Luther's Ecumenical Significance

An Interconfessional Consultation

edited by
PETER MANNS and HARDING MEYER

in collaboration with
CARTER LINDBERG and HARRY McSORLEY

FORTRESS PRESS PHILADELPHIA

Justice and Injustice in Luther's Judgment of "Holiness Movements"

CARTER LINDBERG

"It is," said Luther, "a fictitious expression to speak of a 'holy man,' just as it is a fictitious expression to speak of God's falling into sin; for by the nature of things, this cannot be."[1] In Luther's judgment "holiness movements" may be more or less creative depending upon their leaders but, creative or not, they are nevertheless fiction. It is no wonder that his judgment elicited equally strong replies. Contemporaries railed against Luther for placing doctrine over life, neglecting self-mortification and conformity to Christ;[2] for perverting the gospel into a spurious, fictitious faith alone which displaced discipleship of the cross by the cheap grace of a "honey-sweet Christ."[3] Later generations concerned with the development of Christian holiness may be less polemical but they are no less pointed in judging Luther. Pietism acknowledged that although Luther had laid the groundwork he had not proceeded to emphasize the ethical verification of faith in the new life.[4] Sharply put: "Justification is fiction, rebirth is fact."[5] The founder of Methodism and "father" of contemporary holiness movements stated: "Who has wrote more ably than Martin Luther on justification by faith alone? And who was more ignorant of the doctrine of sanctification, or more confused in his conception of it?"[6] And in our own time one of the more vehement Lutheran charismatic leaders claims that Lutherans have too often missed the message of the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit by reading the Bible through "Lutheran eyeglasses."[7]

Even this cursory review of judgment and counterjudgment reveals the potential for the *ad hominem* attacks so well known with regard to Luther's relationship to the persons he polemically labelled *Schwärmer*.[8] This is an important element of the Reformation controversies which unfortunately continues to color the present. Our concern, however, is with Luther's *theological* judgment and therefore we shall bracket psychological judgments. This means we are immediately confronted by a problem of terminology. It does not require a great deal of insight to recognize that addressing others as "fanatics" or "enthusiasts" is less than constructive for historical-theological research, not to mention ecumenical dialogue. No term is problem-free, but to designate the *Schwärmer* and consequent holiness move-

ments as renewal movements has the following advantages: it is the contemporary self-designation of Neo-pentecostal and charismatic movements; it has not yet accumulated negative connotations; and it provides an umbrella large enough to cover the diverse concerns for personal and ecclesial holiness which run through these movements from Luther to the present.

We shall begin with a brief description of Luther's understanding of the *novus homo, nova creatura,* in light of his motif *simul iustus et peccator.* Luther's initial colleague, Karlstadt, was an important influence in the development of Luther's judgment of renewal movements. Therefore we shall sketch Karlstadt's theology of renewal and Luther's judgment of it. The validity of relating Luther's judgment to post-Reformation renewal movements depends upon both the validity of Luther's judgment with regard to his contemporaries and the extent to which later renewal movements incorporate and continue the concerns of the sixteenth century renewal. Space precludes more than an overview.

Theologically, Luther's judgment was that holiness, like justification, is always alien; it is extrinsic not intrinsic to the person; it is *extra nos*. "Once a Christian is righteous by faith and has accepted the forgiveness of sins, he should not be so smug, as though he were pure of all sins. . . . He is righteous and holy by an alien or foreign holiness. . . ." Sin is forgiven but it still remains.[9] The Christian, that is, the forgiven sinner, is therefore simultaneously righteous and sinner. This motif is the key to Luther's judgment of all renewal movements.

Simul iustus et peccator *and the* novus homo, nova creatura

Over half a century ago Rudolf Hermann argued that Luther's whole theology is comprised in the formula "righteous and sinner at the same time." The concept expressed by this formula is so central to Luther's thinking that none of his theological statements can be understood without reference to it. A number of recent studies also stress this as the characteristic signature of Luther's thought.[10] Luther's radical understanding of justification and the *novus homo coram Deo* as *simul iustus et peccator* may be sharply distinguished from both the medieval tradition and the Reformation renewal movements by a simplified diagrammatic formulation. To the questions of where and how fellowship with God may occur both answered that fellowship with God occurred on God's level and that the sinner must somehow ascend to God. The operative principle is that like is known by like. Therefore regardless of its theological orientation—scholastic *facere quod in se est* or mystic *Gelassenheit*—Luther's theological context emphasized a process in the Christian designed to diminish sinfulness and increase righteousness in the pilgrimage toward fellowship with God. The Augustinian motif, that the Christian is "partly righteous, partly sinner" while striving for inner renewal and obedience to the Christ *in me,* was rejected by

Luther as a process—no matter how grace assisted—which was oriented to achieving holiness and fellowship with God.

Luther's breakthrough to a new understanding of the righteousness of God is well known and need not be reviewed here. The discovery that God's righteousness is a gift, not a demand, displaces the principle of likeness by that of unlikeness as the basis for fellowship with God. The sinner does not ascend to God; rather, God descends to the sinner.[11] The emphasis upon God's descent to and acceptance of the sinner by grace alone is vividly expressed by Luther's images of the marriage between Christ and the sinner and his emphasis upon God's testament rather than covenant. Unlike the medieval use of the bride-bridegroom imagery wherein the bride (the sinner) is purified for this union, Luther depicts the bride as a "poor, wicked harlot."[12] The unilateral giving action of God is clearly evident in his testament. "A testament, as everyone knows, is a promise made by one about to die, in which he designates his bequest and appoints his heirs. . . . [I]f you have a letter and seal, and believe, desire, and seek it [your inheritance], it must be given to you, even though you were scaly, scabby, stinking, and most filthy."[13] These images illustrate Luther's radical understanding of God's justification of the sinner. There is nothing which the sinner can bring to God in order to attain forgiveness—except his or her sin! It is only the ungodly, only the sinner, who is acceptable to God. Paradoxically, to acknowledge sin is to justify God and thereby oneself. "Real sin," not likeness to God, is the presupposition for justification.[14] "Beware of aspiring to such purity that you will not wish to be looked upon as a sinner or to be one. For Christ dwells only in sinners. . . ." "If you are a preacher of grace, then preach a true and not a fictitious grace; if grace is true, you must bear a true and not fictitious sin. God does not save people who are only fictitious sinners. Be a sinner and sin boldly, but believe and rejoice in Christ even more boldly, for he is victorious over sin, death, and the world."[15]

Luther's radical understanding of justification leads to a radical understanding of the person before God. Justification *extra nos* means that fellowship with God is not the raising of like to like by love but rather the acceptance by faith of God's judgment upon the unlike. There is therefore no avenue of access to God other than faith. There is no special human faculty, however defined, which, sufficiently "like" God, will enable the person to ascend to fellowship with God.

