

Tributaries into the River JDDJ

Karl Holl and Luther's Doctrine of Justification

ARMAND J. BOEHME



THE JOINT DECLARATION ON THE Doctrine of Justification (JDDJ) did not appear in a vacuum, but a theological history laid its groundwork. One part of that history involves Karl Holl, a renowned Luther scholar whose work brought about the twentieth-century renewal of Luther studies called the “Luther Renaissance.”¹ Holl’s studies of Luther’s early writings led to supposed new insights into Luther’s theology, including the idea that Luther taught *analytic* or effective justification in contrast with *synthetic* or forensic justification. This study examines two aspects of Holl’s “Luther Renaissance”—the primacy of the early Luther, and the *analytic* understanding of justification—and then traces the influence of these two aspects in Lutheranism and beyond.

THE PRIMACY OF THE YOUNG LUTHER

“The Luther Renaissance” gives the greatest weight and authority to the early or young Luther. Holl viewed Luther through his lectures on Romans and his other early writings before 1520. Holl and his followers believed that the Luther of any period must be interpreted through the lens of the early Luther, and that anything in the mature Luther which conflicts with the early Luther must be rejected or reinterpreted in the light of his early writings and theology.² For example, using Holl’s early-over-late theory one could invoke the early Luther to say that he really taught that the words, “Give us this day our daily bread,” refer to asking for spiritual “bread,” especially the bread of the Eucharist. In 1517 Luther wrote that in the Lord’s Prayer “we ask not for earthly, but for heavenly and spiritual bread . . . a supernatural bread...Christ our bread is given . . . first, through words; second, through the Sacrament of the Altar.”³ Yet Luther said nothing about the Sacrament of the Altar when he explained the Fourth Petition in the Small and Large Catechisms of 1528–1529 and elsewhere. In these later writings Luther said that the daily bread we pray for is “everything necessary for the preservation of this life, like food, a healthy body, good weather, house, home, wife, children, good government and peace—and that He may preserve us from all sorts of calamities, sickness, pestilence, hard times, war, revolution, and the like.”⁴ The mature Luther no longer made any mention of the Eucharist in connection with this petition of the Lord’s Prayer.

To further illustrate Holl’s thesis, one could cite the Ninety-Five Theses (1517) to prove that Luther believed that purgatory exists alongside heaven and hell with souls truly existing there⁵

and that Christians should “be taught that the buying of indulgences is a matter of free choice.”⁶ These are positions that

1. “It should be recognized that the ‘Luther Renaissance’ and the ‘Calvin Renaissance’ are the direct result of the preoccupation of historically minded liberal theologians of the Reformation,” Wilhelm Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation* (Boston: 1950), 277.

For discussions of Karl Holl and the Luther Renaissance, see James M. Stayer, *Martin Luther, German Saviour: German Evangelical Theological Factions and the Interpretation of Luther, 1917–1933* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press—McGill-Queen’s Studies in the History of Religion, 2000), 3–47, 118–124; Harold J. Grimm, “Luther Research,” in Julius Bodensieck, ed., *The Encyclopedia of the Lutheran Church, Vol. II* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965), 1445; James Atkinson, *Martin Luther: Prophet to the Church Catholic* (Exeter, Devon/Grand Rapids: The Paternoster Press/Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), 12; Carl E. Braaten, *Justification: The Article by Which the Church Stands or Falls* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 19; Ingetraut Ludolph, “Holl, Karl,” in Bodensieck, Vol. II, 1035.

Holl’s work is collected in Karl Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols. (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1928). Some of Holl’s work is translated into English: Karl Holl, *The Reconstruction of Morality*, trans. Fred W. Meuser and Walter R. Wietzke and ed. James Luther Adams and Walter F. Bense (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1979); Karl Holl, *What Did Luther Understand by Religion?* trans. Fred W. Meuser and Walter R. Wietzke and ed. James Luther Adams and Walter F. Bense (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977); Karl Holl, *The Cultural Significance of the Reformation*, trans. Karl and Barbara Hertz and John Lichtblau (New York: Meridian Books, 1959); Karl Holl, “Martin Luther on Luther,” in Jaroslav Pelikan, ed., *Interpreters of Luther: Essays in Honor of Wilhelm Pauck* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968), 9–34.

Holl’s work on justification is found in Karl Holl, “Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers Forlesung uber Romerbrief mit besonderer Rucksicht auf die Frage der Heilsgewissheit,” in Holl, *Gesammelte, Vol I*, 111–154; Karl Holl, “Die *justitia dei* in der vorlutherischen Bibelauslegung des Abendlandes,” in Holl, *Gesammelte, Vol. III*, 171–188; Karl Holl, “Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Licht der Geschichte Protestantismus,” in Holl, *Gesammelte, Vol. III*, 525–557; Karl Holl, “Was hat die Rechtfertigungslehre dem modern Menschen zu sagen?” in Holl, *Gesammelte, Vol. III*, 558–567.

