Martin Luther's Definition of the Human Creature

Robert Kolb

Most people have presumed that they knew how to define what constitutes being human. However, the thinking that has gone into these presumptions about what precisely constitutes the final creature of the sixth day reveals a spectrum of opinions regarding the vital elements in the discussion of reality in every branch of philosophy and every kind of religion. Martin Luther inherited presuppositions about what comprises the human creature that God fashioned in his own image. Many of those presuppositions arose out of ancient Greek philosophies. In the course of his career as a professor of Bible at the University of Wittenberg, his own discussion of being human evolved on the basis of an ever deeper immersion in the texts of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles. His growing awareness of the mystery of what it means to be the Creator's human creature led him to define the human creature within the framework of biblical terminology and the distinction of law and gospel. He found in Scripture that God is almighty and responsible for everything. That led him not only to his high appreciation of God as Creator, but also to his conviction that human core identity could be understood only through the unconditional gospel of God's plan for salvation in the death and resurrection of Christ. At the same time, he knew that God holds his human creatures responsible for being the children created in his own image, and his expectations for their exercise of these responsibilities set down his law for their lives. This theological axiom existed within the context of his use of biblical descriptions of the elements that constitute the person of the human being.

Commentators on Luther's anthropology have noted that Luther failed to formulate precise standard usage for the several biblical terms for elements that constitute humanity as God's creation and his use of medieval variants and expressions of them. He developed his holistic view of the thinking-willing-feeling-acting human creature using the terms given to him by biblical and theological texts. Thus, his writings defy succinct systematic synthesizing on how terms for various activities and organs of human thinking and feeling relate to each other.[1] Nonetheless, his use of biblical terminology following the texts gives a clear outline of the reformer's understanding of what it is to be human.

The Framework of Luther's Anthropology

In school and university Luther learned the fundamental anthropology of scholastic theologians, constructed out of ideas handed down from Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, and other ancient authorities. Luther's teachers had studied under the foremost representative of the train of thinking that flowed from the works of William of Ockham (1287-1347) and Gabriel Biel (1418-1495) at the University of Tübingen. Before the fall, Biel taught that, in the state of innocence, human reason or the intellect possessed a natural knowledge of good and evil and an inborn love of virtue. The will conformed to the judgment of reason and initiated the performance of good acts. However, following the fall, the intellect and the will are subject to the flesh and inclined to defy God. The intellect cannot give the will proper wisdom regarding God and proper human action, and the will is blinded by sin. The will is free and is able to produce the best that the sinner is capable of performing; that is sufficient to earn the aid of the grace that is necessary to equip the person to act in God-pleasing fashion.[2]

Luther rejected this Ockhamist estimate of the need for human performance "with purely natural powers" to initiate the relationship with God. Nonetheless, he retained the anthropological estimation that reason and will, as well as the emotions, constitute the human being's fundamental structure along with the body. Luther's colleague Philip Melanchthon sketched the elements that every human being possesses: reason, will, emotions, and bodily, physical activities (*ratio*, *voluntas*, *affectus*, locomotive).[3]

However, Luther's understanding of humanity was not ultimately determined by his knowledge of the philosophical traditions of the Hellenistic world and the processing of them in Christian thought in the Middle Ages: "the heart of the matter was neither in the philosophical substance of human nature, the 'quiddities' that so fascinated late medieval theology, nor in the principles of ethics found among Greek philosophers. Biblical anthropology centered on the relationship of humanity to its Creator."[4] For this reason Luther and Melanchthon found Aristotle wanting, for his Unmoved Mover had no personal communication with that which he moved. Luther's understanding of humanity rested ultimately on the personal relationship with the Creator, who spoke with Adam and Eve, and who went looking for them when they decided to avoid conversation with him. In 1529, Luther formulated his first principle for defining the human creature in his explanation of the first commandment. In his Small Catechism, he described human beings as those who "fear, love, and trust in God above all things."[5] In speaking of Adam's trust in Eden, the professor noted that "just as it is the nature of the eye to see, so it was the nature of reason and will in Adam to know God, to trust God, and to fear God."[6] In the Large Catechism, he described human beings as those who have "true faith and confidence of the heart,

which fly straight to the one true God and cling to him alone," those who "do not let [their] hearts cling to or rest in anyone else." For in him they find the source "of all good" and a "refuge in all need."[7] Luther's understanding of what the human creature is revolves around those elements that produce this true faith or trust in the one to whom the person clings and around the ways in which the body and its life receive God's providing care. He regarded trust as a function of thinking, willing, and feeling, a product of the entire human being.

This conviction that God speaks and human beings respond led Luther to his conviction that God addresses them in two fundamental modes. He tells his people what he has done and is doing for them out of his parental love and faithfulness, the gospel or the promise of new life. He tells them what he expects them to be doing, in commands or the law. Luther preached twice specifically on the proper distinction of law and gospel, once when his understanding of the gospel had come under intense fire from Roman Catholics, and once when the understanding of the distinction of law and gospel had been misrepresented within his own ranks.[8] In addition, a basic hermeneutical principle delineated his understanding of the shape of human life, the principle of the twofold righteousness, two aspects of human identity.[9] Luther contrasted as "alien righteousness, that is the righteousness of another person, infused from outside ourselves, … the righteousness by which the righteous Christ justifies through faith," with the "righteousness that we perform, belongs to us, not that we do this on our own but working together with the first righteousness from outside ourselves."[10] These presuppositions about the conversation between God and his human creature and about the created nature of the latter shaped what he said in more concrete, detailed terms that defined "the human."

Luther on Moses's Description of the Human Creature

Beyond the foundational relationship with the Creator, Luther found a fuller description of the constitutive elements of humanness in Genesis 1 and 2. His treatment of the account of creation in Genesis in his sermons of 1523 on the book (and in the German translation of them, published 1527) examined the text of Genesis 1:26-31 and 2:18-25. God created the human creature in accord with his own image. His human beings came into existence as male and female, according to Genesis 1:27, without describing in Genesis 1 precisely how that happened. It is nonetheless clear from the words "let us make" that God deliberated specifically over the design of the human creature. Luther repeated the estimation of past teachers of the church that the image of God consists of "three powers of the soul, namely memory, understanding, and will." Augustine had joined these three together based on Plato's idea of memory as the basis from which reason and will function.[11] The reformer expressed his own hesitation to carry this analysis too far, specifically in

associating these three aspects of humanity with the Holy Trinity. He told his hearers and readers that he preferred to remain with the simple words of the text and set aside such speculation. He did comment on Paul's contrast of the "earthly" and the "heavenly" images that shape humanity in 1 Corinthians 15:48-59 and Ephesians 4:22-24, viewing the former as the sin-ridden person whose reason is blinded, whose flesh is corrupted by evil desires and love for course sinning and unbelief, false belief, and despair. The heavenly image of Christ is reflected in "love, mercy and grace, humility, patience, wisdom, light, and everything good." Christ embodied this image in his death and resurrection.[12] In preaching to the people, Luther did not try to describe the original shape of humanity in detail, avoiding speculation about what he had not experienced.