For Luther the person is always the whole person. His use of the terms "flesh" and "spirit" does not reflect anthropological dualism but the biblical-theological distinction of the person's relationship to God. Both terms refer to the whole person as he or she relates to God. "The cause of their error is that . . . they make a metaphysical distinction between flesh and spirit as though these were two substances; however, it is the total man that is flesh

and spirit, spirit insofar as he loves the law of God and flesh insofar as he hates the law of God."[16]

There is therefore no "higher power" or intrinsic capacity of the person which can warrant God's relationship. Indeed, humanity is characterized by the ability to "misuse the best in the worst manner."[17] The whole person is a sinner not just some "lower" portion of him. "We are nothing but sin. . . ."[18] Sin is being curved in upon the self; it is the desire to be God and the concommitant refusal to let God be God.[19] Sin, therefore, is so radical that only God's gracious imputation of Christ's righteousness can overcome it.[20] The sinner's acceptance of God's judgment enables him or her to live as righteous in spite of sin.

By "letting God be God" the sinner is allowed to be what he or she was intended to be—human.[21] The sinner is not called to deny his or her humanity and seek "likeness" (*similitudo*) with God. Rather, the forgiveness of sins occurs in the midst of human life. The Christian before God "is at the same time both a sinner and a righteous man; a sinner in fact, but a righteous man by the sure imputation and promise of God that He will continue to deliver him from sin until He has completely cured him. And thus he is entirely healthy in hope, but in fact he is still a sinner. . . ."[22]

The significance of the *simul* motif for Luther's judgment of renewal movements is that it precludes a progressive sanctification which attributes growth in righteousness *coram Deo* to the Christian. This may be spelled out by an examination of the following aspects of the motif: 1) it is a confession of faith, not a universal philosophical truth; 2) it is a living dialectic, not a doctrinal abstraction; 3) it was developed prior to Luther's conflicts with the *Schwärmer* and thus was not a reaction to them; 4) it remained a consistent theme throughout Luther's career; 5) it presents an understanding of sanctification in temporal-qualitative rather than quantitative terms.

1. *Simul iustus et peccator* is a confession of faith in which the believer expresses his or her situation before God and humankind.[23] Luther praises God's great mercy that he makes holy not fictitious sinners but real true sinners.[24] This is not a metaphysical, psychological, or ethical statement; it is rather spiritual and theological.[25] The point for Luther is not whether God accepts or rejects our works but that he forgives.[26] It is through forgiveness that the person receives new life—the new life which in accepting God's judgment accepts forgiveness. Already in the *Dictata* and then in his *Lectures on Romans*, Luther linked the new life with confession and the *simul* motif.[27]

2. Luther's *simul* motif is a living dialectic, not a lifeless doctrinal abstraction. Luther's faith was anything but a comfortable and placid piety. The heights and depths of this faith were not merely sequential but also simultaneous. The obvious difficulty in giving this experience linguistic formulation drove Luther to paradoxical expressions: "No Christian has sin and every

Christian has sin."[28] "The saints are always sinners in their own sight, and therefore always justified outwardly. But the hypocrites are always righteous in their own sight, and thus are always sinners outwardly."[29] The believer is his/her own accusor and, paradoxically, it is in agreement with God's judgment that the accused is defended.[30] Sharply put: the goal of Luther is to become a sinner, whereas the goal of the pious is to overcome sin and become holy.[31]

Luther's emphasis upon the *simul* is not some sort of timeless dialectic of reconciling opposites but rather a temporal history of salvation process between God and persons. The *simul* formula "cannot be relieved of its tension into a via media, but rather the simul indicates a coincidentia oppositorum."[32]

3. We have sketched Luther's *simul* formula on the basis of his early writings, especially the *Lectures on Romans* (1515–16) to show that this central theological orientation is present prior to his criticism, beginning in the 1520s, of contemporary efforts to achieve holiness or perfection as expressed in monasticism and the renewal movement he labelled *Schwärmerei*.

4. At the same time we wish to point out that this motif is not limited to the young Luther but remains a central concern throughout his career.[33]

5. The final point is that, from the standpoint of the *simul*, sanctification is to be understood in temporal-qualitative rather than quantitative terms.[34] Here the complex issues of our subject come to the fore: the Christian as *novus homo, nova creatura*, growth and progress in sanctification and holiness. The new life of the baptized is a life of struggle and advance under the eschatological viewpoint of the new time of the coming of Christ rather than the anthropological viewpoint of measurable steps toward fulfillment of the Law.[35]

The holiness of *novus homo* is, like justification, an alien holiness.[36] This does not preclude growth and progress but views it as the gift of God rather than the achievement of the person. It is, in short, always progress under the sign of the *simul*. Just as justified sinners are real, not fictitious, sinners, so the *novus homo* is a real, not fictitious, *nova creatura*. The progress of the *novus homo*, however, is not measurable by growth in holiness but as life in repentance. It is a life lived between the times, between the now and the not yet. The new life is in progress because it is life under the time of the coming Christ, but like justification it is passive because the person is "being acted upon."[37]

This life of penitence is the life of faith. "Faith, however, is a divine work in us which changes us and makes us to be born anew of God, John 1 [:12f.]. It kills the old Adam and makes us altogether different men, in heart and spirit and mind and powers; and it brings with it the Holy Spirit."[38] The God-initiated and sustained process of becoming the new person begins with

baptism and continues through to death and resurrection.[39] This is God's work for Christians sin daily. Accordingly the Christian remains simultaneously sinner and righteous throughout life.[40] *Coram Deo* the *novus homo* possesses no intrinsic holiness which can be measured, but rather his holiness is extrinsic as he approaches in time the holiness to be given in death and resurrection at the Last Day.[41]

SIXTEENTH-CENTURY RENEWAL MOVEMENTS AND LUTHER'S JUDGMENT OF THEM

The relationship of salvation and sanctification was central to the conflict between Luther and contemporary renewal movements. This is a broad, complex issue for it involves ethical and social as well as theological issues.[42] Since we cannot here pursue all of these, we shall concentrate on the renewal theology of Karlstadt. To a great extent, Karlstadt provided both the stimulus and substance for Luther's judgment of renewal movements. Clearly there were other persons, for example, Müntzer, who were important in influencing Luther's judgment, but the central role of Karlstadt makes him paradigmatic.

Karlstadt urged a process of mortification of the outer person for the sake of inner regeneration. On the basis of Jesus' words on cross-bearing for discipleship, "Karlstadt declared that a surrender of self and a circumcision of delight in creatures must precede regeneration or love of God. . . ." In his emphasis upon the necessity of the circumcision of the heart, he sometimes stated this was beyond human ability and solely the activity of God; at other times that love and righteousness are contingent upon the extent that the person's heart is circumcised.[43] The point, however, is that a new life of obedient conformity to Christ is to follow spiritual rebirth. This emphasis, plus the fact that the new life of the regenerate Christian is shaped by the Law, led Karlstadt's major sympathetic biographer to subtitle the second volume of his Karlstadt study, "Karlstadt as the Pioneer of Lay Christian Puritanism."[44] "Karlstadt thought the proper understanding of Christian freedom pertained not primarily to the Christian's freedom apropos laws, but rather to the regenerated man's ability to obey them."[45]

One becomes a member of the church through the inner experience of regeneration, an experience which is recognized by the person's life. The new community is also to manifest such fruit. "God has given a general law to which the whole believing people, and each congregation and each person should hold and conform. . . .That God's covenant concerns every individual community and in addition each household . . . is shown so often in Deuteronomy alone that I think it unnecessary to adduce evidence."[46]

This covenant ecclesiology does not eliminate the role of the minister. Public preachers are necessary and should evidence divine, regenerating grace as well as have an inner call. The minister must be holy to proclaim

God's holy word. "For the proclamation is a speech of faith which proceeds from the heart through the mouth. Therefore the outward confession or preaching of the death of Christ is a sign or fruit of the inner righteousness. . . ."[47] "He who wants to handle pure and holy things blamelessly should be as pure and holy as the things which he grasps and handles."[48] Karlstadt's emphasis here calls to mind the Donatist position, but it is not clear whether Karlstadt wishes to go that far.

