rare indeed. This is because we seldom analyze [discutimus] ourselves so profoundly that we recognize this weakness or, rather, this vicious pest of our will. This is why we humble ourselves so rarely and seldom seek the grace of God in a right way, for, as it says here, we lack understanding. For this disease is so subtle that even the most spiritual man cannot effectively deal with it. The truly righteous, therefore, implore God with groanings for his grace, not only because they see they have an evil will and are thus sinful before God, but also because they see that they cannot possibly ever penetrate and confine the evil of their will.[81]

With this remark as a base in his dialectic with the scholastics, Luther keeps pressing with related statements which call for an honest look within:

> I believe that if we really analyze our heart . . . .[82]

> they fail to search the secrets of their heart . . . .[83]

> A man who is presumptuous enough to think himself capable . . . has not yet come to know himself.[84]

---

receptive medium. His witness is answered by the acquiescing testimony of the regenerate Spirit within. Christian experience Luther regarded as itself the product of the Biblical message, or, rather, of the power of the Holy Spirit mediated through the Scripture." (p. 16). A. Skevington Wood, Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), pp. 15-17.

[81] Pauck, pp. 86-87 (Ficker, p. 235:25-26).

[82] Pauck, p. 87 (Ficker, p. 236:3-4). Credo, quod si recte cor nostrum discutiamus.

[83] Pauck, p. 87 (Ficker, p. 236:16-17). Ommitunt sua secreta rimari.

[84] Pauck, p. 88 (Ficker, p. 237:4-5).

> experience shows (testetur) that in every good we do there remains that concupiscence toward evil, and nobody is free from it, not even an infant a day old.[85]

> And now look (inspice) at man as he actually is, and see how his whole person is full of these sinful desires . . . .[86]

> Fools that they are, they do not notice (attendentes) that the will, even if it could, would never do what the law prescribes . . . . This they certainly must know in their own experience. . . .[87]

> If you do not believe the Scripture and the example it sets forth, believe at least your own (propriae) experience.[88]

> This is why I said that unless one becomes acquainted with it through practical experience, he will never understand it.[89]

Luther adds to these rather general remarks his own personal testimony:

> Fool that I was, I could not understand, in the light of this, in what way I should regard myself as a sinner like others and in what way I should not put myself ahead of anyone, inasmuch as I had contritely made confession of my sins, for I thought that thereby they had been taken away and made of no effect, also inwardly. But if I should regard myself as a sinner like them on account of my past sins which, they say, must always be remembered (and here they speak the truth but not emphatically enough), then, I thought, they are really not forgiven, though God has promised to forgive them to such as confess them. Thus

---

[85] Pauck, p. 127 (Ficker, p. 271:24-27).

[86] Pauck, p. 130 (Ficker, p. 275:22-23).

[87] Pauck, p. 134 (Ficker, p. 279:16-19).

[88] Pauck, p. 145 (Ficker, p. 291:19-20). This is a part of the Scholia from Romans 4:7, "For not through the law was the promise . . . ."

[89] Pauck, pp. 327-328 (Ficker, p. 447:20-21).

> I fought with myself, because I did not know that though forgiveness is indeed real, sin is not taken away except in hope, i.e., that it is in the process of being taken away by the gift of grace which starts this removal, so that it is only not reckoned as sin.[90]

From these statements one can readily sense Luther's concern for personal integrity in looking at one's own Christian experience, and for this reason he does not hesitate in the least to challenge the Scholastics to try through actual experience to fulfill the law's demands. Luther hopes that through their experimenting with such a challenge they too will become a party to the experiences shared by such as Paul, Augustine, Ambrose, the saints, the mystics, and Luther himself. Luther has this kind of confidence; consequently, he challenges the Scholastics to discover the truth of what he is saying:

> Even their own experience could have made them aware of the utter stupidity of this opinion and caused them to be ashamed of themselves and to repent. For willy-nilly they must sense the wrong desires in their own selves. Therefore, I say now: Hui! Go to work, please! Be men! Try with all your powers to eliminate these covetings

---

[90] Pauck, pp. 128-129 (Ficker, p. 274:2-11). James Mackinnon, pp. 174-175, draws this conclusion: "The Commentary is further interesting as an essay in religious psychology. It mirrors the experience of a soul in its quest for God and salvation and the attainment of what it seeks. Here also the standpoint is the experimental, not the philosophic or scientific one. He is repelled by the religious psychology, based on Aristotle, which he regards not only as erroneous, but as leading the soul away from God . . . . Mind, heart, and will are unsound, diseased, in need of healing, which God alone can effect. How the divine grace effects this in justification and regeneration through Christ is the psychological process which he depicts in his experiemental fashion. There is much of himself in this process--so much that the Commentary might be described as an analysis of his own spiritual life." (Italics mine: CLB). See James Mackinnon, "Early Life and Religious Development to 1517," Luther and the Reformation (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925), I, 168-176.

> that are in you! Give proof of what you say, namely, that it is possible to love God "with all one's strength" (Luke 10:27) naturally, in short, without grace! If you have no sinful desires, we will believe you. But if you live in and with them, you no longer fulfill the law. Does not the law say: "You shall not covet" (Ex. 20:17) but "you shall love God" (Deut. 6:5)? Can, then, one who covets and loves something else also love God?[91]

Conclusion

To look at the whole of Luther's argument with the Scholastics, one discovers that the problem all along is that of understanding properly human nature with its inborn traits of "original sin." The Scholastics, because they were basically committed to Aristotelean concepts, interpolated by foisting philosophical concepts upon the Scripture, and in this fashion derived their understanding of human nature. However, Luther not only exposes this hermeneutical practice

---

[91] Pauck, p. 129 (Ficker, p. 275:2-11). Complementing this challenge to the Scholastics, Luther hits his satirical stride as he confronts them with respect to their easily summoned good intentions: "However, I know of some who, inasmuch as they are aware of this, sit down in some corner and say to themselves: I shall arouse in me a 'good intention' and a will if this is what is required. Meanwhile the devil standing behind him laughs in his sleeve and says: "primp yourself, little kitten, here comes company! Then he gets up, goes into the choir to pray, and says: O little owl, how beautiful you are! Where did you get the peacock feathers? If I did not know (to use the language of the fable) that you are an ass, I should think you were a lion--that is how you roar; but go on, wear your lion's skin: your long ears will betray you! Thereupon he gets bored and counts the pages and verses of his prayer book, wondering whether the prayer is almost over, and consoling himself as he says: Scotus proved that a 'virtual intention' is enough and that an actual intention is not required. Then the devil says to him: Fine! You are right! Now you can feel secure!

O God, what a laughing stock we are to our enemies! A good intention is not so easy as that! And (good God!) it is not in your power, O man, to arouse it in yourself as Scotus and the Scotists teach to our very great detriment. It is utterly pernicious for us to presume that we can form 'good intentions' from ourselves as if we were capable of putting anything together in our minds by our power. This would be in contradiction to the clearly expressed judgment of the apostle." (Pauck, pp. 388-389; Ficker, pp. 500:19-501:7).

with its particular presupposition as wrong, but he presents, on his behalf, a Biblical theology with what he considers a correct view of sin, and, important at this point, he validates his claim by summoning the testimony of the ancient fathers, the saints, the mystics, and real life experience as it relates to the Scripture and that which is uniquely Christian.