Luther informed the congregation that since the fall all people are found either in God's image or Satan's image. God's image expresses itself in wisdom, virtue, and love and is saturated with the good, lacking all evil desires, with a natural uprightness in body and soul.[13] God's command to be fruitful and multiply belongs to the essential characteristics of being human, Luther asserted. This command gave him the occasion to criticize papal devaluation of marriage through its ascribing a higher holiness to celibacy.[14]

Genesis also provided the text for Luther's last lecture course, which extended over a decade until shortly before his death. In 1535, he addressed his students in Wittenberg on human nature as created and as fallen from the relationship in which God had originally created it. Some elements of his earlier, much briefer exposition of the last verses of Genesis 1 reoccurred, such as that "let us make" reveals that God dedicated special "deliberation and plan" to this human creature. This distinguished human beings from beings, *animalia*, of other kinds. Beasts (*animalia*) and human beings (*homines*) share many characteristics: they live and eat together, receiving nourishment from the same materials. However, God created human beings according to his special providential plan. Luther dismissed Epicurus' view that there is no more to life than eating and drinking. The descendants of Adam and Eve were destined for a life beyond the perfectly good life that they had enjoyed in Eden. Their relationship with God would not change from the complete harmony they had when they were first created, but Luther speculated they would have enjoyed "immortal" life beyond Eden.[15]

Luther indulged in some speculation regarding the original state of humanity. He imagined that in that original state, Adam must have displayed the most lucid reason, the sharpest memory, and the most faithful will. He had a sense of peace and rest, free from fear of death and other fears. His reason was enlightened, and he knew God truly. Adam desired to love both God and his neighbor, specifically Eve. And he had a perfect knowledge of the nature of animals, vegetation, and all other creatures. Not only his non-physical qualities exceeded the sinful imagina-

tion's ability to conceive. His body, every member, possessed the highest degree of beauty and strength. His eyes saw better than the lynx and the eagle; his strength exceeded that of lions and bears, and he played with them as Luther would deal with a puppy. Adam gave orders to the lions as Luther would to a dog. In addition, he ate the produce of the land that tasted far better than what Luther ate. His relationship with Eve produced no shame before God, since their relationship was lived out in obedience to God without any evil thought. Luther sketched the contrast between this image of God in the beginning with the present inability of the human imagination to grasp the fullness of what this creature was.[16] Physical work, such as cultivating the ground, would not have been toilsome but rather pleasurable. Best of all, Adam and Eve enjoyed harmony with God.[17]

They also enjoyed harmony among themselves. Luther spent some time combating views that belittled women, common among medieval scholastic and Renaissance thinkers of his time. Eve reflected the image of God just as fully as Adam and shared in their common rule over creation. Luther did not abandon a certain preeminence of the male gender over the female, but Eve partnered with Adam in the management of family and property.[18] In commenting on Genesis 2:18 a few weeks later, Luther noted that God created Eve according to a special plan and that she was in every way Adam's equal in terms of the qualities of body and mind. Luther described the partnership of the two as foundational for human life in community, living out the tasks to which God called them. After the fall, Eve and other women became both an antidote for sin to prevent men from sexual sinning and a companion to help them manage life.[19] God designed them to share property, children, food, bed, and dwelling. Man and woman had a common purpose in life.[20] Thus, Luther found human community and mutual dependence fundamental to God's plan for his human creatures. His understanding that God has assigned to each human being responsibilities in the household (*oeconomia*, embracing family and economic activities), society and its governing structures (*politia*), and church (*ecclesia*), formed the basis of his placement of every individual human being within the warp and woof of communities, from family to nation and culture. Christians recognize that these responsibilities are "callings" or "vocations" from God, who exercises his providential care of all through other human beings.[21]

Luther did view gender as intrinsic to the human creature. Engaging in precisely the kind of speculation he had just forbidden regarding the nature of the spiritual body after the resurrection as he preached on 1 Corinthians 15: 35-38, he asserted gender would remain even though eating, drinking, sleeping, family life, work in the fields, and secular government would disappear.[22]

This overview of human nature and life reveals that Luther placed great importance on the physical element of the human being, the body. Sin introduced dangers to health, including overindulgence in food and drink.[23] However, he devoted even

more attention to the non-physical, using at times the dichotomous description of the human creature as body and soul. At other times, depending on the biblical text, he uses the trichotomous distinction of body, soul, and spirit. His definitions or descriptions of "soul" and "spirit" vary, depending on the biblical text he is commenting on and the binary opposite he is criticizing. His lectures on Genesis also addressed this subject.

On the eve of the Wittenberg reform movement, controversy arose over the argument made by Italian thinker Pietro Pomponazzi (1462-1525), who claimed Aristotle had not taught that the soul is immortal and that the immortality of the soul cannot be demonstrated by reason. In 1513, the Fifth Lateran Council had condemned the idea that the soul is mortal and affirmed that it is immortal and that which establishes the formal aspect of the body.[24] Although Luther did not engage in this debate, it certainly helped form his thinking on the subject. In commenting on Genesis 2:7, God's breathing the "nephesh" into the clod of earth, which God had chosen as Adam's chemical base, Luther speaks of the "immortality of the soul," in direct criticism of Aristotle's denial that the human soul lives forever. Luther here was not thinking of a "soul" without beginning but only of the continuation of life for the human creature through and after earthly death. Luther clearly marked the beginning of the "immortal soul" at this act of creation by God.[25] For Luther went on to struggle with the usage of the term "living soul" in Genesis, for God deemed all animals living beings but then created Adam as the only living soul. The professor attempted a solution by turning to 1 Corinthians 15:45, "It is written: the first human being, Adam, was made a living soul, but the last Adam a quickening spirit." This led Luther to conclude that "living soul refers to physical life that includes eating, drinking, giving birth, growing, characteristics of all living beings." Three years earlier, he had defined nephesh as "the whole person with five senses" and all the activities that constitute the maintenance and use of the body.[26] In 1535, Luther reasoned that Moses must have intended through this expression in Genesis 2:7 to indicate that bodily existence continues into eternity even if the mortal body passes away. In this context, Luther used "immortality" to refer to life beyond the grave and "living soul" to refer to the life of the body that continues in the state of being a "quickening spirit."[27] However, he did not use this distinction consistently.