What is clear, however, is that the fundamental question for Karlstadt was not "How do I find a gracious God?" but rather "How can man fulfill the Law of God?"[49] This is a basic orientation for later renewal movements as well. From Pietism through to the present charismatic renewal, the central concern is not the unconditional forgiveness of sins but the quest for the power to fulfill the will of God.[50] Karlstadt's early expression of this is expressed in his "151 Theses" (1517), where instead of Luther's *theological simul* he presents a *moral simul*: "The righteous man, therefore, is simultaneously good and evil. . . ." Thus "the outer man is able to become a temple of God."[51] The true sense of the law is first understood by the spiritually reborn whose freed spirit now understands the spirit of the law. The gospel is understood in the sense of a new law (*nova lex*), a law of the spirit and life (*lex spiritus et vitae*) mediated by Christ. The Christian is thus given the power to do good works. These works are the presupposition for a second justification, a justification by the law which is an advancing sanctification through fulfillment of the law.[52]

We have focused on Karlstadt because it was Karlstadt who basically formed Luther's opinion of the renewal movements of his day. What Luther attacked in Karlstadt he continued to see in other "Karlstadtians"—a mixture of law and spirit which subverted the good news of God's forgiveness into the bad news of human legalism. Thus in response to the Christians in Strasbourg, Luther wrote:

> Ask your evangelists . . . to turn you away from Luther and Karlstadt and direct you always to Christ, but not as Karlstadt does, only to the work of Christ, wherein Christ is held up as an example, which is the least important aspect of Christ. . . . But turn to Christ as to a gift of God. . . . For such matters these prophets have little sympathy, taste or understanding. Instead they juggle with their "living voice from heaven," their "laying off the material," "sprinkling," "mortification," and similar high-sounding words. . . . They make for confused, disturbed, anxious consciences . . . meanwhile Christ is forgotten.[53]

Numerous essays by historians and theologians, some of whom are heirs to the movements Luther attacked, confirm the formal validity of Luther's extrapolation from Karlstadt to other holiness leaders and groups.[54] Luther's response to their orientation is to ask, "What makes a person a Christian?"[55] Luther's own answer is a resounding rejection of *anything* done by a person

to ground salvation in him or herself.[56] Not even faith makes a person a Christian! "Always something is lacking in faith. However long our life, always there is enough to learn in regard to faith."[57] Luther criticized Karlstadt, Müntzer, and the *Schwärmer* in general for submerging the gospel in the externals of a quest for sanctification, while they in turn accused Luther of relying upon faith alone.

Faith in God is worked by the Holy Spirit "when and where he wills," "by hearing." The Word is a living word of address; it comes from outside the person and proclaims what Christ has done for us. Luther's critique of the renewal is that they invert this order. "Dr. Karlstadt and his spirits replace the highest with the lowest, the best with the least, the first with the last. Yet he would be considered the greatest spirit of all, he who has devoured the Holy Spirit feathers and all."[58]

Luther is certainly not rejecting religious experience and works; rather he is rejecting the order of salvation of the renewal. They invert reality, making the Word of God dependent upon faith, and consequently choose their own means of ascent to God rather than receive God's descent to them. In every area of Christian life they change gospel into law and thereby put the burden of proof for salvation back upon the Christian. But faith wants certainty.[59]

The great danger Luther saw in the renewal movements is that they would either continue papist works-righteousness, albeit of their own type, or dissolve the certainty of salvation into the even more terrifying psychological works-righteousness of introspection and interiorization. Without awareness of the *simul* aspect of the Christian faith and life there is the perennial danger of grounding faith in oneself. The Christian is *simul iustus et peccator* in faith as well as works, therefore he/she is to look to Christ for certainty. In self-reflection the Christian confronts him/herself not as a believer but as a non-believer, or in any case as one who does not know whether he/she believes. In this existential situation Luther's position is "I do not know whether I believe; but I do know in whom I believe."[60] Faith is certainly necessary but the Christian is to rely upon God's grace, not his/her own faith.[61] Luther saw in the renewal the same elements he had struggled with in the monastery. It is not surprising, then, that he viewed Karlstadt and the others in terms of a relapse into a monastic works-righteousness.[62]

With regard to the Donatist tendencies in the renewal, Luther states that to rest the promise of God upon our faith or works is to be "like butter in sunshine."[63] "It is not a fruit of the Spirit to criticize a doctrine by the imperfect life of the teacher."[64] On the other hand, Luther himself did not take a Donatist position against his opponents.[65]

Luther saw, behind the orientation to the inner Word and the consequent emphasis upon sanctification, a dualism with severe consequences for theological anthropology. Such a dualism cannot cope with the ambiguity of life because it fails to grasp the dialectical tension of a theology of law and gospel

where the Spirit is mediated by external means to the Christian who is simultaneously sinner and righteous. To the favorite passage of Karlstadt and others, "It is the spirit that gives life, the flesh is of no avail" (John 6:63), Luther opposed his holistic theological anthropology. "Thus you should learn to call him 'fleshly' too who thinks, teaches, and talks a great deal about lofty spiritual matters, yet does so without grace. . . . On the contrary, you should call him 'spiritual' who is occupied with the most external kinds of works. . . ."[66] Luther defines living according to the flesh as unbelief, a condition which continues to plague the Christian. Only a godly Christian can make such a confession. "Now it is a marvelous thing that he who is righteous before God and has the Holy Spirit says that he is a sinner. It is right, however; he confesses what he has been and still is."[67] "Thus a Christian is righteous and sinner at the same time, holy and profane, an enemy of God and a child of God. None of the sophists will admit this paradox because they do not understand the true meaning of justification. This was why they forced men to go on doing good works until they would not feel any sin at all."[68]

In summary we may say that Luther opposed all orders of salvation which confused justification and sanctification. Any faith "that attributes more to love than to faith . . . (imagines) that God regards and accepts us on account of the love with which we love God and our neighbour after we have already been reconciled. If this is true, then we have no need whatever of Christ." Because Christians do not have perfect fear, love, and trust toward God, they are condemned by the law no matter what program of regeneration and sanctification they are involved in fulfilling. "For the true God does not regard or accept us on account of our love, virtue, or newness of life (Rom. 6:4); He does so on account of Christ."[69]