The Word: A Totally Extraneous Entity and Authority

The third constant follows a pattern similar to the first. Human nature, when confronted by certain phenomena, seems to become aroused and accordingly manifests its carnality. In this instance the particular phenomenon which arouses man to expose his nature is the Word of God, and Luther deals with it by clearly describing the essence of this Word. He also describes carnal man's particular response to that Word, and, in contrast, he describes spiritual or regenerate man's response to the Word.

As to the nature of this Word, Luther first wants to establish it as extraneous, and the very language he uses to describe justification aptly fits the Word:

> For God does not want to save us by our own but by an extraneous righteousness which does not originate in ourselves but comes to us from beyond ourselves, which does not arise on our earth but comes from heaven. Therefore, we must come to know this righteousness which is utterly external and foreign to us.[92]

It is, then, a Word that "comes to us from beyond ourselves." It is a Word "which does not arise on our earth but comes from heaven."

---

[92]Pauck, p. 4 (Ficker, p. 158:10-14).

It is a Word "which is utterly external and foreign to us." The source is God.

Characterization of the Word as totally extraneous, as having no source other than God, calls for documentation. This Luther provides with carefully reasoned and Biblically rooted evidence. His initial statement is based on Paul's claim for the Gospel that God had promised it "beforehand through His prophets in the Holy Scriptures." Luther, in turn, sharply states that merits and the invention of human wisdom "are not the basis of the Gospel," but rather the Gospel "was foreordained in God's counsel to be what it has become."[93] Luther delineates further:

> It is a wonderful sign of God's condescension that, over and above his eternal promise, he gives this pledge in human words, and not only in oral but also in written ones. All this is done in order that, as the promise is fulfilled, they will serve as the evidence that he had planned it so, so that one may recognize that Christianity did not originate by accident or in the fate of the stars (as many empty headed people presume), but that it became what it was to be by the certain counsel and premeditated ordination of God. And, for another reason, he rightly adds: "In the Holy Scriptures." For if he had merely said: "through his prophets," the calumny would be possible that he was adducing the dead who, together with their words, no longer exist. But now he refers and points to their writings which are available to this day.[94]

This same line of thought is picked up by Luther as he discourses on Romans 11:15, "and how shall they preach except they be sent?":

> This is what the apostle emphasizes so strongly in Romans 1:2, lest one think that the gospel came into the world through a man. First, it was promised long before

---

[93] Pauck, p. 11 (Ficker, p. 165:20-21).

[94] Pauck, p. 12 (Ficker, p. 166:5-14).

> it came; it was no new invention. Furthermore, it came into the world not by one but by many, by the prophets of God and not only in form of the spoken word but also in form of the Holy Scriptures.[95]

The Ursprung Luther posits with God, and, he wants it clearly understood that it is a written Word to which one can specifically point. Consistent with his thinking, Luther, who derives his thoughts from Paul in Romans 11:15, stresses that this Word is a sent Word, and consequently those who use it must respect it as just that, a Word sent from God, an authoritative Word:

> Hence, we must see to it, before everything else, that a preacher is sent as John was sent (John 1:6). We can recognize this if he proves by miracles and a testimony from heaven that he was sent (as the apostles were) or if he proves that later he is sent by apostolic authority confirmed from above and that he preaches in humble submission to this authority, always ready to stand under its judgment and to speak only what is commanded to him and not what he likes or has invented.[96]

Further, in stressing the claim that this is a sent Word, Luther brings things into full circle, by coupling man's natural impasse to it, and this Luther does as he discusses Paul's statement, "There is none that understands" (Rom. 3:11):

> none understands . . . because the wisdom of God is hidden and unknown to the world. "And the word was made flesh" (John 1:14) and wisdom incarnate, and thus it was hidden and comprehensible only to proper understanding just as Christ is knowable only by revelation. For this

---

[95]Pauck, p. 297 (Ficker, pp. 422:28-423:4).

[96]Pauck, pp. 296-297 (Ficker, p. 422:10-15).

> reason, people who know only what they see and are knowledgeable only in what is visible . . . . Their wisdom consists of what is within the reach of human inquiry, but not of the knowledge of things that are concealed.[97]

In a corollary from this Scholia on Romans 3:11 Luther writes:

> The understanding of which the apostle here speaks is nothing else than faith itself or the knowledge of things that cannot be seen but must be believed. Thus it is an understanding in concealment, for it is concerned with things that man cannot know by his own resources . . . .[98]

As to its nature, the Word is more than a fulfillment of promise, and there is more to it than simply to say it is a sent Word. It is also a needed Word. As already indicated by Luther, man empirically cannot come up with anything like the Word, for he is not capable. Consequently, Luther says that because man is flesh, carnal, and in sin, God must make Himself known:

> Hence, all knowledge and virtue and whatever good we desire and search for in reliance upon our natural possibilities will turn out to be evil kinds of good, because they are not measured according to God's standard (Quia non in Deum referunter, Sed in creaturam, i. e. in seipsum) . . . . How can man know him if, by fault of the first sin, he is bound to darkness in all his thinking and feeling? (Quamodo nosset, qui vitio peccati primi in tenebris et vinculis quod intellectum et affectumest?)[99]

As a consequence man needs an extraneous revelation; and God has

---

[97] Pauck, p. 89 (Ficker, p. 237:20-28).

[98] Pauck, p. 90 (Ficker, pp. 238:27-239:2).

[99] Pauck, p. 218 (Ficker, p. 355:22-24).

provided it in the Holy Scriptures.[100] Luther concludes:

> Therefore, just as the wisdom of God is hidden under the disguise of foolishness and truth under the form of a lie, so also the word of God comes, whenever it comes, in a form that is contrary to our own thinking insofar as it pretends to have the truth by and from itself.[101]

The natural man's disposition toward the Word: the wisdom of the flesh.

To have demonstrated that the Word is totally extraneous is one thing: How man will respond to that Word is another. Luther proposes that man's response to the Word of God is hinged to his basic human nature, and along with Paul he defines the disposition that egresses from this nature as the "wisdom of the flesh" (Romans 8).

Throughout his commentary on Romans, Luther develops the phenomenology of this wisdom of the flesh. As shown earlier, natural man is entirely turned in upon himself.[102] This is the starting point.

---

[100]Pauck, p. 289 (Ficker, p. 415:23). B. A. Gerrish "concedes that Luther never really questioned the traditional theory of inerrant Scripture and speaks of 'his strict view of verbal inspiration.'" A. Skevington Wood relates this statement and judgment in his Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation (London: The Tyndale Press, 1960), p. 13. These lectures of Luther on Romans support Gerrish's judgment, e.g., "In the prophetic books, the term 'voice' means unconditionally 'the voice of the Lord' in the sense that we must receive, believe, and acknowledge every spoken word, regardless of who speaks it, as if it were spoken by God himself . . . ." (Pauck, p. 106; Ficker, p. 253: 16-17). See also Luther's discussion on total respect for the total word. Pauck, pp. 100-106 (Ficker, pp. 246:18-253:20), esp. pp. 102 (Ficker, p. 249:20-24) and 105 (Ficker, p. 252:6-13).