2. “Holl in particular found in Luther a religion of conscience and morality against which he projected a theology of the Young Luther drawn in large measure from the *Lectures on Romans* and other writings which are actually pre-Reformational in content . . . Its [the Luther Renaissance’s] adherents felt that the reformer in any period must be interpreted in the light of his early works and that the Young Luther must be the basis for determining the statements of the Mature Luther.” Lowell C. Green, *How Melancthon Helped Luther Discover the Gospel* (Fallbrook, CA: Verdict Publications, 1980), 42; see also 31–45. See also AE 1: 40–41. For Luther’s lectures on Romans see AE 25. The study of the time of Luther’s evangelical breakthrough is ongoing; see Martin Lohrmann, “Text, For the Record: A Newly Discovered Report of Luther’s Reformation Breakthrough from Johannes Bugenhagen’s 1550 Jonah Commentary,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (Autumn 2008): 324–330.

3. AE 42: 53, 57. See also AE 42: 53–62 and AE 29: 156–157.

4. AE 21: 146–147. See also AE 45: 255ff.; AE 51: 176–178; AE 53: 79; SC III, 12–14; LC III, 71–84.

5. AE 31: 27, theses 16–19.

6. AE 31: 29, thesis 46.

Luther later rejected.⁷ Many more instances like this could be given, but the above are sufficiently instructive to note the dangers of invoking the “young” or “early” Luther’s writings and theology as determinative for what the mature or later Luther really taught and believed—especially when the later, mature Luther believed and wrote differently. Luther did not always write, “I used to believe A. Now I reject A and believe B.” If his position changed due to his spiritual and theological growth, he most often wrote what he had come to believe on the basis of Scripture without reference to his former incorrect beliefs.

Some scholars do not accept the conclusions of Holl and his followers concerning Luther’s doctrine of justification because they recognize that there was a growing theological maturity in Luther from his early to his later years.⁸ Luther did not suddenly become a full-blown Lutheran in all of his theology on 31 October 1517.⁹ Looking back at his theological development from 1512–1519, Luther identified this as the time during which he began to have the “first knowledge of Christ and faith in Him, namely that Christ makes us righteous and saves us, not by works but by faith.”¹⁰ Luther himself said “that he did not come to his insights all at one time but that his theology developed slowly.”¹¹ He observed, “I didn’t learn my theology all at once. I had to ponder over it ever more deeply, and my spiritual trials were of help to me in this.”¹² Even after 1520 Luther was still moving away from some positions that he had previously held. “[Luther’s] writings from 1519 until 1524 are marked by preliminary solutions. He moved to his final position during 1525–1527.”¹³

This is why in 1545 Luther urged people to remember that some of his earlier writings were not to be followed. “But above all else, I beg the sincere reader, and I beg for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, to read those things [my early writings] judiciously, yes, with great commiseration. May he be mindful of the fact that I was once a monk and a most enthusiastic papist when I began the cause . . . So you will find how much and what important matters I humbly conceded to the pope in my earlier writings, which I later and now hold and execrate as the worst blasphemies and abomination. You will, therefore, sincere reader, ascribe this error, or, as they slander, contradiction to the time and my inexperience. At first I was all alone and certainly very inept and unskilled in conducting such great affairs.”¹⁴ One of Luther’s scribes recorded these words: “Thereupon [Luther] spoke of his earliest books. He was now ashamed of them, he said, because in them he had conceded everything to the pope.” Luther said, “I see that I tried to bring impossible contradictions into harmony. It was a wretched patchwork.”¹⁵ In his “Great Confession” of 1528 Luther wrote, “On subjects which I have treated too briefly here, my other writings will testify sufficiently, especially those which have been published during the last four or five years.”¹⁶ Here Luther urges caution about the content of his writings before 1524.

The above material should not be read to mean that Luther rejected everything from his earlier years.¹⁷ Rather it is to note that Luther grew and matured as a theologian. As he grew in

7. For a discussion of Luther’s adherence to purgatory through 1520, and his rejection of it thereafter, see E. Plass, ed., *What Luther Says*, Vol. I (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), n 25, 387–388; see also quotations 1138–1141. For Luther’s later rejection of indulgences see SA II, II, 23–24; SA III, III, 24–27. See also James E. McNutt, “Which Luther?: A Question of Biographical Method,” *Concordia Journal* 26, no. 4 (October 2000): 293–304.