Therefore the church is not a community of the recognizable elect but an institution with earthly means of communicating the gospel. The church, therefore, is recognized not by its holiness of life but by the "possession of the holy word of God." "Now, wherever you hear or see this word, preached, believed, professed, and lived, do not doubt that the true *ecclesia sancta catholica*, 'a Christian holy people' must be there, even though their number is very small. . . . And even if there were no other sign that this alone, it would suffice to prove that a Christian, holy people must exist there, for God's word cannot be without God's people, and conversely, God's people cannot be without God's word."[70]

In our earlier discussion of Luther's theology we proposed the heuristic device of asking where and how fellowship with God occurs. The answers derived from Luther's theological motifs stressed that fellowship with God occurs not in heaven but here on earth through God's gracious acceptance of the sinner. Thus righteousness *coram Deo* is not an intrinsic capacity or possession of the Christian but a continuous gift. All efforts to usher in the

Kingdom of God both politically and spiritually are therefore repudiated as theologies of glory. Christ's kingdom cannot be visibly identified with either remade social order or "reborn" persons but only with God's Word. The certainty (*certitudo*) of the presence of God is always and only his Word, not human works, lifestyles, feelings, or even faith. Thus Luther continually repudiated all attempts by his opponents to create security (*securitas*), whether it be by spiritually authenticated leadership, lifestyle, or exegesis.

Luther's first encounters with what we call renewal movements were through Karlstadt and Müntzer. On the basis of this Luther created a stereotype which he then found confirmed by later events. Unfortunately, Luther all too frequently extrapolated these initial experiences and judgments onto others who seemed to him to share one or another characteristic with Karlstadt and Müntzer. Thus Luther has been criticized for his rush to judgment against the renewal movements of his day which precluded brotherly if not ecumenical dialogue. Recently there have been scholarly attempts to minimize the theological differences between Luther and Karlstadt. Three studies in particular reduce Luther's judgment to the level of tactics and strategy for maintaining leadership and promoting reform, a form of "sibling rivalry," and biographical factors. Both Ronald Sider and James Preus[71] argue that the main issue was the strategy and timing of the reform. Karlstadt's leadership in Wittenberg during Luther's stay in the Wartburg alarmed Luther and impelled him to return to Wittenberg in order to "recapture" his leadership role and eventually to rationalize his position by analogies to the biblical prophets and apostles. Except for Karlstadt's views on images and the Lord's Supper, it is claimed that his theological differences from Luther were not fundamental. Their different accents are seen in terms of their different biographies. Karlstadt emphasized fulfilling the divine law but that does not mean that Luther's accusation of works-righteousness is correct, for Karlstadt always speaks of fulfilling the law by the reborn. Luther's monastic experience of anxiety before the judgment of God made him hypersensitive regarding any emphasis upon sanctification. On the other hand Karlstadt's experience of renewal and change in his life was related to his earlier experience of striving for success in life and career.[72]

I have no quarrel with the understanding that theology and biography are intimately related.[73] But it is unacceptable to reduce one to the other. There is no doubt that Luther had a personal stake in the progress of the Reform movement, as did every other reformer. But to say that the simplest explanation for Luther's displacement of Karlstadt in the Wittenberg Movement is Luther's motivation "to reclaim personal leadership of a movement he felt was more his own than anyone else's"[74] fails to see that both Luther and Karlstadt were living out of their respective understandings of the truth of the gospel. The personal involvements and tactics of both reformers were informed and shaped by their theologies.[75] For Luther the priority of the

Word alone precludes evangelical compulsion, whereas for Karlstadt personal inability to root out superstition necessitates evangelical compulsion.[76] Nevertheless, we need to be sensitive to the fact that Luther's theological critique of his contemporaries is colored with harsh invective and *ad hominem* arguments which serve no useful purpose in today's ecumenical dialogues.

A constructive contribution to the present ecumenical dialogue is Luther's dialectical relating of doctrine and life which understands doctrine not merely in terms of content but in terms of its function: "Doctrine directs us and shows the way to heaven. . . . We can be saved without love . . . but not without pure doctrine and faith." Doctrine and life are incomparable, not at all on the same level; and therefore the devil's argument about "not offending against love and the harmony among the churches" is specious.[77] The function of doctrine is the proclaiming the forgiveness of sins as unconditional promise. That is why the church stands or falls on the basis of its relation to the doctrine of justification by grace alone through faith alone. Thus Luther's relationship to the renewal movements of his time is not an incidental chapter in church history but related to the fundamental apprehension and sense of the Reformation.[78]

POST-REFORMATION RENEWAL MOVEMENTS

The implicit contemporary relevance of Luther's judgment of the renewal movements of his day may be drawn out by its application to selected post-Reformation renewal movements. We shall restrict ourselves to commenting on aspects of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Pietism and contemporary charismatic renewal.[79]

The central motif for Pietism is rebirth. Martin Schmidt argues that the Pietist motif of rebirth replaced that of justification and stems from both pre-Reformation spiritualism and Reformation renewal figures such as Karlstadt and Müntzer.[80] Even when Pietism made an appeal to justification it converted it to its own use so that justification became a moment in the all-encompassing motif of rebirth.[81] The significance of Spener's *Pia Desideria* is not so much its particular proposals for reform but its orientation to theological thinking: "Our entire Christianity exists in the inner or new man. . . ."[82] This is the locus for Spener's fundamental opposition between old and new birth, the world and God. The essential task of the Christian is to preserve himself unstained by the world.[83] The "world" has to do with the concrete temptations and errors of daily life—ambition, desire for fame, pride, greed, and so forth. "The opposition between the world and salvation is so deep that it must be overcome by an event sui generis—an event that only knows *one* analogy, birth. This event can have only *one* creator, God himself. . . ."[84]

In developing these perspectives, Spener reintroduced into theology the medieval use of the principle that like can only be known by like.[85] Thus the

characteristic of Spener's view of rebirth is its teleological orientation toward the new man and his growth. Consequently he polemicized against the opinion that faith could be the embodiment of the relationship to God and Christian conduct. Faith is not able to carry the entire content of the new being, it requires completion through its fruit, love, or at least by the decisive modifier "living."[86] This emphasis upon the new person is the point of departure for perfectionism, a hope to be realized in history. This reduces both ecclesiology and theology to a form of Christian ethics.[87]

Pietism overcomes radical doubt not by hearing the Word of God as an address of promise but by experientially verified faith. Thus Pietism introduces the usage of modifiers for the term faith: weak faith, living faith, powerful faith, and so forth. Luther's straightforward position—that faith simply takes God's promise as true and honors it in that it does not take God to be a liar[88]—is displaced by discussions about the quality of faith and its accomplishments.