[101]Pauck, p. 327 (Ficker, p. 446:31-33). Luther also says that from God's point of view the Word is the means God has chosen to heal man. Per sermonem enim suum eos curare instituit. (Pauck, p. 69; Ficker, p. 217:18-19).

[102]Pauck, p. 218 (Ficker, p. 355:22-24).

Then, when confronted with words, or realities, that challenge this nature of his, the dynamics of his nature manifest themselves.[103] Luther, in a lengthy discussion of Romans 8:7, "the wisdom of the flesh is an enemy of God," begins with this definitive statement of the "prudence of the flesh:"

> The "prudence of the flesh" chooses what is to selfish advantage and it avoids what is harmful to the self. Moreover, it rejects the common good and chooses what harms the common spirit. This is the prudence that directs the flesh, i.e., concupiscence and self-will. It enjoys only itself and uses everyone else, even God; it seeks itself and its own interest in everything; it brings it about that man is finally and ultimately concerned only for himself. This is the idolatry that determines all he does, feels, undertakes, thinks and speaks. God is only what is good for him and bad only what is bad for him.
>
> In the Scriptures, the curvedness, depravity, and wickedness are exposed many times under the names of fornication and idolatry. As we have said in connection with the sixth chapter of this letter, they are in the hidden depths of our nature, indeed, they are nature itself insofar as it is

---

[103] Cf. Supra, p. 59. In the Lectures on Romans the Dynamics associated with the "wisdom of the flesh" are described not only as they relate to righteousness and works, but as they show themselves in relationship to the "will of God"; Pauck, p. 253 (Ficker, pp. 386:24-387:2); Pauck, p. 268 (Ficker, pp. 396:9-397:5); Pauck, p. 327 (Ficker, pp. 446:26-447:20); to "predestination"; Pauck, pp. 251-253 (Ficker, pp. 395:1-396:22); to "prayer"; Pauck, pp. 347-350 (Ficker, pp. 465:26-469:12); to "one's neighbor"; Pauck, p. 203 (Ficker, p. 342:4-5); Pauck, p. 221 (Ficker, p. 358:1-8); Pauck, p. 344 (Ficker, pp. 462:13-463:3); to "himself"; Pauck, pp. 261-265 (Ficker, pp. 390:13-394:5); Pauck, p. 266 (Ficker, pp. 394:28-395:7); Pauck, pp. 407-408 (Ficker, pp. 517:14-518:21); to "chastity"; Pauck, pp. 2-3 (Ficker, pp. 341:33-342:3); to "ethical issues"; Pauck, pp. 407-408 (Ficker, pp. 517:14-518:21); to "work"; Pauck, p. 345 (Ficker, pp. 463:16-464:14); to "love"; Pauck, p. 262 (Ficker, pp. 390:23-391:1).

> wounded and in ferment through and through--and this to such an extent that, without grace, it is not only incurable but also wholly unrecognizable.[104]

Luther, as he continues his discussion of the "wisdom of the flesh," gives careful analysis to this dynamic within man. He reminds his students that "the fruit does not produce the tree, but the tree the fruit."[105] Further, Luther enlists the support of Aristotle:

> Works and actions do not produce virtue, as Aristotle says, but virtues determine actions, as Christ teaches. For a second act presupposes the first one, and the prerequisite of an action is substance and power just as there is no effect without a cause. (et operatio prerequirit substantiam et virtutem et effectus causam.)[106]

Luther also identifies this drive within man as "human nature" (natura),[107] and a natural ferment (fermentata natura),[108] but to this drive Luther adds information as to "the objects of concern . . . the objects of 'its inordinate enjoyment'" to which human nature attaches itself.[109] He speaks of them as stages (gradus),[110] and they are eight in number:

External goods:	riches	parents	relatives
	power	friends	children
	honors	family	wife

---

[104]Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, p. 361:11-22).

[105]Pauck, p. 228 (Ficker, p. 364:16-17).

[106]Pauck, p. 228 (Ficker, p. 364:17-20). Supra, p. 59 for an earlier discussion on the "power" (virtutem), or dynamic.

[107]Pauck, p. 226 (Ficker, p. 362:24).

[108]Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, p. 361:21).

[109]Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, p. 361:23-24).

[110]Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, p. 361:23).

Physical goods:	health	strength	beauty	
Goods of the soul:	talent	memory	intelligence	prudence
Knowledge and skills:	physical mental	virtues	natural acquired	
Corporal (human) wisdom such as:		liberal arts philosophy		
Intellectual wisdom:	in the knowledge of and with respect to the mysteries of:		Scripture Creation	
Affectional grace:	in righteousness, devotions, the gifts of the Spirit, meditations			

God in so far as he is known in his divine attributes.[111]

These "gifts," as Luther calls them, "God has given to us men, clothing us, as it were, in a garment of many folds." "To these," Luther notes, the "'wisdom of flesh' clings."

> To be sure, not all men range over all of them, nor are all equally interested in the same one of them, but one is more and another less, versed in one and the same; and the other in only a few. Man, I say, turns all of them to himself, seeks his own good in them, and horribly makes an idol out of them.[112]

Luther calls them "eight big traps,"[113] but if one divides them into their parts they become many. Within the context of his presentation Luther dwells basically only with the first named, "External Goods." However, what is listed as "Intellectual wisdom in the knowledge of (cognitione) and with respect to the mysteries of Scripture

---

[111] Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, pp. 361:25-362:11).

[112] Pauck, p. 226 (Ficker, p. 362:13-17).

[113] Luther's analogy of "traps" comes from Psalm 25:15, "He will pluck my feet out of the snare," and Psalm 91:3, "the snare of the fowler."

(and) Creation"[114] finds development elsewhere in the lectures as the following examples will point out.

For example, in his discussion of Romans 2:22, "you that abhor idols commit sacrilege," Luther demonstrates how man with his "prudence of the flesh" treats the Word of God. Defining "sacrilege" as "theft of the holy," Luther proposes that the Jews become guilty of sacrilege in a twofold way. The one, a generalization, showed itself in "withdrawing their mind from the truth and the spirit by relying on their own understanding."[115] The other, the particularization, charges that they took

> the letters and the words of Scripture, which is not only holy but the Holy of Holies, and distorted them by giving them a false meaning, and thus they cast and carved them into a spiritual idol . . . . But, in the eyes of the apostle, sacrilege is worse than idolatry, because to invent something erroneous is not so great a sin as to put a false meaning on Scriptures, i.e., to disregard the holy."[116]

A frequent category used by Luther is the "right" and "left," the "right hand" and the "left hand." The "left" usually fits the libertine, the philistine, the "couldn't-care-less" type, and the "right" fits the morally upright, the Pharisee, the self-righteous.

---

[114]Pauck, p. 225 (Ficker, p. 362:7-8).