8. For a summary of scholars noting this point see Otto W. Heick, “The Just Shall Live by Faith,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 43, no. 9 (October 1972), 579–590, who lists scholars like Uuras Saarnivaara, Edward Cranz, Axel Gyllenkrok, Ernst Bizer, Kurt Aland, Reinhard Schwarz, Matthias Kroeger and Paul Althaus. See also Gordon L. Isaac, “The Changing Image of Luther as Biblical Expositor,” in Timothy Maschke, Franz Posset and Joan Skocir, ed., *Ad Fontes Lutheri: Toward the Recovery of the Real Luther: Essays in Honor of Kenneth Hagen’s Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2001), 68–71; Kenneth Hagen, “Changes in the Understanding of Luther: The Development of the Young Luther,” *Theological Studies* 29, no. 4 (September 1968): 472–496; Gordon Rupp, “Miles Emeritus? Continuity and Discontinuity Between the Young and the Old Luther,” in George Yule, ed., *Luther: Theologian for Catholics and Protestants* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), 75–86; Lowell C. Green, “Change in Luther’s Doctrine of the Ministry,” *The Lutheran Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (May 1966): 173–183.

9. John F. Johnson, “Luther on Justification,” *The Springfielder*, 31, no. 3 (Autumn 1967): 36–42.

10. Lowell C. Green, “Luther and Melancthon,” in Gerhard L. Belgum, ed., *The Mature Luther* (Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1959), 117; see also p. 121.

11. *Ibid.*, 44. See WA TR I: 146, 12–16; WA TR II: 281, 11–13; WA TR V: 210, 6–16; WA 54: 185–186.

12. AE 54: 50.

13. Green, *How Melancthon Helped*, 43.

14. AE 34: 328. Holl and advocates of the Luther Renaissance dismiss such statements of the mature Luther by saying that Luther was old, didn’t remember correctly, etc. See also Stayer, 30–39 and Green, *How Melancthon Helped*, 67–70.

15. AE 54: 342–343.

16. AE 37: 372; WA 26, 509.

17. A case in point is Luther’s testamental theology, which remained a constant throughout his theological life. On this, see Kenneth Hagen, *A Theology of Testament in the Young Luther: The Lectures on Hebrews* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974); Joan Skocir, “A Search for the Authentic Luther: Kenneth Hagen’s Approach to Luther Studies,” in Maschke, Posset and Skocir, ed., 262–269; Kenneth Hagen, “Luther on Atonement—Reconfigured,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 61, no. 4 (October 1997): 251–276. Luther’s testamental theology is directly tied to forensic justification (salvation as a free and gracious gift) as well as a theology of the cross. For the ties between forensic justification and the Bible’s testamental theology see Basil Hall, “*Hoc Est Corpus Meum: The Centrality of the Real Presence for Luther*,” in Yule, 139. Most modern Lutherans have rejected Luther’s testamental theology and have chosen a covenant theology which is also tied to an analytic view of justification. See Kenneth Hagen, “From Testament to Covenant in the Early Sixteenth Century,” *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 3, no. 1 (April 1972): 1–24; Gerhard Forde, “The Lord’s Supper as the Testament of Jesus,” *Word & World* 17, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 5–9; A. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan (New York: George H. Doran, Co., 1927), 337–338; Terence Y. Mullins, “Some Words About . . . Diatheke (testament),” *Lutheran Partners* (January/February 1999): 19–20; Armand J. Boehme, “And to My Heirs I Bequeath,” *Martin Luther and American Lutherans on Diatheke*, *LOGIA* 14, no. 1 (Epiphany 2005): 27–32; Armand J. Boehme, “Sing a New Song: The Doctrine of Justification and the *Lutheran Book of Worship* Sacramental Liturgies,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 43, no. 2 (April 1979): 96–119. Eck preferred a covenant understanding of the Lord’s Supper, and believed that the term testament (which Luther used) attached forensic terminology to the Lord’s Supper; see Vilmos Vajta, *Luther on Worship*, trans. U.S. Leupold (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1958), 39, n. 44. Brilioth also

his understanding of Scripture and Christ's saving work, so his theology grew, changed, and matured and became more biblical. To invoke the early Luther as determinative for the theology and practice of Lutherans is at best a highly questionable methodology. The whole of his work is to be diligently studied in order to arrive at a balanced view of his theology.