This orientation allows the development of a hermeneutic of the Bible as the pattern for life. In the final analysis Pietists viewed Scripture as the confirmation and legitimation of their own experience.[89] The idea of an order of God, the goal of which is personal renewal, displaced justification as the mid-point of Pietist theology. This is a shift away from Luther's *pro nobis* emphasis and his dialectic of *simul iustus et peccator*. Pietism emphasized the visible formation of the renewed person verified by the ethical fruits of faith. Rebirth signifies a higher nature and quality of being. Luther, on the other hand, remains with an ongoing battle between the old and new person which is never transformed into a visible victory on earth. Victory always remains the judgment of God not the possibility of the Christian. The dynamic of Pietism was not Luther's dialectic of law and gospel, sin and grace, damnation and faith, but rather the development of the power of faith in renewal and good works.[90]

Pietism's displacement of justification by rebirth denotes a shift from Luther's theocentric orientation to an anthropocentric orientation. This comes into sharper focus when we recall our earlier diagrammatic mode of expressing Luther's theology in terms of God's *descent* to the sinner as opposed to the motif of the sinner's *ascent* to God. To Luther the gospel is radical good news because it is the proclamation of salvation not a program for salvation. God promises to accept the *sinner*. God descends to the person who is unlike himself. The Aristotelian theorem is turned inside out—unlike is known by unlike. We have already referred to Spener's discussion of rebirth in just the opposite terms. God loves the sinner but because only like may be known by like it is necessary for the sinner to be reborn.[91] As harsh as it sounds, this seems to be a classic case of what is thrown out the front door (by Luther) returning through the back door (by Pietism).

This motif of ascent toward God through rebirth and renewal explains the

synergistic expressions within Pietism. Persons cooperate in the process of salvation. This is not merely a modification of Luther's central position but a reversal of it. The person is thrown back upon him/herself and his/her experience of faith for the certainty of salvation. Whenever, no matter to what extent, the burden of proof for salvation rests upon the believer, the only options are pride or the despair of uncertainty for the person is really being asked to overcome him/herself. It is of interest that Schmidt sees a line of development here from Francke to Nietzsche. Unlike Luther, who guides sinful believers toward the unconditional truth of God's Word and the invariability of God's promise, Francke refers them back to their faith. From a modern perspective the catechetical sermons of the great Halle pietists appear related to contemporary existential theology.[92] The question of the modernity of Pietism echoes Troeltsch's evaluation of the continuity of Reformation Spiritualism and Anabaptism with the modern spirit, and more recent studies linking charismatic renewal with medieval asceticism and Reformation Anabaptism. This common link of medieval and modern was already intimated by Luther when he equated the papacy with the enthusiasts in the Schmalkald Articles.[93]

Pietism departs from Luther in its understanding of the relationship of faith and works. Spener and Francke among others tended to regard works as the verification of faith or at least a sign of faith. The ethical fruits of faith thus become indications of a person's degree of growth in faith and the quality of his existence in grace. Luther is not concerned for such goal-determined inferences. Although Luther can express the view that works are signs of faith, his major perspective is that our standing in justification cannot be determined by the form of our sanctification.[94] This is also applicable to the church. While for Luther the true church remains hidden from the eyes of persons, Pietism's "kernel-community," while remaining within the church, may be distinguished from other Christians by perceptible, examinable signs of piety. Thus in this way the concept of the church approaches that of an ideal, independent community of saints.

Contemporary renewal movements not only are analogous to the renewals of the Reformation and Pietism but also have ties to Pietism through the Wesleyan movement. "Seen historically, the (charismatic) movement belongs to those movements which have grown out of the soil of classical German Pietism. Thus it is characteristic for the charismatic movement that it has returned in a changed form with its impulse of this tradition as it has become effective in the Methodism of England and North America, in the holiness movements and in the Pentecostal movement."[95]

The charismatic renewal expresses its concern for regeneration and the *novus homo* through its emphasis upon baptism in the Holy Spirit with the attendant signs of edification and sanctification, the charismata. Throughout the charismatic renewal the emphasis is upon receiving the power of the

Holy Spirit to become and be a new person. The gospel is expressed in terms of "a quality and style of life." The fullness of the Holy Spirit is sought with the view "to receiving power to live the Christian life more effectively and fruitfully."[96] There is an overriding concern among Lutheran charismatics for sanctification which dissolves the dialectical tension of such classic Lutheran motifs as the *simul*.

Charismatic theology is oriented toward a covenant-type theology in distinction from Luther's emphasis upon testament. While not explicitly spelled out, this orientation is expressed through emphasis upon baptism with (or in) the Holy Spirit with a consequent growth in sanctification. A primary means to personal sanctification is speaking in tongues. The results range from assurance of salvation to cessation of smoking.[97] The new life of sanctification is a life patterned upon Jesus, which not only gives guidance in the details of life but also separates one from the world. Separation from the world is the recognition both of the impending destruction of the world and that discipleship to Jesus means commitment to spiritual warfare. The Christian therefore should pray for the charismatic gifts and cooperate in the Spirit-wrought manifestation of sanctification in his life. Mortal sins, that is, sins over which we have control by God's Spirit, cannot co-exist with manifestations of the Holy Spirit. It is in this perspective that the third use of the law is advocated.[98]

The primary concern for charismatic theology does not seem to be that of the forgiveness of sins but rather that of power to lead a new life. Certainly these questions are not mutually exclusive but there is a marked difference in accent. The primary understanding of justification here is that of liberation and empowerment. This charismatic orientation toward power and the presence of God leads to a striving for more experiences and more faith. Baptism in the Spirit gives "more of Jesus." In a manner reminiscent of Pietism there is the penchant to qualify faith, baptism, and the Christian life by adjectives such as "living," "spirit-filled," and so forth. In theological terms we would say charismatics are more interested in sanctification than justification. Furthermore, this interest is colored by the concern to achieve security in faith by a *praxis pietatis*.

The fundamental problematic is that salvation is understood in terms of the expression of a particular spiritual praxis. And this praxis is not sufficiently distinguished from that salvation which issues from God. The eschatological reservation—that we live by faith, not by sight—is forgotten. The charismatic movement is permanently in danger of foreclosing the ultimate by its desire to realize it in the penultimate.

This critique is confirmed by an American theologian with charismatic experience, Richard Jensen. He argues that the renewal is sometimes characterized by striving for *more* than is required. "By doing the *more* that is required, we can move from the realm of Christ to the realm of the Spirit.