[115]Pauck, pp. 57-58 (Ficker, p. 207:22-23). primo cor proprium et animum auferentes a veritate et spiritu et in suum sensum transferentes.

[116]Pauck, p. 58 (Ficker, pp. 207:24-208:8). A related comment is found in the Scholia on Romans 3:4: "For our human wisdom does not only refuse to believe and obey the words of God, it also thinks that they are not words of God; it even believes itself to have the words of God and presumes to have truth." (Pauck, p. 64; Ficker, p. 212:30-32).

Each represents a thought pattern peculiar to itself. The dualism is succinctly expressed in the Scholion for Romans 3:11, "There is none that seeks God":

> Hence the godless on the left have no understanding because in their vain desiring they are blinded by what is immediately within their reach. And those on the right have no understanding because they are ensnared in the conceit of their own wisdom and righteousness. And thus they shut themselves out from the divine light.[117]

Again Luther asks:

> How can the godless at the left and people who are bound to the senses possibly know this, in view of the fact that they put so much value on what can be seen? And how can the others at the right, in view of the fact that they consider and ponder so much the insights of their own minds?[118]

In one of the corollaries that develops out of "there is none that understands; there is none that sees God" (Rom. 3:11), Luther continues to stress the right and the left as it relates to Revelation:

> The godless at the left . . . rarely err so profoundly that "they say in their heart: There is no God." (Ps. 14:1). They know of God and his commandments, but it is through their whole way of life that they say: "There is no God." What they tell us about him is not true: therefore there is no truth and no God.
>
> Those at the right . . . too, say this with words and deeds but chiefly with their heart, because they do not really know God but picture him to themselves as they like. Therefore, they do not hear what God says

---

[117] Pauck, p. 90 (Ficker, p. 238:17-20). Igitur Sinistrales Impii non intelligunt, quia visibilibus in vanitate concupiscentiae obcaecantur. Dextrales vero non intelligunt, quia in sensu proprio de sapientia et Iustitia sua impediuntur. Et sic sibiipsis sunt obex Lucis diuinae.

[118] Pauck, p. 91 (Ficker, p. 239:5-8).

> nor know about it, but they think and assert that they have the word of God and demand to be listened to. This is how they go wrong in their heart and so, when they hear the voice of God, they harden their hearts as if it were not God's voice and as if it were not God speaking. And this because the voice of God speaks against everything they produce from their own mind (which seems so right and wise and filled with the things of God) . . . . They deny the truth and become fools precisely because they claim to know everything.[119]

Again the definition of the Hebrew word rasha, "ungodliness" (Psalm 32), used by Paul in Romans 4, aptly fits:

> This is the vice of pride which becomes apparent when one denies God's truth and righteousness, practices self-righteousness and dogmatically asserts one's own wisdom. It makes people godless, heretical, schismatic, eccentric, and individualistic or particularistic.[120]

Paul's question in Romans 10:6, "Who shall ascend into heaven?" gives Luther the opportunity to discuss the nature of the Word, and natural man's response to that Word:

> For the whole life of the old man is concentrated in the thinking or mind or wisdom and prudence of the flesh just as the life of the serpent is centered in its head . . . .
>
> This is why unbelievers are contentious and always take offense at the word of faith. For when they are asked to have faith, they demand visible proof, because, in their presumptuousness, they think that they are able to tell what is right and that all others are mistaken. It is absolutely certain that Adam and the old man are still alive in a man who does not yield and who thinks that he is always right.[121]

To show further, how natural man exercises "projection" upon the

---

[119] Pauck, pp. 91, 92 (Ficker, pp. 239:26-240:12).

[120] Pauck, p. 138 (Ficker, p. 284:5-8).

[121] Pauck, p. 290 (Ficker, p. 416:9-11;14-18).

Scripture, Luther, in reference to Romans 11:9, "Let their table be made a snare," defines "snare" as the "Scripture itself, insofar as it is understood and handed down in a deceitful manner."[122] He then goes on to describe how and why this projection works:

> Now, what they take offense at is the truth that is held up before them. But they turn away from it, and if they cannot escape from it, they distort it and deny that it must be understood as they are told. The "snare," therefore, means . . . the "stumbling block" that they turn away from what is held up before them as true and from everything that goes counter to their own conceit.[123]

A final statement clearly sets forth the full thrust of this third constant. The Word is, in its essence, an extraneous entity and authority, and in no way will it change. Consequently, Luther through Paul's influence (Rom. 1:17-18) says that it is not the Word that will change its nature rather, man must change his nature and conform to the Word.

> For the wisdom of the flesh is hostile to the word of God, but the word of God is immutable and insuperable. Therefore, the wisdom of the flesh must undergo a change; it must give up its own form and take on the form of the word. This happens when by faith it yields and undoes itself and conforms itself to the word, believing that the word is true and it itself untrue.[124]

The attitude of the spiritual man: the wisdom of the Spirit

The morphology of Luther's thought becomes increasingly apparent. There is an extraneous Word and there must be, yet natural man meets

---

[122]Pauck, p. 309 (Ficker, p. 432:12,21).

[123]Pauck, p. 310 (Ficker, p. 433:8-12).

[124]Pauck, p. 188 (Ficker, pp. 329:27-330:1).

this good and healing Word of God with hostility and adverse judgment. Indeed, Luther's writings reveal that a libidinous type of disposition is inherent in man, owing to Adam, a disposition that is thoroughly self-centered and using everything, God, His word, people, all things to selfish, self-protecting ends. In fact, Luther states that "the 'prudence of the flesh' has an amazing sense for its own advantage."[125] But Luther goes on to say: "The will of a superior, even if it causes loss, is better than that of a disobedient underling, even if it brings advantage."[126]

The nature of that "loss" or, as stated above, the "change," the "giving up," that the natural man must experience through faith, requires examination at this point, and what is found is that Luther prescribes something akin to "radical surgery." In fact, his prescription ultimately parallels that of Paul's. Luther, too, calls for a death to the carnal self.

In the first of his Scholia in which he is elaborating on Paul's purpose in writing, Luther states:

> As Christ says through the prophet Jeremiah: "to pluck up and to break down and to destroy and to overthrow" (Jer. 1:10), namely, everything that is in us (i.e., all that pleases us because it comes from ourselves). . . .[127]

In connection with Romans 3:22 in which Paul speaks of "faith in Jesus Christ," Luther says that the phrase "'faith in Christ' must be

---

[125] Pauck, p. 407 (Ficker, p. 518:1-2).

[126] Pauck, p. 407 (Ficker, p. 518:2-3).