HOLL'S VIEW OF LUTHER ON JUSTIFICATION

Basing his conclusions especially on Luther's 1515–1516 lectures on Romans, Holl maintained that the analytic view of justification in these early Romans lectures was Luther's true teaching throughout his life and that Luther never adhered to a "synthetic" view.¹⁸

What exactly does Holl mean by the terms "synthetic" and "analytic?" He defined synthetic justification "as a declarative judgment of God whereby the sinner was justified solely on the basis of the work of Christ." Further, Holl maintained "that Luther rejected this [synthetic] view of justification, as did Holl himself." Holl believed that synthetic justification was a Melancthonian perversion of Luther's early pure analytic teaching on justification.¹⁹

Instead of "synthetic" justification, Holl believed that Luther taught "analytic" justification, which Carl Braaten describes

as "a real transformation of persons from the state of sinfulness to that of righteousness . . . God does not only declare a person righteous, he literally makes a person righteous." Thus Holl believed he was saving God from performing a "pious fiction"—namely, declaring a person righteous who in fact really isn't. Braaten continues, "This [analytic and transformative view of justification] places regeneration before justification." Holl's view of "God's justification is an analytic judgment of the renewal that is taking place within the human subject," which means that the "righteousness that we [Christians] possess is the reason for God declaring us to be righteous."²⁰

As David Brondos observed, "Holl compares the manner in which God declares believers righteous to the way an artist already sees in the block of marble the finished statue which he will sculpt out of the block, even before he has begun: in the same way, God sees in the sinner the righteous person that he will ultimately fashion out of him or her. This means that the basis upon which people are justified or forgiven is the new life which God brings about in them through Christ."²¹

So how did Holl's emphasis on the young Luther and analytic justification arise? Holl remade Luther through his own theological lens. In other words, Holl himself believed analytic jus-

faulted Luther's understanding of the Lord's Supper as a testament for the same reason; see Yngve Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, trans. A.G. Hebert (London: SPCK, 1931), 101–103. See also Robert C. Croken, *Luther's First Front: The Eucharist as Sacrifice* (Ottawa: The University of Ottawa Press, 1990), 73–81.

The theology of the cross is another constant in Luther's theology from his early days to his death. See Heino O. Kadai, "Luther's Theology of the Cross," in Heino O. Kadai, ed., *Accents in Luther's Theology* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1967), 230–272; Alister E. McGrath, *Luther's Theology of the Cross* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993); Walther von Loewenich, *Luther's Theology of the Cross*, trans H.J. Bouman (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1976); Regin Prenter, *Luther's Theology of the Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970); Gerhard O. Forde, *On Being a Theologian of the Cross: Reflections on Luther's Heidelberg Disputation, 1518* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997).

18. "Insofern musst man sagen: wenn Gott den Sunder in dem Augenblick, in dem er nur Sunder ist, für ‚gerecht erklärt‘, so nimmt er das Ergebnis vorweg, zu dem er selbst den Menschen führen wird. Sein Rechtfertigungsurteil ist ‚analytisch‘, d.h. er spricht denjenigen gerecht, der in seinem Augen jest schon gerecht ist. Nicht weil er etwa ‚vorausfahe‘, was der Mensch aus eigenen Kräfte tun oder werden wird—erst eine spätere Veranstaltung hat dies aus Luthers Lehre gemacht—, sondern weil er die Macht seines eigenen Willens kennt." K. Holl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre im Lichte der Geschichte Protestantismus," III, 532. See also I, 124–125 for analytic and synthetic in Holl.

19. Braaten, *Justification*, 13. "Melancthon hat die lutherische Rechtfertigungslehre verdorben." K. Holl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre in Luthers Vorlesung über den Römerbrief mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Frage der Heilsgewissheit" Vol. I, 128, also 126–129 and K. Holl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre im Lichte der Geschichte des Protestantismus," Vol. III, 534–541. Holl seems to have appropriated this analytic and synthetic terminology from Albrecht Ritschl. See Gregory A. Walter, "An Introduction to H.J. Iwand's *The Righteousness of Faith According to Luther*," *Lutheran Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 19. This dichotomy between Melancthon and the Formula of Concord versus later Lutheranism and Luther on justification is still seen today. Alister E. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification from 1500 to the Present Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 10–32, credits Erasmus with being the origin of the Lutheran concept of forensic justification. McGrath has also denied forensic justification as part of Luther's theology; see Alister

E. McGrath, "Forerunners of the Reformation? A Critical Examination of the Evidence for Precursors of the Reformation Doctrines of Salvation," *Harvard Theological Review* 75, no. 2 (1982): 225; Alister E. McGrath, "Justification—'Making Just' or 'Declaring Just'? A Neglected Aspect of the Ecumenical Discussion on Justification," *The Churchman* 96, no. 1 (1982): 44–52

20. Braaten, *Justification*, 13–14. "Karl Holl avers that Luther does not teach justification by the mere imputation of righteousness and by the non-imputation of sins for the sake of Christ. According to Holl, Luther teaches that 'God justifies the sinner whom He Himself makes righteous and because He makes him righteous.' Thus justification [for Holl] means renewal, and only after God has renewed man and made him righteous, He declares him righteous. The actual basis of the divine judgment which justifies is not the merit of Christ, but the renewal of man." Uuras Saarnivara, *Luther Discovers the Gospel: New Light Upon Luther's Way From Medieval Catholicism to Evangelical Faith* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1951), 13, n38; also see XII–XV and Stayer, 22–23.