. . . from sin to holiness . . . from justification to sanctification, from first faith to total faith, from water baptism to Spirit baptism. . . . Speaking in tongues in this system almost becomes a sign that we have moved beyond Christ and his grace for sinners to a higher and more advanced state."[99] This means that the emphasis upon holiness and sanctification as experientially legitimated by baptism in the Spirit and tongues shifts the burden of proof from God to the person. "Then we are caught up in the endless cycle of *more*. To become holy always requires more of us: more faith, more good works, more obedience, more everything. Until we receive the initial evidence of our holiness, speaking in tongues, we must live under a cloud of guilt over our lack of spiritual achievement. When we do receive the evidence of our holiness we are tempted to be proud of our achievement."[100]

The emphasis upon sanctification in terms of self-development is evident in the works of two authors of particular influence in charismatic renewal, Morton Kelsey and Watchman Nee. In terms of theological anthropology the issue, as presented by Kelsey and Nee, is a dualism which spiritualizes the person in a legalistic direction.[101] Kelsey provides "twelve rules" and Nee lists "seven steps" for training our souls to be open to our inner spiritual world. "But as soon as one adds twelve rules or seven steps to our relationship to God and his Spirit it becomes quite clear that grace is not *alone*. Both Kelsey and Nee are really talking about grace *plus*. It is grace *plus* human openness. It is grace *plus* obedience to the rules and steps. It is grace *plus* man's plunge within and into himself."[102] The characteristic emphasis throughout charismatic literature on the person being open to the Holy Spirit and living in expectation of the Spirit's free gifts is a mark of charismatic anthropology rather than pneumatology. From the perspective of the Reformation, persons are not "open" by themselves, but are rather sinners whose openness to God is blocked by sin and evil. If the human problem is being closed in upon the self then exhortation to be open can at best only create sufficient guilt to which the gospel of forgiveness may be addressed. At worst this exhortation and application of the law creates either pride or despair. Again we are reminded that the charismatic emphasis is not so much on the forgiveness of sins as it is on empowerment.

But it is precisely *within* him/herself that the person is a sinner. The spirit/flesh opposition is not a dualistic anthropology but two different ways of life. The biblical view of the person sees him or her in totality and uses the terms spirit and flesh to designate personal orientation. Dualistic anthropologies oppose spirit and flesh as references to the inner and outer person, and thereby lead to a separation of justification and sanctification. "As we follow the rules and get in touch with our spiritual 'within,' spiritual experiences result. Such experiences, speaking in tongues for example, are then interpreted as qualitative signs of a deep walk with the inner spirit. Spiritual

experiences are easily identified as the signs of *our* (note the 'our') sanctification, growth and maturity." The results are pride and divisiveness.[103]

The charismatic may respond that the call to openness comes not from within the person but rather from the Holy Spirit, and therefore one may expect such a stance to be fulfilled. The theological consequence of this, however, continues to be a conception of the person as a being who is open toward God, as one whose essence is disposable toward God. The tension between the person as *imago Dei* and sinner thus collapses. In Luther's terminology this is the collapse of the person as *simul iustus et peccator* into the person as *partim iustus, partim peccator*, for whom sin is being displaced by righteousness. This is a theology of progressive sanctification which introduces a third use of the law in place of the dialectic of law and gospel, and emphasizes the growth of the individual over the community.

If, as some Mennonite scholars claim, the charismatic movement is heir to concerns of Reformation renewal movements, then there is an "old-new" wine implicit in charismatic theology which may burst the traditional Lutheran wineskins. For Luther, grace was unconditional. And justification by this grace alone through faith throws the shadow of works-righteousness over personal efforts at holiness. This grace, this forgiveness of sin, mediated by Word and sacraments, was Luther's answer to his quest for a gracious God. The charismatic quest is for a gracious community and a holy life. Again, these are not exclusive concerns but the accent is sufficiently different to create two different theologies and life-styles. The renewals' search for a biblically paradigmatic community of faith and a life-style of obedience led to an emphasis upon an ontological change in the life of the believer as opposed to the *simul* anthropology of Luther. For the renewal movements: "Revelation is indeed received in the midst of disobedience, but for the purpose of repentance and growth in holiness. It is conditional."[104]

We need to remember that the theme of sanctification was no less emphasized by Luther than by his contemporary "charismatic" opponents. The difference as Luther saw it was that his opponents inverted the order of God's relationship to persons. For Luther only the external proclamation of the gospel and the material reception of the sacraments may call a person out of self-work and self-reflection. It is self-help and self-sanctification which is put to an end by God's promise: "I am here for you." Luther saw in Karlstadt the subtle return of justification by the good works of mortification and discipleship which displaced the "external" work of God, who comes to us in Word and sacrament.

The renewals' emphasis upon the *novus homo* as the point of departure for perfectionism, a hope to be realized in history, has the following ecclesiological and theological consequences: Applied to the pastorate it has the ring of Donatism, for only the pastor who is a true Christian is able to lead others carefully on the way of the Lord. Applied to theology it leads to a devaluation

of doctrine and an emphasis upon the life of the individual and the life of the church. Applied to ecclesiology it reduces the church to an *ecclesiola* of the like-minded, like-experienced and like-disciplined, based on conceptions of the primitive church. Applied to ecumenics it results in a transconfessionalism dependent not upon doctrinal agreement but upon a particular Christian life-style. Finally, and perhaps the most serious consequence, applied to the Christian life it leads to an anxious and insecure conscience.

Thus Luther proclaims: "Let us thank God, therefore, that we have been delivered from this monster of uncertainty and that now we can believe for a certainty that the Holy Spirit is crying and issuing that sigh too deep for words in our hearts. And this is our foundation: the gospel commands us to look, not at our own good deeds or perfection but God himself as he promises, and at Christ himself, the Mediator. . . . And this is the reason why our theology is certain: it snatches us away from ourselves and places us outside ourselves, so that we do not depend on our own strength, conscience, experience, person, or works but depend on that which is outside ourselves, that is, on the promise and truth of God which cannot deceive."[105]

Ever since Luther's attack on Karlstadt there has been a strong Lutheran anxiety that all types of renewal orientations endanger justification by grace alone. Luther sharply attacked his opponents on the basis of his stereotype of them. Their own sharp responses only served to confirm what Luther's stereotype led him to expect. Successful dialogue with contemporary renewals will be related to maintaining the validity of Luther's insight into justification and sanctification in terms of the new person being simultaneously righteous and sinner while remaining sensitive to the dangers to understanding caused by stereotyping.

NOTES

1. *LW* 12:325; *WA* 40 2:347,29–31.

2. Hertzsch, 2:93,36–94,2; 98,33–99,2. On Francke cf. Heinold Fast, ed., *Der Linke Flügel der Reformation* (Bremen: Schünemann, 1962), 246ff.

3. Franz, 321–343; Hans Hillerbrand, "Thomas Muentzer's Last Tract Against Martin Luther," *MQR* 38 (1964):20–36. Franz, 228,9; 234f.; 222ff.; 318,22ff.

4. Philipp Spener, *Pia Desideria*, ed. Kurt Aland (Berlin, 1955), 42,8–13; 79,35f. Johann Arndt, *Sechs Bücher vom Wahren Christentum* (Stuttgart: Steinkopf, n.d.), 791.

5. *WNM* 51–90, 91–111, 129–168; 162ff. M. Schmidt, *Pietismus* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972), 14.

6. John Wesley, *The Works of John Wesley* (London, 1872), 7:204. Cf. also George Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1980), 73.

7. Hans Frøen in Norris Wagen, ed., *Jesus Where Are You Taking Us?* (Carol Stream, IL: Creation House, 1973), 113–134, 205–222.

8. Cf. Mark Edwards, *Luther and the False Brethren* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1975), 201f.

9. *LW* 12:328; *WA* 40 2:352,33f. Cf. *LW* 12,367; *WA* 40 2:407,30–408,23.