[127] Pauck, p. 4 (Ficker, p. 158:6-8).

understood to mean faith in Christ and in the word of anyone through whom he speaks." He then goes on to speak of the "cutting out" that is called for:

> We must, therefore, try to avoid being so definitely set in our own thinking that at some time we become perhaps unable to believe in Christ because we do not realize when, where, and through whom he speaks to us . . . . i.e., you must at all times and places be ready to listen and keep listening; you must do nothing else than listen with humility in order that you may be taught . . . .[128]

Romans 6:2 which includes "we that are dead to sin" receives this exegesis:

> For the Lord hates the body of sin and gets ready to remake it into another one; therefore he also commands us to hate and destroy and mortify it and to pray for its end and "the coming of his Kingdom" (Matt. 6:10).[129]

Romans 6:4 which declares that "we are buried together with" Christ is applied by Luther to the spiritual man:

> First of all, when he was dead, Christ no longer sensed anything of what was happening outside, even though he was still outside. So it is also with the spiritual man; though with his senses he may be aware of all things and involved in them, he is totally withdrawn from them in his heart and dead to them. This is what happens when a man thoroughly detests everything that belongs to this life, nay, rather, when feeling distaste for the whole business of this life, he endures it with joy and glories in the fact that he is like a dead corpse and "the offscouring and the filth of this world" (I Cor. 4:13), as the apostle says.[130]

In another context (Romans 9:28) Luther explicitly states that

---

[128]Pauck, pp. 109-110 (Ficker, p. 256:8-9,11-14 and 21-22).

[129]Pauck, p. 178 (Ficker, p. 321:16-18).

[130]Pauck, p. 181 (Ficker, p. 324:9-15).

"the flesh and the wisdom of the flesh are in no way capable of comprehending the righteousness and wisdom of God." By implication, the alternative to the "wisdom of the flesh," the "wisdom of the Spirit," holds this frame of mind:

> For no one can receive the word of Christ unless he abjures everything else and rids himself of it, i.e., unless he humbly surrenders also the sovereignty of his reason and his whole mind. (Quia Verbum Christi Non potest suscipe Nisi abnegatis et precisis omnibus, i.e., etiam intellectu captiuato et omni sensu humiliter submisso.) But because most people, persisting in their pride, do not take hold of the word or, rather, are not taken hold of by it, hardly a remnant is saved; the word is cut short in those who perish and consumated in those who believe.[131]

A similar thought is expressed by Luther as he expounds on Romans 10:15, "How shall they preach except they be sent?":

> Now the word which the heretics preach gives them great satisfaction because it sounds as they want it to sound. They aim at the highest religiousness (so it seems to them). And so their own thinking remains unchanged and their will unbroken. For the word does not come to them counter to or beyond what they think but according to their own ideas, as if they were its equal or even its judges.
>
> But, in reality, the word of God comes, when it comes, in opposition to our thinking and wishing. It does not let our thinking prevail, even in what is most sacred

---

[131]Pauck, p. 280 (Ficker, p. 408:23-28). The entire Scholia on Romans 9:28, "For the Lord shall consumate his word and cut it short in righteousness" deals with the problem at hand (in his exposition Luther uses the allegorical and tropological method). "For because the word of the Spirit pronounces a 'No' upon all pride and self-will, it must equally pronounce a 'No' also upon all who are proud and sufficient to themselves in their own knowledge, and it must cut itself off from them." Thus the tropological "abridgement" implies the allegorical one. (Pauck, p. 280; Ficker, p. 408:30-33). N. B. Quia enim Verbum spiritus abnegat omnem superbiam ac sensum proprium, ideo pariter necesse est abneget et prescindatur ab omnibus quoque superbis ac proprie sapientibus (Ficker, p. 408:30-32).

> to us, but it destroys and uproots and scatters everything. As we read in Jer. 1:10 and 23:29: "Are not my words as fire and as a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces?" . . . the word of God "crushes the rock"; it destroys and crucifies all our self-satisfaction and leaves in us only dissatisfaction with ourselves. Thus it teaches us to have pleasure, joy, and confidence in God alone and to find happiness and well-being outside ourselves or in our neighbor.[132]

In his discussion of Paul's statement in Romans 15:4, "that through patience and the comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope," Luther sums up the matter in these words:

> To give up all tangible reality for mere words and the Scripture--this is something great. Not everyone is able to do this, but only those who have died to all tangible things, at least in feeling, even though actually they do use them, but then because of necessity, not voluntarily. These are the Christians who have heard the saying of their Master: "Every one of you that does not renounce all that he possesses cannot be my disciple!" (Luke 14:33). "They use the world as if they used it not" (I.Cor. 7:31) and they do good as if they did it not. Everything they do is dedicated to God; they serve him in everything and seek nothing for themselves.[133]

In an explicit discussion on the word and man's attitude towards the word, Luther comments this:

> Only faith can accomplish this. It extinguishes all the wisdom of the flesh and all insistence on knowledge and makes one ready to be taught and led and willing to listen and to yield. For God does not require a magnitude of works but the mortification of the old man in us. But he cannot be mortified except by faith, which humbles our self-will (sensum proprium) and subjects it to another (subiicit alterius).[134]

---

[132] Pauck, p. 298 (Ficker, p. 423:15-23,29-33).

[133] Pauck, pp. 410-411 (Ficker, p. 520:9-16). Complementing settings can also be found on pp. 160 (Ficker, p. 305:7-20); 215 (Ficker, p. 353:1-4); 240-241 (Ficker, pp. 375:6-376:2); 255 (Ficker, p. 288:10-28); 291 (Ficker, p. 417:9-12); 294 (Ficker, p. 419:8-18).

[134] Pauck, p. 290 (Ficker, p. 416:8).

Necessity of the Holy Spirit

With respect to the fourth constant Luther does not offer a systematic treatment of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the lectures on Romans. But in references he points out how necessary the Holy Spirit is in helping man at last to see himself as the self-seeking, self-centered, and manipulatory being he is. It is necessary for the Holy Spirit to work in a person in order to free him from the "wisdom of the flesh" and to bring him under the "wisdom of the Spirit" so that, because of the latter, he will maintain a proper disposition towards the Scripture. Furthermore, the Holy Spirit serves as agent behind the Scriptures.

Luther gives no precise theological proposition concerning the doctrine of the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. However, he uses the names of writers, such as David or Paul, interchangeably with the Holy Spirit. Thus he indicates his understanding of the "whence" of Scriptures. At one time Luther says: "We must, therefore, in faith believe that what the Spirit says in this Psalm is true . . . ."[135] At another: "This is why the Holy Spirit enjoins (principit)," and then he proceeds to quote Psalm 45:11.[136] He says that the Spirit uses these negative statements "in identifying the source for Hosea 3:14 and Romans 6:3."[137] When Faber suggests in his commentary that the text

---

[135]Pauck, p. 99 (Ficker, p. 247:11-12).

[136]Pauck, p. 110 (Ficker, p. 256:20).