In response to Rome's charge that imputed righteousness was a pious fiction, Quenstedt wrote: "The righteousness of Christ is not our formal righteousness nor a righteousness that inheres in us subjectively, but is our real (*realis*) and sufficient righteousness by imputation. We do not through this righteousness become righteous by a righteousness inhering in us, but through the imputation of this righteousness we are formally justified in such a way that without it there is not substance to our righteousness before God . . . The righteousness of Christ which has been reckoned to us is in itself neither putative nor fictitious, but absolutely real, corresponding exactly to God's mind and will . . . it is an absolutely real judgment of God which is rendered from the throne of grace through the Gospel in respect to the sinner who believes in Christ." Cited from Robert D. Preus, "Perennial Problems in the Doctrine of Justification," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 45, no. 3 (July 1981): 182–183, note 26. See also Henry P. Hamann, Jr., "Justification by Faith in Modern Theology (Concluded)," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 29, no. 4 (April 1958): 273–276. Hamann's excellent study on justification is serialized in the January to April 1958 issues of CTM. Henry P. Hamann, Jr., "Justification by Faith in Modern Theology," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 29, no. 1 (January 1958): 25–37; Henry P. Hamann, Jr., "Justification by Faith in Modern Theology," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 29, no. 2 (February 1958): 98–118; Henry P. Hamann, Jr., "Justification by Faith in Modern Theology," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 29, No. 3 (March 1958): 187–199.

21. David A. Brondos, "Sola Fide and Luther's 'Analytic' Understanding of Justification," *Pro Ecclesia* 13, no. 1 (Winter 2004): 46.

tification and thus found this teaching in Luther and claimed it was Luther's true theology. As Dietrich Korsch wrote, "We are confronted by the fact that Holl's detailed historical research on Luther followed the development of the systematic structure of Holl's own doctrine of justification." Holl himself "connected *Rechtfertigung* (justification) with *Gerechtmachung* ("making righteous") in a way reminiscent of Calvin and Bucer." These ideas received their "persuasiveness" because Holl transmitted them "through the historical figure of Luther."²²

Holl's invocation of the young Luther as the "correct" Luther runs counter to Luther's own statements about his early Roman Catholic theological perspectives that he had left behind. As James M. Stayer has written, "[T]he theology of Luther's early theological lectures was Catholic theology . . . Luther said as much in the Autobiographical Fragment of 1545—before the controversy with the papacy, his theology was Romanist—and readers of his Latin works should recognize that it was a theology which he had left behind."²³

In summary, Holl believed in the superiority of the theology of the early Luther, that Luther's theology of justification is analytic rather than synthetic (forensic or alien), and that justification is a gradual process of transformation or renewal that enables Christians to be counted righteous now because at the end of their gradual transformation they will become righteous (holy) and God will see this result in them. He believed that this transformed, sanctified life of righteousness in Christ saves God from inflicting a pious fiction on human beings—declaring someone righteous when he or she is not. Thus salvation depends on the Christian's righteous living rather than on the atoning work of Christ that is received by imputation through faith. With Holl's theology it is difficult to describe a Christian as *simul justus et peccator*.

Holl saw Luther's faith in the realm of conscience and relationships. According to Anssi Simojoki, this contributed to Holl's rejection of alien righteousness and his acceptance of

justification in a proleptic, anticipatory way, not as a present reality by virtue of God's pronouncement through His Word but rather seen from its final fulfillment in the future. Thus all the judicial aspects in the justification were

repudiated and replaced with ideas of sanctification and the new life in Christ. It was among Karl Holl's disciples that the centrality of union with Christ in justification gained more terrain, and the expressions characteristic of Philip Melancthon receded considerably before those of Andreas Osiander.²⁴

TIES TO OSIANDER

Holl's view of Luther on justification has historical ties to the Osiandrian controversy during the Interims. Andreas Osiander based his understanding of justification in part on the inner renewal of the sinner. Bente noted that in 1549 Osiander began to teach a doctrine of justification that "abandoned the forensic conception of justification by imputation of the merits of Christ, and returned to the Roman view of justification by infusion."²⁵ Justification by infusion means that our justification depends on "a righteous condition within ourselves."²⁶ Osiander taught that the renewal of the inner man (sanctification) was part of justification, so the assurance of our justification "does not exclusively rest on the merits of Christ and the pardon offered in the Gospel, but must be based on the righteous quality inhering in us."²⁷