"Body and Soul" or "Body, Soul, and Spirit"

Luther's writings reflect the fact that biblical writers sometimes summarized the human creature as consisting of "body and soul" and sometimes they differentiated "body, soul, and spirit." Luther usually let the text on which he was commenting or preaching determine his usage. His general usage spoke of a person as "body and soul." But a text such as Luke 1:46-55 elicited comment on the soul and spirit. His

meditation on Mary's "Magnificat" of 1521, dedicated to giving comfort to Elector Frederick the Wise, echoed Mary's own usage. Luther recognized that Mary's use of her "spirit" and her "soul" probably mirrors Hebrew and Aramaic synonyms. He strove to demonstrate how the two terms expressed the location of a person's faith in God. He defined the "spirit" as "the loftiest, deepest, noblest part of the human creature." The spirit enables a person to grasp the divine. It is the organ of faith in God, the depository for God's Word. Psalm 51:37 spoke of the spirit, in Luther's words, as sincere faith; Psalm 78:37 equated the "spirit" with the "heart."[28] God governs the human spirit that is turned toward him. He defined "soul" as the same spirit in essence but seen performing a different function. The soul is directed into the earthly realm, as it animates the body. The spirit is what gives a person essential identity that exists even apart from the body. The soul remains with the body during sleep, keeping the body alive. The body serves to accomplish what the soul and spirit tell it.[29] However, the body cannot deal with the divine matters that reason cannot fathom. Reason provides light for earthly life, for the body. Without the spirit and its connection with God through faith, it will fall into error.[30] The spirit provides wisdom, while the soul provides knowledge and feelings.[31]

Luther drew an analogy between this structure of the human creature and the Old Testament tabernacle with its three sections. The Holy of Holies, where God dwells, had no light. The Holy Place had its seven lamps. The Outer Court was fully open, and bathed in sunlight. The human spirit believes what cannot be seen or comprehended. The soul reasons, knows, and understands the visible, the things of the body. The body, like the forecourt, is on public display so that others may observe what it does and how it lives.[32] Luther cited 1 Thessalonians 5:23, where Paul prayed for the holiness of spirit, soul, and body; he then observed that when the spirit loses its holiness—which is faith pure and simple—nothing holy remains in a person. The spirit preserves soul and body from sin and error so long as it trusts in God. When it does not, neither soul nor body please God. God must preserve the human spirit so that the soul and body belong to him.[33]

Luther's views varied in the ensuing years as he interpreted various biblical texts. In 1526, he commented on Ecclesiastes 12:7, associating the spirit that returns to God at death is the same breath of life mentioned in Genesis 2:7. He made the obscure observation that since we do not know whence God fashioned the spirit, we do not know whither it goes, apart from being with God.[34] In his 1538 annotations on the Gospel according to Matthew, based on earlier work on the Gospel, Luther explicated Matthew 10:28 by affirming that the soul lives even when the body is killed. He claimed that the soul is the life of the body, an axiom in medieval theology. Murderers can separate the soul from the body—that is, they can take life away from the body—"but they cannot kill you completely, whether they want to or not, the soul lives and cannot be killed." Luther asserted that this relationship of soul

and body lies beyond human comprehension because our life is hidden in God (Col. 3:3). But the dead Abel, Luther reasoned, could accuse the living Cain (Gen. 4:10), and Abraham, though dead, could be alive for all things live to God (Luke 20:38).[35]

Flesh and Spirit

Luther placed this analysis of the elements of the human creature as designed and formed by God within the context of the corruption of God's good creature by sin, reflecting, above all, the formulations of the Apostle Paul. Paul bestowed on the thinking of Christians a contrast or conflict between the "flesh," not to be confused with the "body," and the "spirit," not to be equated with the spirit as a component of the human creature. Instead, this "flesh" and "spirit" dichotomy describes the person who lives apart from God in contrast to the person who lives by faith in Christ. Both "flesh" and "spirit" in this case permeate the entire Christian person. Christians experience the battle that goes on between God and Satan within their own lives, between the "flesh" as a designation for desires and actions in defiance of God and in service to self and "spirit" as trust in God and the actions that flow from it.

In 1520, Luther's programmatic effort to construct a framework for Evangelical piety, *On Christian Freedom*, treated the distinction of flesh and spirit as the conflict between the spirit of faith and joy over the benefits that Christ has conferred and the flesh, "a contrary will … which strives to serve the world and seeks its own advantage." In 1520, the shadow of the cloister focused his taming this flesh on keeping the body active and disciplined.[36] In 1531, while lecturing on Galatians 5:17, he included in the "flesh" not only "sexual desire, pride, anger, sadness, impatience, unbelief" but also "party spirit, pride, hatred, contempt for the neighbor, trust in their own righteousness, presumption, neglect of godliness and the Word, blasphemy." He placed the conflict with the spirit that is faithful to God in the midst of his own experience, as it had been in Paul's, as described in Romans 7.[37]

In 1522, offering readers of his translation of the New Testament a series of key biblical terms to aid their understanding of Scripture, Luther sketched his understanding of each term. "Flesh" does not refer to sexual deviations, and "spirit" is not limited to internal thoughts about God. Paul's term "flesh" in Galatians 5:16-25 embraces "the whole person with body and soul, mind and senses, because everything about a person longs for the flesh." Even learned theologians can be fleshly in discussing spiritual subjects if they do this apart from God's grace. The pinnacle of "fleshliness" is failing to trust God. By the same token, "spiritual" describes the person of faith with very bodily works of love, such as Christ's washing the feet of the disciples and Peter's practicing his vocation as a fisherman. Luther asserted that fleshly people are those who work in the service of their own temporal gain,

while spiritual people are those whose lives inwardly and outwardly serve the Holy Spirit and point to the future life.[38] In one of his last sermons, he treated Galatians 5:16-24, defining "flesh" as that which drives human beings not only to sexual offenses against God's plan for their sexuality but also to hatred, envy, anger, greed, and other wickedness.[39]

Luther on the Body

Luther's background in the philosophy of William of Ockham equipped him with an appreciation of the created order. Ockham held that in the created objects of daily human experience, human beings encountered the fundamentals of language. Luther regarded language as an essential element in the personhood of those created in the image of the speaking God. As a result, the Wittenberg professor abandoned the spiritualizing dismissal of the body that led to the monastic life with its rejection of marriage and its ascetic ideals of using abstinence from and denial of God's temporal blessings as a path for earning merit in his sight.