[137]Pauck, p. 180 (Ficker, p. 323:19).

of Romans 6:17 should be changed, Luther responds by saying: "I believe that the Spirit . . . spoke intentionally in the way of the text."[138] On Romans 12:6 Luther comments:

> It is strange, indeed, that there is not more concern among us for such an important teaching of so great an apostle, a teaching which is manifestly that of the Holy Spirit.[139]

Another facet of the Holy Spirit with which Luther works relates to repentance. Understanding repentance in a thological sense, as a change of mind or appetite, the movement from the "wisdom of the flesh" to the "wisdom of the Spirit," one can see that, to Luther, this dramatic and real change, namely repentance, is effected only by the Holy Spirit. Moreover, it is of critical significance when one is mindful that the "wisdom of the Spirit" breeds an entirely different disposition. Luther writes as follows concerning the source of a proper spiritual understanding:

> For no one can think rightly about God unless the Spirit of God is in him. Apart from him, he will speak and judge wrongly about whatever may come under his judgment--God's righteousness or mercy, himself or others. For the Spirit of God must give testimony to our spirit.[140]

---

[138] Pauck, p. 188 (Ficker, p. 329:26-27). A similar statement is found on p. 299, with the phrase, "of them that preach the Gospel" (Ficker, pp. 424:27-425:5).

[139] Pauck, p. 333 (Ficker, p. 452:3-4). Luther, however, does not limit his comments only to those who write the Scripture and to what they wrote. He is more inclusive, for example: "In his 'Sermon on the Annunciation,' Blessed Bernard, filled with the Holy Spirit, shows" and "Neither Blessed Jerome nor the Septuagint nor the Spirit wanted to say this." Bernard: Pauck, p. 234 (Ficker, p. 369:28). Jerome: p. 413 (Ficker, p. 521:28-29).

[140] Pauck, pp. 33-34 (Ficker, p. 186:1-5).

In his reflections on the verse in which Paul contrasts "newness of spirit" and "oldness of the letter," (Romans 7:6) Luther associates "oldness of the letter" with the absence of the Holy Spirit. Luther asserts that for one who learned or memorized the Gospel or Moses, "it is merely an empty letter and the soul's death," if "the Spirit of Grace is not present."

In a similar vein, Luther scores the "proud" who

> care nothing about the Spirit from which this understanding must proceed and about the method by which the Spirit wants to be understood. Therefore, Isaiah says rightly in the eleventh chapter, not that "wisdom" but that "the spirit of wisdom shall rest upon him," (Isaiah 11:2). For only the Spirit understands the Scriptures rightly and in accordance with God.[141]

To substantiate his claims concerning the Holy Spirit, Luther lays emphasis on experience:

> How this can be, can easily be stated in words, but only the Holy Spirit can actually bring it about and only one who experienced it has any knowledge of it.[142]

Or,

> The problem is solved in the following way: the apostle speaks in the Spirit; he can therefore be understood only by those who are in the Spirit.[143]

---

[141] Pauck, p. 195 (Ficker, p. 336:7-10). Two other supporting statements can be found on pp. 233-234 (Ficker, pp. 368:3-369:3) and p. 262 (Ficker, pp. 390:23-391:24).

[142] Pauck, p. 226 (Ficker, p. 363:2-3).

[143] Pauck, p. 78 (Ficker, p. 228:12-13).

Or, concerning "The way of peace they have not known" (Rom. 3:17):

> Why have they not known it? Because, inasmuch as it is peace in the Spirit, it is concealed and hidden in much tribulation . . . . But under these tribulations there is concealed a peace that no one knows unless he experiences it in faith.[144]

And, finally, for the all important work of the mortification of the flesh, the work of the Holy Spirit is necessary:

> "To be led by the Spirit of God" means freely, promptly, gladly to mortify the flesh, i.e., the old man in us, i.e., to despise and renounce all that is not God, even ourselves. It means "not to be afraid of death or of its friends, the savage race of penalties" and "to give up the vain joys of earth and its dirty, sordid fields" and readily to abandon all good things and to embrace evils instead. This is not an achievement of nature but of the Spirit of God in us.[145]

Conclusions

As one observes Luther at work in his study of Paul's letter to the Romans, he soon recognizes that Luther demonstrates certain basic convictions, tantamount to general laws, and that dominant among these is his doctrine of man.

Thus, for Luther, man is to be seen as an ever active individual who has endless psychic, moral, and spiritual energies. Man in his

---

[144] Pauck, p. 98 (Ficker, p. 246:12-13;16-17).

[145] Pauck, p. 230 (Ficker, p. 336:14-19). Luther also states: "The cause . . . is the light of the Spirit . . . . For man knows himself only if God is his light. Apart from him, he cannot know himself at all; apart from him, he, therefore, is also not displeased with himself." p. 308 (Ficker, p. 431:25-28), Cf. also p. 79 (Ficker, p. 229:22-26), and p. 86 (Ficker, pp. 234:22-235:2).

essential nature displays a self-limiting role. There are things beyond him which he is unable to know and to achieve with respect to God, himself, and his neighbor. He also plays an aggressive self-centered role wherein all things, God as well as the Scriptures, can be and will be bent or used to man's own selfish advantage.

Secondly, and as a symptomatic expression of man as self-limited and as an energetic, self-centered being, man as a philosopher will not surrender to the Scriptures, God's own self-revelation. Man, in the person of Scholastic theologians, wants to project an alien structure upon the Scripture, and he does this, in Luther's judgment, because he fails to understand himself; therefore, he will fail to understand his God, as well as the necessity for a Revelation and resignation to that Revelation.

Thirdly, Scripture is to be viewed as an extraneous entity that has its source and direction from the Lord, through the Holy Spirit. To this "sent" or "revealed" Word man's response varies. With carnal nature, only, man distorts or reconstructs this Word to fit his own judgments. He needs to realize that this Word will not change and is not to be changed, but that man himself is to change by becoming a regenerate being, a spiritual being, one who will hold a totally positive attitude toward the Word.

Fourthly, with man being what he is and the Word being what it is, a mediating party is necessary, and this is the Holy Spirit. Consequently man must yield, surrender, give up, and allow a divine work to be worked in him.

CHAPTER V

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In an age of adventure when a new world was discovered by Columbus, and when scholars were rediscovering philological tools for learning, Luther entered into a world of theological discovery and adventure. In the lectures that Luther gave on the letter of Paul to the Romans, one witnesses a university professor at work with the help of fresh linguistic tools for unlocking Greek and Hebrew that open up new vistas of Biblical thought. Luther shows himself as a scholar using not only the traditional tools of learning and lecturing, but also the Greek New Testament edited by Erasmus in 1516. Improved skill in the understanding of Greek and Hebrew, and a text in the original Biblical language helped Luther to reflect more accurately on the Scripture.

The lectures indicate that Luther was entering into the discipline associated with modern exegesis, such as, the use of the original language, word studies and definitions, and literary and thought structure. He demonstrated a profound grasp of the Scripture, both the Old and New Testament. He used a large number of sources, some one hundred in his exposition. These sources represent quite an historical sweep. Some were secular but most were religious in outlook. Some were from the Early Church Fathers, particularly Augustine on whom Luther leaned so much. Others were more contemporary. Some were rather philosophically minded, or totally metaphysical in outlook. Others like the mystics manifested a piety and reverence for the sacred. All of these made some degree of impact on Luther.

Moreover, Luther displayed a dependence on the Scripture, recognizing the Scripture as its own interpreter Scriptura sui ipsius interpres. He accounts for this constant dependence on the Scripture by showing that it is far more than a response in faith to Scripture's own claim to authority. By his consistent and unyielding presentation of his thoughts on the nature of man, Luther also shows cause why such dependence is necessary and why the Word must be an efficacious Word that transforms men.