Gerhard Forde observed that Osiander

wanted to understand righteousness in terms of the indwelling of the divine nature in the soul . . . With [the Kantian revival of the latter half of the nineteenth-century] came also renewed questioning of a purely forensic justification, often in connection with increasing admiration for the erstwhile "heretic" Osiander. The Ritschlians . . . launched something of a polemic against forensic justification, claiming that justification, particularly for Luther, was to be understood as an analytic judgment rather than a synthetic one. An analytic judgment was understood to be one based on a view of the outcome of the process of justification, while a synthetic judgment is forensic in the sense that it declares the truth. Karl Holl, the virtual father of modern Luther scholarship, brought the argument about forensic justification into contemporary Lutheranism in this form.²⁸

22. Stayer, 23; Holl, "Die Rechtfertigungslehre", Vol. 1, 123. Bense writes of "Holl's Luther" and states that in Holl's view Luther saw that "justification always includes the entire process of sanctification, and that it is effected by the *Christ within us* . . . according to Holl and Holl's Luther, the end of justification is the complete sanctification of the forgiven sinner, that is, complete inner transformation into the likeness of Christ." Holl and Holl's Luther also put forth the "concept of progressive sanctification for the believer." Bense, "Editor's Introduction," in Holl, *What Did Luther Understand*, 11–13. Stayer notes that Holl's understanding of justification came before he did his Luther work; see Stayer, 18–20.

23. Stayer, 122. "[W]hen Holl rejected the Mature Luther and based his view of 'analytic' justification on the works of the Young Luther, he was confusing 'Catholic' doctrine with the teachings of the Reformation." Green, *How Melancthon Helped*, 70; also 145. "Holl's mistake was that he . . . did not see the difference between these [Luther's earlier statements on justification] and his [Luther's] Reformation statements regarding justification." Saarnivara., 14, note 38.

24. Anssi Simojoki, "Martin Luther at the Mercy of His Interpreters: The New Helsinki School Critically Evaluated," in John A. Maxfield, ed., *2001: A Justification Odyssey* (St. Louis: The Luther Academy, 2002), 122.

25. F. Bente, *Historical Introductions to the Book of Concord* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, reprint 1965), 152.

26. *Ibid.*, 154.

27. *Ibid.*, 155, 157. Also see Green, "Luther and Melancthon," 130. Hamann wrote that Osiander's analytic view of justification had notable similarities "to those made in modern discussions of justification." Henry P. Hamann, "Article III: The Righteousness of Faith Before God," in Robert D. Preus and Wilbert H. Rosin, eds., *A Contemporary Look at the Formula of Concord* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1978), 140. Also see David C. Steinmetz, *Reformers in the Wings* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 91–99.

28. Gerhard O. Forde, "Forensic Justification and Law in Lutheran Theology," in H. George Anderson, T. Austin Murphy, Joseph A. Burgess, eds., *Justification by Faith: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VII* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), 278–279.

HOLL'S IMPACT ON LUTHER SCHOLARSHIP

Holl's exaltation of the theology of the young Luther and an analytic view of justification has had a wide impact in Lutheranism and beyond. This came about because, according to Jaroslav Pelikan,

the scholarship of the so-called "Luther-renaissance" has concentrated upon the Luther of the decade closing at Leipzig in 1519 . . . Of particular interest has been the doctrine of justification, as developed in Luther's early lectures on Romans. Just when did Luther come to the truly "Lutheran" view of justification and righteousness? And for that matter, what was this truly Lutheran view? In these and related problems much of the research into the theological development of the young Luther has centered, with results that have permanently changed the interpretation not only of Luther but of the entire Reformation.²⁹

JUSTIFICATION AT HELSINKI, 1963

Holl's widespread impact on Lutheranism is seen in the difficulty of defining justification at the Helsinki meeting of the Lutheran World Federation in 1963. Carl Braaten observed, "One of the chief contributing factors to the modern quandary over the meaning of justification was Karl Holl's conclusion that Luther taught an 'analytic' justification" rather than a synthetic or forensic one. At Helsinki two theological views struggled for ascendancy, "those of Karl Holl" and those of "Theodosius Harnack. Little did the majority of delegates realize that the contending parties were following theological signals given behind the scenes."³⁰

Time reported that the Helsinki LWF assembly's attempt to "produce a modern statement of Luther's classic Reformation doctrine . . . ended in failure" and that "justification and its meaning for modern man came in for some severe questioning." One Lutheran theologian, Dr. Gerhard Gloege, said that the doctrine of justification "is clearly an embarrassment" to the Lutheran Church today.³¹