10. Rudolf Hermann, *Luthers These "Gerecht und Sünder zugleich"* (Darmstadt, 1960) (1930), 7. Cf. Wilhelm Link, *Das Ringen Luthers um die Freiheit der Theologie von der Philosophie* (Munich, 1955), 77–85; Steven Ozment, *Homo Spiritualis: A Comparative Study of the Anthropology of Johannes Tauler, Jean Gerson and Martin Luther (1509–16) in the Context of their Theological Thought* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 131–185; Heiko A. Oberman, "Simul Gemitus et Raptus: Luther und die Mystik," in I. Asheim, *Kirche, Mystik, Heiligung und das Natürliche bei Luther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 20–59, 59; Gerhard Ebeling, *Luther: Einführung in sein Denken*, (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), 15; Michael Baylor, *Action and Person, Conscience in Late Scholasticism and the Young Luther* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 228ff.

11. *WA* 5:128,36–129,1.

12. *LW* 31:351; *WA* 7:55,26; 1ff.; 25,34.

13. *LW* 35:88; *WA* 6:361,3–7. Cf. also *LW* 27:268; *WA* 2:518–521; and Kenneth Hagen, *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther. The Lectures on Hebrews* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974); and "The Testament of a Worm: Luther on Testament and Covenant," *Consensus* 8 (1982):12–20, 16: "Research on Luther's use of testament, covenant, and cognates to 1525 shows that, except where Luther sees covenant as a synonym for the testament of Christ, he uses *Pactum* and *Bund* pejoratively and in negative contexts."

14. *WA* 3:298,6ff.; 291,26–28; 55 2:24,6–12; 33,1–4; *LW* 10:240–243. Cf. David Steinmetz, *Luther and Staupitz: An Essay in the Intellectual Origins of the Protestant Reformation* (Durham, N.C. Duke University Press, 1980), 140, 130, 134, 139; Ozment, *Homo Spiritualis*, 182.

15. *LW* 48:12f.; *WA Br* 1:35,24ff.; *LW* 48:281f.; *WA Br* 2:370–372.

16. *WA* 2:415,6–10.

17. *LW* 31:41; *WA* 1:354 (thesis 24).

18. *LW* 12:307; *WA* 40 2:322,6–11.

19. *LW* 25:291; *WA* 56:304,25ff.; *LW* 31:9ff.; *WA* 1,225 (thesis 17).

20. *LW* 24:347; *WA* 46:44,34–38.

21. *LW* 12:343; *WA* 40 2:373,25–35.

22. *LW* 25:260; *WA* 56:272,16–20; Cf. also *WA* 57:165,12–13; 2,497,13.

23. Link, *Das Ringen Luthers*, 77.

24. *LW* 31:63; *WA* 1:370,9ff.

25. *LW* 25:322; *WA* 56:334,3f.

26. *LW* 31:64; *WA* 1:370,26f.

27: Cf. Marilyn Harran, "The Concept of Conversio in the Early Exegetical Writings of Martin Luther," *ARG* 72 (1981):13–33, 26–27.

28. *LW* 12:328; *WA* 40 2:352,24f.

29. *LW* 25:257; *WA* 56:268,27–30.

30. *LW* 25:188; *WA* 56:204,24f.

31. *LW* 25:217–218; *WA* 56:232,34ff.; *LW* 25:215; *WA* 56:231,6ff. Baylor, *Action and Person*, 223: "Luther drew an important distinction between 'becoming' a sinner and 'being' one. By 'becoming' a sinner he meant coming to the condemnation of the whole self which he equated with humility; 'being' a sinner meant for Luther remaining in the prideful, natural condition that is confident of the person's ability to fulfill divine law." Cf. *LW* 12:304,310f.

32. Oberman, "Simul Gemitus et Raptus," 59; Hermann, *Luthers*, 21.

33. *LW* 26:232ff.; *WA* 40:368,26ff.

34. Hermann, *Luthers*, 234ff.; R. Hermann, *Luthers Theologie*, ed. by Horst Beintker (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 111f. For a critique, cf. Axel Gyllenkrok, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung in der frühen evangelischen Theologie Luthers* (Uppsala, 1952), 112ff.

35. *LW* 26:342; *WA* 40:526,2–527,9.

36. *LW* 35:411; *WA DB* 7:421,6–15.

37. *LW* 25:433–434; *WA* 56:441,14–442,22; *LW* 11:496; *WA* 4:364,9–25; Gyllenkrok, *Rechtfertigung und Heiligung*, 79–98, 102ff.

38. *LW* 35:370; *WA DB* 7:11,6–9.

39. *BC* 445; *LW* 35:36; *WA* 2:732,25–33.

40. *BC* 432. Cf. Paul Althaus, *Paulus und Luther über den Menschen*, (Gütersloh: Mohn), 1963[4], 74–77.

41. *LW* 35:32f.; *WA* 2:729,19ff.

42. Cf. George Williams, "Sanctification in the Testimony of Several So-Called Schwärmer," in Asheim, ed., *Kirche, Mystik, Heiligung*, 194–211, 195.

43. Ronald J. Sider, *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt. The Development of His Thought 1517–1525* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), 216, 220ff.

44. Barge. Sider, *Karlstadt*, 280.

45. Sider, *Karlstadt*, 282. Cf. also R. J. Sider, "Karlstadt's Orlamünde Theology," *MQR* 45 (1971):191–218; 352–376; Karlstadt, "Von Abtuhung der Bylder," ed. by H. Lietzmann, (Bonn, 1911), 44; Ulrich Bubenheimer, *Consonantia Theologia et Jurisprudentiae: Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt als Theologe und Jurist zwischen Scholastik und Reformation*, (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1977), 244.

46. R. J. Sider, *Karlstadt's Battle with Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), 56f.

47. C. Lindberg, "Karlstadt's 'Dialogue' on the Lord's Supper," *MQR* 53 (1979):35–77, 58f.

48. Hertzsch I, 15.

49. Kähler, 37*; Bubenheimer, *Consonantia Theologia*, 285.

50. Cf. the introduction in Kilian McDonnell, *Presence, Power, Praise: Documents on the Charismatic Renewal*, 3 vols., (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1980). Cf. Marsden, *Fundamentalism*, 79f., 84. On male authority, cf. Larry Christenson, *Die christliche Familie* (Marburg/Lahn: Edel, 1975).

51. Kähler, 8*–37*.

52. Bubenheimer, *Consonantia Theologia*, 275f., 286.

53. *LW* 40:70; *WA* 15:396,16–26; *LW* 40:134; *WA* 18:116,13–18.

54. *LW* 26:396; *WA* 40:603,25ff. Cf. James Stayer and Werner Packull, eds., *The Anabaptists and Thomas Müntzer* (Dubuque & Toronto: Kendall Hunt, 1980).

55. *LW* 40:67; *WA* 15:394,1–5.

56. *LW* 31:344f.; *WA* 7:50,15f.