This thesis has been sharply delimited as to method and source material, but a number of questions suggest themselves for further examination. What, for example, was the specific nature of much of Luther's formal schooling? Curiosity is keen with respect to the nature and content of the lexicon, grammars, and the primary and secondary source materials which the Renaissance scholars provided Luther and his times. One wonders about the extent of the effect of the Occamist school of theology on Luther, and the absence of Thomas Acquinas' influence. Augustine's impact on Luther was extensive, but did it remain so? What of the exegete-theologians and their direct influence on Luther? How great was it? How determinative was the influence on Luther by the mystics through their devotional writings? How significant was the tropological method on Luther's pragmatic accent in Biblical interpretation?

Finally, since the lectures on Paul's letter to the Romans are among his earliest, one becomes extremely curious as to their place in Luther's growth pattern. To what extent did the interpretations expressed in connection with Romans change? Or, was Luther's theology crystalized at

this point? What of his stance toward the Word itself? How much of Luther's theological conviction comes from Paul and out of Paul's letter to the Romans? There is no evidence of any critical attitude in the lectures on Romans, such as a canon within a canon, or remarks like "epistle of straw." Thus the question arises: at what point did such critical thinking enter, and how does it relate to the implied mood of the lectures of 1515-1516?

After an inductive examination of Luther's lectures on Paul's letter to the Romans, one can form certain propositions. There is some hesitation to absolutize, since Luther in these lectures is not giving explicit directions as to how to interpret the Scripture. He was not writing about hermeneutics. Nonetheless he clearly demonstrates certain principles in the natural course of his exposition.

1. The initial proposition is that first hand observation is desired. One should work with the primary source and with the original languages, striving constantly for accuracy. Then the Interpreter can be independently creative, and not dependent upon secondary sources that might be in error.
2. Logic is also to be a part of the Interpreter's discipline. By training he should understand the rules of logic so that he will not only be logical in his own presentation, but can also assess the logic of others. With respect to Biblical teaching and Christian experience, the limitations of logic should be manifest. Logic is to be an analytical tool, and

a helpful means of expressing one's thoughts.

3. The Interpreter does well to be aware of the full historical sweep of expositors and exposition which bears upon his subject. He does not limit his reading to what his own generation says. He is aware of what his own generation says, but he is also aware of what past generations have experienced and stated. He includes in his reading those with whom he agrees as well as disagrees. He reads secular literature as well as religious. He reads those works based on Revelation as well as those of a metaphysical or philosophical nature. He lets himself be influenced by the mystics as well as the coldly intellectual. He is aware of all levels of life and reality as he is able. He is sensitive, forward, and candid about presupposition, particularly his own, Sola Scriptura. He commits himself to a "universal" experience peculiar to all men, and a universal "Christian experience" peculiar to the Biblical era and the era of the Christian church. The past is relevant.

With such a variety of resources within his thought, the Interpreter can achieve greater understanding. His experiences can be confirmed as valid, or they can be challenged. In response to challenge, there can be correction, if necessary. There can then

be certainty, and it must be granted that thorough and long schooling, both academic and experiential is necessary to produce this kind of Interpreter.

4. A significant part of interpretation will depend on the Interpreter's doctrine of man, and the source from which this doctrine of man is derived. It will be a matter of how creativity is viewed. Can one create "new," or can he only creatively interpret his own experience, delineating this experience for the totally egocentric and thus restricted dynamic that it represents? Is he to recognize that he can only creatively respond to and articulate God's approach to man as he, the Interpreter, experiences it and reads of it in the Scriptures and in the witness of others in the Christian Church through the ages?

To declare that man represents a closed universe and that he has other severe limitations which necessitate, therefore, that God act in history, places peculiar problems before the Interpreter and calls for a particular response. The Interpreter, according to Luther, must realize that his basic posture is to be one of faith, humility, reverence, and repentance.

Faith, in that it is constantly aware that it is God who has proclaimed the Word, prompts the Interpreter to hear the Word and respond. Faith, in that the Interpreter puts his mind to work at its greatest capacity in order to

comprehend and articulate the word of God (opus dei). But faith requires humility to effect a check and balance system for the dynamics which come from his human nature.

Humility, in that he is well aware of what he is. The Interpreter, in faith, puts to death anything that comes from himself, and he is alive only to that which has come to him in Revelation.

Humility in that he surrenders to one criterion, Sola Scriptura, and from that one authority, supported by related experiences, he derives his presuppositions. God has made the moves in history to redeem man and this work of God is recorded in the Scripture through the Holy Spirit for all of history to read.

Reverence, in that it is God who has acted and about whom the Scriptures speak. The Interpreter will let God be as He presents Himself, particularly through Jesus Christ, and he, the Interpreter, will but constantly remain the child of God listening to the Father's word.

Repentance, in that he sheds "the wisdom of the flesh" and all that such wisdom bestows upon him and takes on himself an entirely new form--one that is patterned after God, and Him alone.

5. Lastly, there is the final focus of the Interpreter. For Luther it was "the apostle . . . the apostle . . . the apostle." To hear the apostle was to hear the word of

Christ. The word Luther heard was the Word Luther would have all students of the Scripture hear. It was a word that spoke of human nature and of grace. The last word summarizes best what Luther wants to say and what he thinks the Scripture says:

> For grace sets before itself no other object than God to whom it is moved and directs itself; it sees him alone; it seeks him alone and moves toward him in all things, and everything else it sees in between itself and God it passes by as if it did not see it, and simply turns to God. This is what it means to have a "right heart" (Ps. 7:10; 78:37) and a "right spirit" (Ps. 51:10).
>
> Nature, on the other hand, sets before itself no other object than the self, to which it is moved and directs itself; it sees and seeks only itself and aims at itself in everything; everything else, even God himself, it bypasses as if it did not see it, and turns to itself. This is what it means to have a "perverse" and "wicked" heart (Ps. 101:4; Prov. 27:21).[1]

---

[1] Pauck, p. 219 (Ficker, p. 356:22-30).

gelizare/Nō em̄ erubesco euangeliū. Virtus em̄ dei est in
salutē omni credenti: iudæo primū & græco. Iustitia em̄
dei in eo reuelat ex fide in fidem: sicut scriptū ē: Iustus
aūt ex fide uiuit/Reuelatur em̄ ira dei de cælo sup omnē
impietatē & iniūstitiā hominū. corū qui veritatem dei in
iniustitia detinent: quia qđ notum est dei/manifestum
est in illis. Deus em̄ illis mānifestauit. Inuisibilia em̄ ipius
a creatura mūdi per ea quæ facta sunt/intellecta conspi/
ciunt: sempiterna quoq; eius virtus & diuinitas/ita ut
sint inexcusabiles. Quia cū cognouissent deū/non sicut
deū glorificauerūt aut grās egerūt: sed euanuerūt in co/
gitationibus suis: & obscuratū est insipiens cor eorum.
Dicentes em̄ se esse sapientes/stulti facti sunt. Et mūta
uerūt gloria incorruptibilis dei/in similitudinē imaginis

Berlin, Staatsbibl. 64 theol. qu. 21 A Gl. zu 1, 16ff.