The 1963 LWF document on justification said that "Justification by faith remains a difficult and obscure doctrine." There were three things that led to Helsinki's theological impasse. First, justification is "only vaguely comprehensible to millions" today; second, "downgrading works [in matters of salvation] seems less acceptable than ever to self-justifying activist modern man"; and third, "modern Biblical study makes it clear that

justification is not, as Luther thought, the dominating theme of the New Testament." The Helsinki justification document also said that "we are unable simply to take for granted that the Reformers were right and their opponents totally wrong." Moreover, the LWF document said, "We cannot today casually dismiss the theological teaching of the Roman Church as patently false, unbiblical and unevangelical." The LWF struggle to properly define justification by faith was made more difficult because "the critical study of the Bible" among modern Lutherans has caused them to "see much greater variety and diversity among the biblical writers."³² The justification document's words and phrases show the influence of Holl as it wrestles with the proper understanding of justification (analytic or synthetic), speaks about legal fiction, the Christian being in Christ and Christ in him/her, union with Christ, the obedience of faith, and the inner transformation of the believer. It also speaks of God's righteousness being His covenant faithfulness.

One Roman Catholic observer, Dr. Johannes Witte, noted that the Helsinki document on justification by faith no longer affirmed what Luther had affirmed. He "argued that many modern Lutheran interpretations of justification, by stressing the life of faith rather than the initial encounter with God, are moving closer to Catholic doctrine."³³ With such disunity apparent to all, "This spectacle of Lutherans deeply disagreeing among themselves on the doctrine on which the church stands or falls became the immediate context for the beginning of discussions on the doctrine of justification between Lutherans and Roman Catholics following the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965)."³⁴ The official dialogues between Rome and the LWF be-

29. Jaroslav Pelikan, *Luther's Works Companion Volume: Luther the Expositor – Introduction to the Reformer's Exegetical Writings* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1959), 40–41. Commenting on the neglect of Luther's Smalcald Articles William R. Russell wrote that most church historians and theologians have concentrated on the young Luther which has led to the neglect of the older Luther. William R. Russell, *The Schmalkald Articles: Luther's Theological Testament* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1995), 10–11; see also James M. Kittelson, *Luther the Reformer* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1986), 14–16.

30. Braaten, *Justification*, 13–14. Also see Carter Lindberg, "Do Lutherans Shout Justification But Whisper Sanctification?" *Lutheran Quarterly* 13, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 11–20.

31. "Lutherans: Justifying Justification," *Time* 82, no. 8 (August 23, 1963): 48.

32. *A Study Document on Justification* (New York: National Lutheran Council, 1962), 7–9. For examinations of this document and others preceding JDDJ see Nestor Beck, *The Doctrine of Faith: A Study of the Augsburg Confession and Contemporary Ecumenical Documents* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1987); Carl Braaten, *Principles of Lutheran Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); George Lindbeck and Vilmos Vajta, *The Role of the Augsburg Confession: Catholic and Lutheran Views* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); Richard Klann, "Contemporary Lutheran Views of Justification," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 45, no. 4 (October 1981): 281–295, especially 290–294. Braaten wrote about Helsinki's "paralyzing effect on Lutherans around the world." It had "attempted a contemporary reformulation of justification" but it ended up with "a cacophony of opinions on the topic. The strong forensic representation" of justification "was dubbed as too scholarly" even though "it is Pauline." This has led Lutherans and others to criticize Lutheranism for its use of Paul's writings to emphasize the core of its theology (forensic justification). These critics invoke the whole of Scripture and its many disparate images as superior to the Pauline center. In so doing these critics believe they "have dealt a fatal blow to Luther's interpretation of Paul's doctrine of justification." Braaten, *Justification*, p. 125. The forensic nature of justification and its centrality as the article by which the church stands or falls is denied by many Lutherans, many other Christians, NPP, the Finnish interpretation of Luther, and modernist works-righteous human beings.

33. Peter Blaesser, "Helsinki Through the Eyes of a Roman Catholic Visitor," *Lutheran World* (January 1964): 64; and *Time* 82: 48.

34. Samuel H. Nafzger, "Joint Declaration on Justification: A Missouri Synod Perspective," *Concordia Journal* 27, no. 3 (July 2001): 182. The newly created Institute for Interconfessional [later Ecumenical] Research was described by some at Helsinki "as the first pontoon in a bridge to be built to Rome." The authors of the CTM article thought that the institute would serve to offer "a sharp and clear pronouncement to Rome on the doctrine of justification through faith and a clear analysis of the gradual developments

gan in 1965.³⁵ The joint Lutheran-Roman Catholic declaration on justification in 1985 said that it was a “continuation” of the discussions about justification begun at Helsinki in 1963.³⁶