Luther taught that God made each new human creature to grow in the womb of the mother, but he also concluded that this creature's origin and growth remain a mystery. Even if the womb were open, a human observer would not see how a person grows any more than we can observe the growth of trees, he told his students in 1526.[40] In 1532, his homiletical exposition of 1 Corinthians 15 affirmed that fundamental for the human creature are "body, soul, and all the senses." On the other hand, he noted that certain characteristics of the mortal body, including decaying and stinking, would not be part of the spiritual, resurrected body. For, he observed, the mortal body begins to stink a day after death and then becomes home to maggots and worms. Its putrid smell generates worms, snakes, and toads, according to some.[41]

Luther's preaching often reminded his people of God's providence in supplying their daily needs for food, clothing, and other bodily necessities.[42] Explaining the first article of the Creed, he expressed his thankfulness for God's daily and abundant provision of "shoes and clothing, food and drink, house and farm, spouse and children, fields, livestock and all property—along with all the necessities and nourishment for this body and life."[43] Indeed, the fourth petition leads the whole person to recognize the Creator's goodness in giving "everything included in the necessities and nourishment for our bodies, such as food, drink, clothing, shoes, house, farm, fields, livestock, money, property, an upright spouse, upright children, upright members of the household, upright and faithful rulers, good government, good weather, peace, health, decency, honor, good friends, faithful neighbors, and the like."[44] He quoted Psalm 127:2, "so he gives [what people need] to his beloved

in sleep," in a sermon on Luke 5:1-11 in the Summer Postil to show that worry about temporal welfare is in vain, for "God bestows his gifts overnight. Grain and all food from the earth, indeed, all that a person has or may acquire must be given by God."[45]

In commenting on Matthew 10:30, Luther went beyond the words of Matthew 10:30 to rejoice that God keeps track not only of the hairs of our head, the most worthless part of the body since they are dead, but also of "your fingers, all your joints, even your nails." That meant that the devil could not touch a single hair if not permitted to do so by our Father.[46]

The "body" in Luther's view can refer to other material blessings, including property, honor or respect of others, and family, as he indicated in his hymn, "A Mighty Fortress,"[47] as well as to life lived in faith. Preaching on Psalm 110:4 in 1535, the reformer reminded the congregation that the sacrifice of Christ elicits in their lives what Paul labeled the body as a living sacrifice (Rom. 12:1-2). Luther explained that meant the loss of life, possessions, and honor sacrificed in serving the Lord.[48] However, in 1523, while composing his preface introducing the Old Testament to readers of his translation, he interpreted this Romans passage as referring to "the constant exercise of the gospel both in preaching and in believing."[49] In his Church Postil of 1522, the living sacrifice of the body is summarized as its mortification by fasting, anticipating Christ's return, and working, such as Anna performed in the temple in Luke 2:37.[50] Luther's confidence in the presence and power of God extended beyond his restoration of the sinner's relationship with the Creator to his provision for the body in this life. Jesus's admonition not to worry about life, food, and clothing in Matthew 6:25 reminded the reformer that it is only reasonable to conclude that God has given his people "body and life" without our first being concerned about them, and he will preserve them as well. Jesus is saying, Luther concluded, that God gives life and preserves our bodies, including food and clothing, as part of that gift.[51]

Alongside such necessities of physical life, Luther was concerned about the health of those around him, having suffered again and again from a variety of ailments himself. He recognized that the borderline between purely physical afflictions and the mental and spiritual state of a person was not always firm. When his friend and colleague Philip Melanchthon fell ill in 1540 in the midst of the conflict around the bigamy of their supporter Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Luther visited him. In his usual brusque manner, Luther first stormed the gates of heaven with an imperative prayer, and then he threatened Melanchthon with excommunication if he did not place himself in God's hands and recover.[52] Four years later, Georg Spalatin, pastor in Altenburg, who had covered for Luther in the delicate days of Luther's excommunication and imperial ban, suffered from physical symptoms related to melancholy or depression. "God does not want the sinner to die but to

live and turn to him," Luther wrote his friend, whose conscience suffered from a bad pastoral decision. Luther took Spalatin's feelings of sin and guilt as seriously as Spalatin himself did. He assured Spalatin of forgiveness for his bad judgment, arguing that if he viewed himself as a real sinner, he should believe that Christ is a real savior.[53] Similarly, Luther encouraged his children's tutor Hieronymus Weller, and Weller's sister, Barbara Lisskirchen, when they were struggling with melancholia and its physical effects.[54] When Else von Kanitz, a fellow nun who had escaped from Cloister Nimbschen with Katharina von Bora, fell into melancholia, Luther gave her practical advice. She should recognize that she was sharing the cross that Christians bear, an aspect of the reformer's theology of the cross. He offered the practical suggestion that she come to Wittenberg to teach school there, a diversion from her affliction.[55]

Luther often warned against overindulgence in eating and drinking. In his *Open Letter to the German Nobility* in 1520, he condemned the abuse of food and drink, which had given Germans a bad reputation in other lands.[56] In his lecture on Genesis 1:30 in 1535, he noted that the "leprous obesity" of his fellow Germans stood in contrast to the physical attractiveness and health of Adam and Eve. He criticized endangering one's health by brutish consumption, especially of meat; he preferred the delightful fruits of the earth.[57] His preface to the Smalcald Articles of 1538 denounced gluttony along with a series of other societal evils.[58]

Luther's concern for bodily health guided his answer to a request for counsel when the plague struck Breslau in 1527. Pastor Johann Hess wrote for aid in deciding whether Christians should flee the plague. Luther's practical wisdom rested on the principles of trusting God, carrying out the calling that he has given, and exercising reasonable care for the body that does not try to put God to the test. His confidence that God provides through the gifts of the physician and the pharmacist shaped his response to Hess, along with his conviction that God places certain people in callings with responsibilities for the public safety. Thus, he insisted that the governing officials and medical personnel in Breslau should remain at their posts and serve as agents of God's providence in times of plague. So should pastors charged with the spiritual care of the sick and dying.[59] On the other hand, God "commanded that by the sweat of our brow we should seek our daily food, clothing, and all we need and avoid destruction and disaster whenever we can, as long as we do so without detracting from our love and duty toward our neighbor." Because of this principle, he urged individuals to make every effort to care for themselves in the midst of the plague.[60] He prescribed public policy that provides "municipal homes and hospitals staffed with people to take care of the sick so that patients from private homes may be sent there."[61] Luther called failing to use medicine and other precautions to avoid the disease tempting God and a form of suicide. "Use medicine; take tonics, fumigate the house, yard, and street, avoid persons and places" where illness may

be contracted, he counseled. He urged following the Old Testament model of quarantine—practiced for lepers in his own time—as a precautionary measure when plague struck.[62] Luther's concern for both the bodily and the spiritual welfare of the sick demonstrates his holistic conception of the human being.