An Illustration of the Gloss and Luther's Special Printing Arrangement

rere ꝙrũde ys ꝙ ꝙrũrunt, sũt ꝙbus sibi videntur ꝙrere ꝙrũ
rere ꝙrũ non ꝙrerunt, ꝙrũodo eis vult ꝙrere ꝙrũ inuenire,
sed per fidem in humilitate & non per propriam sapientiam
& presumptionem.

Corol.

Sicut illud. Non est iustus quisquam, de istis dicitur
hominum generibus intelligitur ꝑ qui ad sinistram & dexteram
declinauerunt. Ita et illud. Non est intelligens, Et non
est requirens. Sibi enim ꝙrũa non sunt iusti, non intelligunt,
non requirunt, deficiendo & omittendo, isti vero & cedendo
& minus committendo. Sunt enim minus iusti, minus intel
ligentes, minus querentes, adeo, vt sint incorrigibiles in
suo sensu. Quomodo & Canonis ait, Faciunt me intelli
gendo, vt nihil intelligant. Et idem iterum, Summa
iustitia summa stultitia, immo iniustitia est, Scilicet
dum pertinaciter stabeatur & non cedatur in partem con
trariam. Vnde & proverbium vulgo habetur. Wisse kunt
niemen gnöglich. Sapientes crassius delirant.

Primo dicit, Non intelligens, quam non requirens.
Quia primus est nosse, quam velle & operari, requirere est

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

Luther, Martin. Der Brief an die Römer. Vol. LVI of Luthers Werke. Edited by Johannes Ficker, Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus. Nachfolger, 1938.

-----. Divi Pauli apostoli ad Romanos Epistola. Wittenburgii: Joan. Grunenbergii, 1515. Facsimile edition with the author's comments on the Book of Romans. In rare book collection at Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, Missouri.

-----. Luther: Lectures on Romans. Vol. XV in The Library of Christian Classics. Newly translated and edited by Wilhelm Pauck. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, c.1961.

B. Secondary Sources

Bleven, Bruce. "The Analysis of Genius," Wisdom, III (May 1958).

Boehmer, Heinrich. Luther in Light of Recent Research. Translated by Carl F. Huth, Jr. New York: The Christian Herald, c.1916.

-----. Road to Reformation. Translated from the German by John W. Doberstein and Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1946.

Cooper, Lane. Louis Agassiz As A Teacher. Ithaca, New York: Comstock Publishing Co., Inc., c.1945.

Ebeling, Gerhard. "Die Anfänge von Luthers Hermeneutik," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XLVIII (1951), 172-229.

Elert, Werner. The Structure of Lutheranism. Translated by Walter A. Hansen. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1962.

Fife, Robert Herndon. The Revolt of Martin Luther. New York: Columbia University Press, c.1957.

-----. Young Luther. The Intellectual and Religious Development of Martin Luther to 1518. New York: The MacMillan Company, c.1928.

Gerrish, B. A. Grace and Reason. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, c.1962.

-----. Luther. Vol. I. Translated from the German by E. M. Lamond. Edited by Luigi Cappedelta. Saint Louis: B. Herder, 1916.

Grisar, Hartmann, S.J. Martin Luther, His Life and Work. Adapted from the 2nd German ed. by Frank S. Eble, edited by Arthur Preus. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, c.1955.

Heikkinnen, Jacob W. "Luther's Lectures on the Romans (1515-1516)" Interpretation, vii (April 1953), pp. 178-194.

Holl, Karl. "Luthers Bedueutung fur den Fortschrift der Auslegungskunst," Gessammelte Aufsätze. I. Luther. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932.

Kooiman, Willem Jan. Luther and the Bible. Translated by John Schmidt. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1961.

Meissinger, Karl August. Luthers Exegese in der Frühzeit. Leipzig: M. Heinsius Nachfolger, 1911.

Luther, Martin. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. A new abridged translation by J. Theodore Mueller. Grand Rapids: Zondervon Publishing House, c.1954.

-----. "Die Nachschriften zur Vorlesung über den Römerbrief." Edited by Johannes Ficker. Nachschriften der Vorlesungen über Römerbrief, Galaterbrief und Hebräerbrief in D. Martin Luthers Werke. LVII. Weiman: Herman Böhlaus Nachfolger, 1938. Pp. 111-lxxxiv, 3-232.

-----. "Preface to the Complete Edition of Luther's Latin Writings," Translated by Lewis W. Spitz, Sr. Career of the Reformer, IV. Edited by Helmut T. Lehman. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1960, pp. 327-338.

-----. "Preface to the New Testament," Translated by Charles M. Jacobs. Revised by E. Theodore Bachmann. Word and Sacrament I. Edited by E. Theodore Bachmann. Vol. xxxv in Luther's Works, edited by Helmut T. Lehman. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1960, pp. 327-328.

-----. Vorlesung über den Römerbrief 1515/1516. Edited by Johannes Ficker. Leipzig: Verlagsbuchhandlung. Theodore Weicher, 1908.

-----. Vorlesung über den Römerbrief 1515/1516. Translated and edited by Eduard Ellwein. Vol. II of Martin Luther Ausgewählte Werke. Edited by S. S. Borcherdt und Georg Merz. Dritte Auflage. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957.

-----. Vorlesung über den Römerbrief 1515/1516. The Latin edited by Johannes Ficker and the German translated by Eduard Ellwein. 2 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1960.

MacKinnon, James. Early Life and Religious Development. Vol. I of Luther and the Reformation. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1925.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. Luther The Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings. Companion Volume to Luther's Works. Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, c.1959.

Prenter, Regin. Spiritus Creator. Translated by John M. Jenson. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1953.

Quanbeck, Warren A. "Luther's Early Exegesis," Luther Today. Vol. I of The Martin Luther Lectures. Decorah, Iowa, c.1957.

Reu, M. Luther and the Scriptures. Columbus, Ohio: The Wartburg Press, 1944.

-----. Luther's German Bible. Columbus, Ohio: The Lutheran Book Concern, 1934.

Rupp, Gordon. The Righteousness of God. Luther Studies. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953.

Sasse, Hermann. Here We Stand: Nature and Character of the Lutheran Faith. Translated by Theodore G. Tappert. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, c.1938.

Spitz, Lewis, editor. The Reformation: Material or Spiritual? Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, c.1962.

-----. "Luther: The Reformer," The Religious Renaissance of the German Humanists. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, c.1963. Pp. 237-266.

Thiel, Rudolf. Luther. Translated by Gustave K. Wienke. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, c.1955.

Vogelsang, Erich, editor. "Aus der Römerbriefvorlesung 1515/1516," Der Junge Luther. Vol. V in Luthers Werke in Auswahl. Berlin: Walter de Gruhter. Pp. 222-304.

Wood, A. Skevington. Luther's Principles of Biblical Interpretation. London: The Tyndale Press, 1960.