57. *LW* 40:253; *WA* 26:166,2f.

58. *LW* 40:83; *WA* 18:66,17–20.

59. *WA* 10 3:15,6–12; *LW* 40:260f.; *WA* 26:172,17ff.; *LW* 40:83; *WA* 18:66,12f.; *LW* 35:164,170ff.; *WA* 16:371,14ff.; 384,19ff.

60. Otto Hof, "Luthers Unterscheidung zwischen dem Glauben und der Reflexion auf den Glauben," *KuD* 18 (1972):294–324, 323f., also 294ff.

61. *LW* 40:252; *WA* 26:164,39ff.

62. *LW* 40:222f.; *WA* 18:213,29ff.

63. *LW* 40:252; *WA* 26:164,23.

64. *LW* 40:57; *WA* 15:218,5f. Cf. *LW* 41:151f.; *WA* 50:630,34–631,5.

65. *LW* 40:251; *WA* 26:164,5–11.

66. *LW* 35:371f.; *WA DB* 7:13,5ff.

67. *LW* 36:355; *WA* 19:515,19–21.

68. *LW* 26:232f.; *WA* 40:368,26–29.

70. *LW* 41:150; *WA* 50:629,28–35.

71. Sider, *Karlstadt*, 104–147, 197ff., and *Karlstadt's Battle*, 4; James Preus, *Carlstadt's "Ordinaciones" and Luther's Liberty: A Study of the Wittenberg Movement, 1521–1522* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974), 2.

72. U. Bubenheimer, "Andreas Rudolff Bodenstein von Karlstadt," in Wolfgang Merklein, ed., *Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt. 500–Jahre–Feier* (Karlstadt, 1980), 5–58, 37,52,38,40.

73. Gordon Rupp, *Patterns of Reformation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969), 120; Willis Stoesz, "The New Creature: Menno Simon's Understanding of the Christian Faith," *MQR* 39 (1965):5–24, 17 n. 82.

74. Preus, *Wittenberg Movement*, 51. Cf. my review of Preus in *MQR* 52 (1978):273–275.

75. Cf. C. Lindberg, "Theory and Practice: Reformation Models of Ministry," *Lutheran Quarterly* 27 (1975):27–35, and "Conflicting Models of Ministry—Luther, Karlstadt and Muentzer," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 41 (1977):35–50.

76. Lietzmann, "Von Abtuhung der Bylder," 19. Cornelius Dyck, "The Life of the Spirit in Anabaptism," *MQR* 47 (1973):309–326, 319: "There is a dimension of Luther's *simul iustus et peccator* here which the Anabaptists vigorously rejected, in principle, as being at the heart of the ethical failure of the Reformation."

77. *LW* 27:41f.; *WA* 40 2:51,13ff.

78. Karl Steck, *Luther und die Schwärmer* (Zurich: Zollikon, 1955), 5.

79. For a comprehensive treatment of what follows, cf. my study: *The Third Reformation? Charismatic Renewal and Lutheran Tradition*, (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1983).

80. Cf. Martin Schmidt, "Epochen der Pietismusforschung," in Berg and Dooren, eds., *Pietism und Reveil* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), 22–79; *WNM* 331f.; 9–23; Bubenheimer, *Karlstadt*, 40; Kenneth Davis, *Anabaptism and Ascetisism* (Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1974).

81. *WNM* 171f., 173 n. 14.

82. *WNM* 130, 170ff.; Spener, *Pia Desideria*, 79, 35f.

83. Spener, *Pia Desideria*, 39, 19.

84. *WNM* 136.

85. *WNM* 271.

86. Spener, *Pia Desideria*, 17,21; 35,9; 61,14; 66,33; 79,1,36; 18,1; 29,9; 61,11; 28,21.

87. *WNM* 168.

88. *WA* 4:287,5; 360,8; *LW* 21:347; *WA* 7:593,26.

89. M. Schmidt, "Der Pietismus und das moderne Denken," in K. Aland, ed, *Pietismus und Moderne Welt* (Witten: Luther, 1974), 9–74, 40.

90. *WNM* 327ff., 159, 173, 238ff.; Eberhard Peschke, *Bekehrung und Reform. Ansatz und Wurzeln der Theologie August Hermann Franckes*, (Bielefeld: Luther, 1977), 142f.

91. *WNM* 186, 271.

92. *WNM* 233f., 237.

93. K. Davis, "Anabaptism as a Charismatic Movement," *MQR* 53 (1979), 219–234; *BC* 312,4.

94. Peschke, 143. Cf. W. Joest, *Gesetz und Freiheit. Das Problem des tertius usus legis bei Luther und die neutestamentliche Parainese* (1961), 213 n. 244.

95. Christof Ziemer, "In und neben der Kirche. Charismatische Bewegungen der DDR," *Die Zeichen der Zeit* 6 (1979):218–226, 224, 221. Cf. McDonnell, 1:1vi, Martin Schmidt, *John Wesley*, 2 vols. (Zurich: Gotthelf, 1953–1966), 1:271–273; 2:59–60, 255–259, 273f., 407; Arnold Bittlinger, *Papst und Pfingstler*, (Frankfurt a. M.: Land, 1978), 173ff.; Marsden, *Fundamentalism*, 72–101.

96. Larry Christenson, *Social Action Jesus Style* (Minneapolis: Dimension Books, 1976), 96; *The Charismatic Renewal Among Lutherans* (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1976), 48.

97. Larry Christenson, *Speaking in Tongues* (Minneapolis: Dimension Books, 1975), 78f.

98. Cf. Theodore Jungkuntz, "Ethics in a Relativising Society," and "Response to Dr. Lazareth," *The Cresset*, Occasional Paper 3 (1978), 13, 15, 57–59.

99. Richard Jensen, *Touched by the Spirit* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975), 115.

100. *Ibid.*, 118.

101. *Ibid.*, 101. Cf. Morton Kelsey, *Encounter with God* (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1972); Watchman Nee, *The Normal Christian Life* (Ft. Washington, PA: Christian Literature Crusade, 1957).

102. Jensen, *Touched by the Spirit*, 99.

103. *Ibid.*, 102f., 98. Cf. Carl Maxcy, "Catholic Spirituality, Catholic Ethics and Martin Luther," *Ecumenical Trends* 10/4 (1981): 55–57, 57: "In my opinion, the twisted spirituality which has plagued Roman Catholics in the twentieth century is also partially the result of the post-Freudian obsession with self-analysis. The tendency is quite 'ecumenical,' because it afflicts Christians of every denomination. Our culture has told us that introspection is the proper *modus operandi* in life. As a result contemporary spirituality has turned increasingly to naval-gazing and has made us unable to get outside ourselves. . . . A healthy person is one who looks outside for truth and meaning. . . ."

104. C. J. Dyck, "Hermeneutics and Discipleship," in J. B. Horst, et al., *De Geest in het geding opstellen Aangeboden aan J. A. Oosterbaan*, (Willink, 1978), 57–72, 72.

105. *LW* 26:387; *WA* 40 1:589, 15–19, 25–28.