Other elements of life in which the body worked together with reason, will, and emotions included procreation, the use of language, and music. Luther emphasized both the companionship of the "helper" Eve and the cooperation of Adam and Eve in giving birth to children in his Genesis lectures and numerous other places.[63] He recognized that the physical nature of procreation is inextricably connected with reason, will, and especially emotions. His own family life publicly illustrated the relationship of husband and wife with their children, first of all in the companionship he and Katharina von Bora enjoyed.[64] His concern for wife and child surfaced in his seeking advice from one of his followers, Argula von Grumbach, in 1530, on how to wean the newborn Magdalena.[65] His grief over the death of his daughters Elisabeth and Magdalena depicts the bonds that weave together the generations.[66] His words of comfort for mothers who had experienced a miscarriage reveal his sensitivity to the bodily perils and emotional ordeals of childbirth and his confidence that God also controls and loves his people in the midst of evil's assaults.[67]

Integral to Luther's understanding of what it is to be human was his high appreciation of the acts of speaking and listening. He cultivated the use of language and exploited his gift of hearing the tones and rhythms, the sense and intention of the language spoken in the market place. He put this to use through his teaching and writing. More fundamentally, as Johannes von Lüpke observes, for Luther "language is the quintessence of living as human beings; compared to a speaking person, a person without words is nothing more than half-dead, and there is no more powerful or noble human activity than speaking since human beings are distinguished from other animals most decisively by speaking (WADB 10.2.100,10-31, LW 35: 254, cf. WA29.349.31-350.13, 350.2-4)." Von Lüpke asserts that for Luther, language occupies the place "where reason stands in the philosophical definition. Human beings are linguistic beings; even their reason is dependent on language."[68]

Thus, Luther emphasized rhetorical principles for communicating, just as Melanchthon did. He knew the importance of the relationship between spoken words (and written words as well) and both the fashioning and the reception of verbal communication by reason, will, and emotions.[69] For Luther, the ear served as the channel that received both the devil's deceptions and God's saving promise. Hearing leads to trust and obedience.[70] As important as speaking God's Word was to Luther, he also emphasized the importance of believers coming to God to listen. Oswald Bayer has pointed out the importance of entering into God's presence in silence, letting him speak new life into us.[71]

The ear and the tongue, along with associated instruments, such as vocal cords, not only served as the body's contribution to the vital center of being human—communication with God and with others. They also provided the tools that produced music, according to Luther. His well-known praise of music coupled this "divine and most precious" gift with the gift of speaking; together, these gifts enabled human beings to praise God and were thus vital for their relationship with God.[72] Early in his career, he noted that a heart that rejoices in the Lord produces song and singing.[73] Luther also recognized the power of music to tame human thinking that was out of control, as David used it to drive the evil spirit out of Saul.[74] To a degree uncommon in medieval theology, Luther expressed his high estimation of the human body and his deep concern for its welfare.

Luther's Vocabulary of Human Thinking, Willing, and Feeling

Body and non-corporeal elements of humanity work together in Luther's composite picture of the human creature. A review of some of his use of biblical terms for their activities reveal that Luther did not develop a succinct definition of how human beings live out their humanity but instead used the variety of terms Scripture and his teachers had placed at his disposal. In medieval thought, reason and intellect may be synonymous, or they may distinguish the action of the intellect and the entity that reasons. Luther is well-known for his dismissal of reason as a "whore," but his appreciation of properly functioning reason soared to lofty praise when it functioned within its proper bounds. Critical to understanding these two aspects of Luther's attitude toward human reasoning is his distinction between the realm in which our understanding absorbs who God is and what he has done for sinners, *and* the earthly realm that he has placed under human stewardship. Lecturing on Isaiah 9:1 in 1543, the professor commented, "reason is the greatest and most unbelievably precious gift of God, nor should it be held in contempt when it wisely puts things in order and discovers things in human affairs."[75] Brian Gerrish cites the reformer's sermon on Isaiah 60:1-6 in his Church Postil. There, Luther notes that in earthly activities "the rational person is self-sufficient" and reason is a sufficient guide, for instance, in knowing how to "build houses, make clothing, conduct marriage, wage war, navigate on the sea, etc." In relationship to God, however, "nature is absolutely stone-blind so that it cannot even catch a glimpse of what those things are." Reason produces government and law if rightly used. It elicits moral behavior that permits society to run more or less smoothly. But it can also construct false systems of government and errant codes of conduct.[76] In a sinful world reason's challenge is to foster living "soberly, righteously, and godly" (Titus 2:12), a challenge comparable to keeping sober in a tavern, chaste in a brothel, godly in a dance-hall, innocent among murderers.[77]

Luther did not discount the role reason can play in aiding human contemplation of God's revelation of himself so long as it only supplies tools for understanding and does not try to shape understanding.[78] Luther used elements of Aristotelian logic in explaining biblical concepts, for instance, through syllogisms or the physics of substance and accident, while carefully setting limits on the proper use of these tools.[79] Thus, reason functioned as a significant component part of the human creature; as such, it not only contributed to the fulfillment of the individual but also to the potential for abuse and succumbing to Satanic attack.

The will likewise functions as God's good gift and yet is subject to Satan's turning it away from God. Bengt Hägglund summarized Luther's definition of the human will (*voluntas*) as the inner orientation of human creatures which determines the entire direction of their lives and expresses, in the actions it causes, their very identity.[80] It included the process of making a decision and a choice (*arbitrium*). In 1535, he told his students that God commissioned Adam and Eve to have their wills make decisions in exercising their lordship over fish, birds, animals, and their fields. In relationship to God, however, Adam, even before the fall into sin, was like clay in the potter's hands, in what Luther called a state of "passive potentiality." His power to want to live in trusting harmony with his Creator was God's gift.[81]

The very understanding of the will as a decision-making agent imposed on Luther the struggle to define how the creature could freely will within an existence whose boundaries or definition had been set by the Creator. Early in his theological development, Luther began his struggle to solve the problem of his inability to turn his will to God alone, the impotence of his powers of choice (*arbitrium*) to choose God and his will instead of going his own contrary way. He avoided speculation about God's predestination of sinners for salvation since he had not been present in the divine counsels before the foundation of the world. Instead, Luther concentrated his attention on his own will since he had experienced that its choices in regard to God were bound. In his treatise *On Bound Choice* (*De servo arbitrio*), he further struggled with the mystery of how God the Creator can hold the human creature accountable for actions within the sphere of human responsibility when he, as Creator, is responsible for all things. Luther wanted to avoid the implication that the human will stood under "compulsion" in such a way that made this human creature like an automaton or marionette. In no way was he a determinist, nor did he deny human responsibility. Luther stated that the will performs acts of willing "spontaneously and freely" (or in Philip Watson's rendering "of its own accord and with a ready will"). Thus, even when overtaken by the mystery of sin, people "cannot by their own powers lay aside, restrain, or change, but they keep on willing ... even if compelled by external force [the devil] to do something different...."[82] Luther took over a medieval analogy that may seem limping to modern readers by asserting that "the human will is placed between the two like a beast of burden. If God rides

it, it wills and goes where God wills, as the psalm says, "I was like a brute beast in relationship to you; nevertheless, I am continually with you" [Ps. 73:22-23]. If Satan rides the animal, it wills and goes where Satan wills; nor can it choose to run to either of the two riders or to choose one or the other, but the riders themselves contend for the possession and control of the animal.[83] Hans-Joachim Iwand caught Luther's intention: "Therefore, we do not want to understand the human being on the basis of the will, but the will on the basis of what it means to be human."[84]

The reformer finally turned the focus to the transformation wrought by the Holy Spirit in converting the sinner to faith in Christ. This new creature in Christ lives according to God's design for human life "from pure willingness and inclination and of its own accord, not from compulsion…." The will of this new creature of faith "cannot be turned another way by any opposition, nor be overcome or compelled even by the gates of hell, but it goes on willing and delighting in and loving the good, just as before it willed and delighted in and loved evil." The Holy Spirit and God's grace continue to bestow the new life of the new creature, and that new life includes the restoration of the proper functioning of the human will.[85]

The word Luther used most frequently to describe the emotional aspects of humanity was the "heart." The emotions often appear in the context of the conversations human beings are having with either God or the devil. Luther picked up on biblical usage that treats emotions as inseparable from thinking, so that the "heart" may embrace feeling, willing, and reasoning. He noted already in his 1517 lectures on Hebrews that "mind" and "heart" designate intellect and affections.[86] Emotions may evade our expression in words, but they both proceed from and form concepts that finally follow some pattern, even if its unarticulated logic is totally flawed and faulty. Birgit Stolt summarizes the biblical understanding of the "heart" that Luther assumed as

> the seat of mental faculties, understanding, feeling, will, the power to make decisions, memory and other things. In one's heart as the center of personal consciousness and capacity to understand the human being receives in the Old Testament the commands of God, in the New Testament grace and divine enlightenment. In the heart, not in the head, the free decision for or against God takes place.[87]

The Holy Spirit, Luther told the Wittenberg congregation in 1537, is poured into the heart, is active there, and through baptism, the Lord's Supper, and the proclamation of the Word of God shapes our feelings and faith.[88] God addresses the heart by speaking and thus determines human existence through his Word.

Luther viewed the heart as the organ that connects with God by its trust. Jonathan Reinert's careful description of how Luther's use of the "heart" as the expression for the believer's trust in Christ begins in his lectures on the Psalms in 1513-1515.

There, it is often the heart that is said to turn to God in true repentance.[89] The professor's usage focused on the heart ever more as the source of all prayers of believers, and by 1520, the heart had become for Luther the agent of trust and faithfulness of Christ's people.[90] In 1534, Luther treated the connection joining believers to God by suggesting that he had not placed Jesus into their hands, nor drawn him for their eyes to capture, but that he had painted the Word into their hearts.[91]

However, the "heart," Luther observed, also fashioned false gods. Commenting on Genesis 6:5, he affirmed that the imagination of the heart fashioned evil continually.[92] Genesis 8:21 provoked the reflection that reason, will, and intellect work together as the heart to fashion something, as a "rational being whose heart is always inventing or imagining something." According to Moses, Luther stated that whatever it invents or fashions is evil.[93]

Stolt cites Luther's estimate of the heart's positive role in the work of translating Scripture as but one of many examples of how the heart works: "It requires an upright, devout, honest, sincere, God-fearing, Christian, trained, informed, and experienced heart." She refers to Luther's introduction to the Psalms. There, he treats the psalms as windows to the hearts of the psalmists so that readers can "see what kind of thoughts they had, how their hearts were disposed, and how they acted in all kinds of situations in danger and in need." Luther continued by describing the heart as

> a ship on a wild sea, driven by the storm winds from the four corners of the world. Here it is stuck with fear and worry about impending disaster; there comes grief and sadness because of present evil. Here breathes a breeze of hope and anticipated happiness; there blows security and joy in present blessings. These storm winds teach us to speak seriously, to open the heart and pour out what lies at its bottom.

The hearts of the people of God are like gardens, like heaven, where beautiful flowers blossom with joy because of God's blessings. Looking into the hearts of the saints can, on the other hand, be a glimpse of death and hell itself.[94]

Luther inherited the related terms "*conscientia*" and "*synderesis*" from his scholastic teachers. Bonaventura included *synderesis* in the will as that which moved the conscience to make proper moral judgments. Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus regarded the *synderesis* as a *habitus* within the intellect; Scotus used the word "*conscientia*" as the agent of applying the inborn principles of the *synderesis*. Biel believed that the *synderesis* was not merely a *habitus* but an integral part of human beings, directing them to right actions. The conscience provides knowledge and guidance to the freely deciding will with the aim of acting in a manner that earns initial grace.[95]

Luther used both terms, seemingly as synonyms, shaped in part by Augustine's usage. Following Augustine, Luther viewed the conscience as the human being's

hearing God's address to his whole self, the perception of God's will for his creatures. Luther's "*conscientia*" did more than provide moral guidance; it embraced a larger orientation toward God and other human creatures, toward the entire creation in accordance with God's will.[96] His student Johannes Mathesius remembered his teacher's defining conscience as having two aspects: in relationship to God, the conscience extends its trust; towards other human beings, it reaches out in love.[97] In his *On Christian Freedom*, Luther taught that Christ had bestowed righteousness on the consciences of his people by freeing them from sin and death, that is, orienting their view of God and his creation toward him and his Word.[98] Luther explained the "searing" of the conscience in lecturing on 1 Timothy 4:2 in 1528: a seared conscience cannot assess the world accurately. When Satan has seared the conscience, it does not perceive the reality of God and his world properly. For the conscience produces the content of what a person believes—the teaching or doctrine—and a person "lives by what the conscience teaches."[99] Here, Luther includes one's whole perception of God and all he has made in the conscience.

Luther also treated the "mind" (*der Sinn*), viewing the believer's way of thinking and perceiving reality as the mind of Christ. His sermon on Ephesians 4:1-6 in Caspar Cruciger's edition of the Summer Postil (1543) stated that this "mind" or way of thinking flows from the forgiveness of sins and the unmerited gift of eternal life, which produces the recognition that those who trust in Christ are children of God, partakers of the benefits that flow from Christ's death and resurrection. This directed the mind away from envy of those with other gifts, serving God and neighbor within the boundaries set by the Creator in the callings of daily life. Believers thus thank God for using them as instruments of his providence wherever he places them. This thankfulness for precisely the callings or assignments God has given to each believer leads to unity and harmony among the people of God.[100]

The biblical descriptions of the way in which faith in Christ moves and directs human beings in daily life relied on these terms that Luther found in the biblical text. Rather than giving a succinct definition of the component parts of God's human creature, he defined being human in terms of the relationship of fear, love, and trust in God above all else, and in terms of the relationships that flow from trust in God revealed in Christ with the neighbors whom we are to love and serve with a Christ-like spirit of self-sacrifice.

Conclusion

Martin Luther's view of what it is to be God's human creature focused on the relationship of love and trust that bound him to his God and on God's providence for his body and the life described as "soul," "spirit," and a series of other terms

that he assembled from the medieval tradition and Scripture. His sensitivity to the complexity of his own person, the complexity of every human creature, let him focus on his relationship with God as the fundamental element of his humanity. To describe the human role in that relationship, he employed a range of biblical and traditional terms that heightened appreciation of the gift of being God's human creature. His description of what makes human beings the creatures they are presented a holistic picture, with a higher appreciation of the physical body than had been present in medieval theologians. He acknowledged the ancient and medieval distinction of reason, will, affections, and the physical, but more prominently spoke in biblical terminology, both in setting forth the component parts of the human creature and in treating the struggle between God and Satan within this creature in Pauline terms of "flesh" and "spirit." Luther's definition of being human encompassed all of human life, from conception in the womb to the resurrection from death and life eternal, always in relationship with the Creator himself.

Robert Kolb *is Professor of Systematic Theology Emeritus at Concordia Seminary, Saint Louis, is co-editor with Timothy J. Wengert of the 2000 translation of* The Book of Concord *and co-editor with Irene Dingel and Lubomír Batka of* The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology *(2014). He has authored several books on Luther and Lutheran teaching, including two appearing in 2024*: Face to Face. Martin Luther's View of Reality *(Fortress Press) and the second edition of* The Christian Faith, a Lutheran Exposition*, co-authored with Theodore J. Hopkins (Concordia Publishing House).*

Notes

1. My thanks to Dennis Ngien, who has pointed me to this analysis as found in Pekka Kärkkäinen, "Emotions and Experience," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Martin Luther*, ed. Derek Nelson and Paul Hinlicky (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), 1: 436-448; Simeon Zahl, "The bondage of the affections: willing, feeling, and desiring in Luther's theology, 1513-1525," in *The Spirit, the Affections, and the Christian Tradition*, ed. Dale M. Coulter, & Amos Yong (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2016), 181-206.
2. Heiko A. Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), 48, 63-65.
3. In *Loci communes rerum theologicarum*, 1521, the topic "De hominis viribus adeoque de libero arbitrio," *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl* [Studien–Ausgabe], 6 vols., ed. Robert Stupperich (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1951–1975), 2.1:8–17, and in *Loci praecipui theologici*, 1535/1559, *Melanchthons Werke*, 2.1: 236–252, esp. 237.17–25.
4. Erik H. Herrmann, "Luther and the Importance of the Hebrew Heritage for his World of Thought," in *Simul: Inquiries into Luther's Expression of the Christian Life*, ed. Robert Kolb, Torbjörn Johansson, and Daniel Johansson (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021), 53.

5. *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche*, ed. Irene Dingel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014) 862/863.3-10) [henceforth BSELK]; *The Book of Concord*, ed. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 351 [henceforth BC].

6. *D. Martin Luthers Werke* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1883- 1993), 42: 124.11-12 [henceforth WA]; *Luther's Works* (Saint Louis/Philadelphia: Concordia/Fortress, 1958-1986) 1:165 [henceforth LW].

7. BSELK 932/933. 4-11; BC 286-387.

8. WA 36:8-23, and WA 45:145-156; see Robert Kolb, "'The Noblest Skill in the Christian Church': Luther's Sermons on the Proper Distinction of Law and Gospel," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 71 (2007): 301-318.

9. See essays in *The Alien + the Proper. Luther's Two-fold Righteousness in Controversy, Ministry, and Citizenship*, ed. Robert Kolb (Irvine, CA: 1517 Publishing, 2023).

10. WA 2: 145.9-10, 146.36-37; LW 31:297, 299.

11. Augustine, *De Trinitate* X, xi (18), *Corpus Christianorum L, Aurelii Augustini Opera Pars XVI, 1*, ed. W. J. Mountain (Turhout: Brepols, 1968), 330-331. See Lenka Karfíková, *Grace and the Will according to Augustine*, trans. Markéta Janebová (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 187-191. Medieval teachers used this trilogy, frequently refining Augustine's presentation.

12. WA 24:48.20-51, 9.

13. WA 24:51.10-25.

14. WA 24:53.16-57, 21.

15. WA 42:41.38-43, 18; LW 1:56-57.

16. WA 42:46.27-49, 8; LW 1:62-64.

17. WA 42:48.27-49,7; LW 1:65. See Christian Volkmar Witt, *Martin Luthers Reformation der Ehe: sein theologisches Eheverständnis vor dessen augustinisch-mittelalterlichem Hintergrund* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017).

18. WA 42:51/52.12-22; LW 1:69.

19. WA 42:87.11-89.5; LW 1:115-117; cf. WA 42:92.27-38; LW 1:123.

20. WA 42:103.14-22; LW 1:137.

21. Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*; trans. Carl C. Rasmussen (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1957).

22. WA 36:635.22-25; LW 28:172-173.

23. WA 42:55.18-23; LW 1:72.

24. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils. Volume Two. Trent to Vatican II*, ed. Norman P. Tanner, S.J. (London: Sheed & Ward, and Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, 1990), 1:605-606.

25. WA 42:63.25-33; LW 1:84.

26. WA 36:659.16-36; LW 28:189.

27. WA 42:64.37-66, 19; LW 1:85-86.

28. WA 7:550.1-559.28; LW 21:303-312.

29. WA 7:550.19-551.11; LW 21:303.

30. WA 7:550.35-555.11, 555.25-226.4; LW 21:303, 304.
31. WA 7:551.9-11; LW 21:303.
32. WA 7:551.12-24; LW 21:304.
33. WA 7:551.25-552.4; LW 21:304.
34. WA 20:197:23-31; LW 15:182.
35. WA 38:505.5-506.2; LW 67:105-106.
36. WA 7:60.2-33; LW 31:359-360.
37. WA 40.II:88.17-90.21; LW 27:70-71.
38. WA DB 7:12-13.5-26; LW 35:371-372.
39. WA 51:50.1-57.9; LW 58:283-293.
40. Lecturing on Ecclesiastes 11:5, WA 20:187.22-188.2; LW 15:173-174.
41. WA 36:645.19-29, 647.34-650.22, 654.20-657.14; LW 28:178-179, 181-182, 185-187,
42. See Robert Kolb, "Luther's Providential God," in *The Interface of Science, Theology, and Religion. Essays in Honor of Alister E. McGrath*, ed. Dennis Ngien (Eugene: Pickwick, 2019), 48-65.
43. BSELK, 870-871.10-12; BC 354.
44. BSELK, 878-879.8-12; BC 357.
45. WA 22:75.35-76.8; LW 78:210.
46. WA 38:507.4-21; LW 67:108-109.
47. WA 35:457.8-9; LW 53:285.
48. WA 41:211.32-37; LW 13:333.
49. WA DB 8:31.7-18; LW 35:248.
50. WA 10.I, Part 1:433.5-435.15; LW 75:425-427.
51. WA 22:266.20-268.6; LW 79:104-105.
52. Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther and the Preservation of the Church*, 1532-1546, trans. James L. Schaaf (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 209-210. Cf. Luther's report to his wife, WA Br 9:168, 172.22-24; LW 50:215.
53. WA Br 10:638-640, Nr. 4021, cf. Stephen Pietsch, *Of Good Comfort. Martin Luther's Letters to the Depressed and their Significance for Pastoral Care Today* (Adelaide: ATF, 2016), 27-100, 137-254.
54. WA Br 10:373-375, Nr. 1593; WA Br 10:518-520, Nr. 1670, 10:546-547, Nr. 1684; WA Br 6:86-88, Nr. 1811. On the last mentioned, see Pietsch, *Of Good Comfort*, 269-272.
55. WA Br 4:236, Nr. 1133.
56. WA 6:467.7-16; LW 44:214.
57. WA 1:55.13-25; LW 1:72.
58. BSELK, 722-723.23; BC 299.
59. WA 23:340/341.12-344/345.13; LW 43:120-122.
60. WA 23:346/347.13-23; LW 43:123.
61. WA 23:352/353.14-354/355.23; LW 43:126-127.
62. WA 23:262/263.30-270/271.2 ; LW 43:131-134.

63. WA 42:87.9-90.9; LW 1:115-119, see Witt, *Reformation der Ehe*, 305-319, Jane E. Strohl, "Luther on Marriage, Sexuality, and the Family," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, ed. Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel and Lubomir Batka (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 370-382. On Luther's family life, see Robert Kolb, *Face to Face: Martin Luther's View of Reality* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2024), 251-256.

64. Sabine Kramer, *Katherina von Bora in den schriftlichen Zeugnissen ihrer Zeit* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016).

65. Letter to Katharina, June 5, 1530, WA Br 5:347-348.

66. Neil R. Leroux, *Martin Luther as Comforter: Writings on Death* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 218-220.

67. WA 53:205-208; LW 43:247-250.

68. Johannes von Lüpke, "Luther's Use of Language," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, ed. Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel and Lubomir Batka (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 149 (143-155).

69. Von Lüpke, "Luther's Use of Language," 149-151, Birgit Stolt, *Martin Luthers Rhetorik des Herzens* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2000), 82-83, 127-146; Ulrich Nembach, *Predigt des Evangeliums. Luther als Prediger Pädagoge und Rhetor* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972).

70. WA 57,3:220.18-221.3, 222.1-9; LW 29:222-224.

71. Oswald Bayer, "Silence Before God," *Lutheran Quarterly* 34 (2020): 125-137.

72. WA 50:369.12/37-370.12/33.

73. WA 3:253.6-9; LW 10:208.

74. WA 50:370.13/34-371.13/36; LW 53:323.

75. WA 40.III:612.31-613.3.

76. WA 10.I, Part 1:531.5-532.12; LW 76:55. See Brian A. Gerrish, *Grace and Reason: A Study in the Theology of Luther* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 12-14.

77. WA 10.I, Part 1:40.18-41.11.

78. Gerrish, *Grace and Reason*, 14-16.

79. Theodor Dieter, *Der junge Luther und Aristoteles. Eine historisch-systematische Untersuchung zum Verhältnis von Theologie und Philosophie* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 378-422.

80. Bengt Hägglund, "Die Frage der Willensfreiheit in der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Erasmus und Luther," in *Renaissance – Reformation. Gegensätze imd Gemeinsamkeiten*, ed. August Buck (Wiesbaden: Harassowitz, 1984), 188-189, 193-194.

81. WA 42:64.27-36; LW 1:84-85.

82. WA 18:634.23-29; LW 33:64.

83. WA 18:635.7-22; LW 33:65-66.

84. Hans-Joachim Iwand, *Um den rechten Glauben, Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. Karl Gerhard Steck (Munich: Kaiser, 1959), 56.

85. WA 18:634.37-635.7; LW 33:65. Luther elaborates this point at WA 18:714.38-722.29.

86. WA 57, Part 3:196.13-19; LW 29:198.

87. Stolt, *Luthers Rhetorik des Herzens*, 51. Cf. WA 4:7.22, 40.II:425.20-426.19.

88. WA 45:22.6-23.12. Stolt, *Rhetorik des Herzens*, 53-55.

89. E.g., WA 4:307.32-309.11xx; LW 11:417-419, WA 4:325.21-22; LW 11:443.

90. Jonathan Reinert, "Das menschliche Herz und Luthers Theologie. Ein weiterer Blick auf den Weg des werdenden Reformators," *Lutherjahrbuch* 88 (2021): 44-68.

91. WA 37:456.37-457.16.

92. WA 42:290.3-291.23; LW 2:39-40.

93. WA 42:348.37-39; LW 2:122-123.

94. WA DB 10.I:100/101.32-102/103.15; LW 35:255-256.

95. Oberman, *Harvest*, 65-66.

96. Cf. the definition formulated by the student colleague of Luther's mentor, Johannes von Staupitz, Johannes Altenstaig, in his theological dictionary, *Vocabularius Theologie*… (Hagenau: Gran, 1517), LIa-b, consulted at the Herzog August Bibliothek Catalog at http://diglib.hab.de/drucke/b-49-2f-helmst-1/start.htm. Accessed January 24, 2022.

97. WA TR 5:40, Nr. 5273.

98. WA 7:59.24-60.9, LW 31:357-358.

99. WA 26:69.13-18, LW 28:311. Luther and his colleagues understood "doctrine" as the activity of teaching the dynamic Word of God. On Melanchthon's use of "*doctrina*" as a "verbal noun," cf. Peter Fraenkel, "Revelation and Tradition, Notes on Some Aspects of Doctrinal Continuity in the Theology of Philip Melanchthon," *Studia theologica* 13 (1959):116-118 (97-133). His analysis describes Luther's usage as well.

100. WA 22:297.21-298.12; LW 79:150-151.