THE NEW PERSPECTIVE ON PAUL

As was noted earlier, Holl’s Luther Renaissance has resulted in permanently changing the understanding of Luther, his theology, and the Reformation understanding of justification and righteousness.³⁷ Part of the wider change in understanding Luther, his theology and the Reformation is seen in what is known as the New Perspective on Paul (NPP).³⁸

Krister Stendahl (1921–2008), a Swedish Lutheran, is credited with being the “father” of NPP through his highly influential work *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles*.³⁹ Stendahl posited the idea that justification was not the center of Paul’s theology. Instead it

was a relatively minor part of Paul’s thought that was used to defend the existence of the Gentiles in the church. Stendahl also believed that the righteousness Paul spoke about was the disclosure of God’s victorious work which enabled both Jews and Gentiles to be in his church. Stendahl did not believe that chapters 1–8 of Romans deal with how one can be saved. He thought Paul’s understanding of justification and righteousness is very different than Luther’s. For Stendahl, Paul was not consumed with Luther’s angst-ridden efforts to find a gracious and loving God. Rather Paul had a robust conscience. Paul’s writings nowhere indicate “that he had any difficulties in fulfilling what he as a Jew understood to be the requirements of the law.”⁴⁰ Paul “does not feel responsible for sin; he is on the side of God.”⁴¹ Though Stendahl believed that Paul did see himself as a sinner (though only in the sense that he persecuted the church), he believed that Paul “made up for that sin and, moreover, he is proud of the extent to which he has made up for it . . . Paul is confident that he has made up for the only sin which he speaks about concretely.”⁴² Stendahl even saw Paul as “blameless” and not necessarily as someone who is truly at the same time sinner and saint.⁴³

The exact influence of Holl on Stendahl is not clear, but Stendahl was well versed in scholarly circles and could hardly have been unaware of Holl’s work; nor, as Pelikan noted, could someone like him in scholarly circles have escaped the impact of Holl’s work. It is also important to state that Stendahl was involved with the first two rounds of the Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogues.⁴⁴

Others like E.P. Sanders,⁴⁵ N.T. Wright,⁴⁶ James D.G. Dunn⁴⁷ and Robert Gundry⁴⁸ have built on Stendahl’s groundbreaking

which led Rome away from this doctrine as the central doctrine. The net result could be a truly Biblical and confessional rapprochement.” A Symposium, “Helsinki—After One Year,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 35, Nos. 7–8 (July–August 1964): 401. “The previous [LWF] assembly at Helsinki had opened the way to more intense ecumenical relations . . . The relationship of the LWF with Rome has progressed considerably since the Federation was asked to send observers to Vatican II.” Andre Appel, “The Lutheran World Federation: From Institution to Movement,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 42, no. 6 (June 1971): 401. Also see Robert Preus, *Justification and Rome* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997), 21, 103–104.

35. H. George Anderson and T. Austin Murphy, “Preface” in Anderson, Murphy & Burgess, *Justification by Faith*, 8.
36. “Justification by Faith,” #87, in Anderson, Murphy, and Burgess, *Justification by Faith*, 46. For an overview of the Helsinki and Evian meetings see *Proceedings of the Fourth Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, Helsinki; July 30–August 11, 1963* (Berlin & Hamburg: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1965); LaVern K. Grosch, ed., *Sent Into the World: The Proceedings of the Fifth Assembly of The Lutheran World Federation – Evian, France – July 14–24, 1970* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1971).
37. Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor*, 40–41.
38. James D.G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007); Michael B. Thompson, *The New Perspective on Paul* (Cambridge: Grove Books Limited, 2002); James A. Meeke, “The New Perspective on Paul: An Introduction for the Uninitiated,” *Concordia Journal* 27, no. 3 (July 2001): 208–233; A. Andrew Das, “Beyond Covenantal Nomism: Paul, Judaism, and Perfect Obedience,” *Concordia Journal* 27, no. 3 (July 2001): 234–252; Guy Prentiss Waters, *Justification and the New Perspectives on Paul* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R Publishing Company, 2004); D.A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Vol. I, The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2001); D.A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, eds., *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Vol. II, The Paradoxes of Paul* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004); Robert Smith, “Justification in ‘the New Perspective on Paul,’” *The Reformed Theological Review* 58, no. 1 (1999): 16–30; Robert Smith, “A Critique of the ‘New Perspective’ on Justification,” *The Reformed Theological Review* 58, no. 3 (1999): 98–113; F. David Farnell, “The New Perspective on Paul: Its Basic Tenets, History and Presuppositions,” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 16, no. 2 (Fall 2005): 189–243; John Piper, *The Future of Justification: A Response to N.T. Wright* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2007); Guy P. Waters and Gary L.W. Johnson, eds., *By Faith Alone: Answering the Challenges to the Doctrine of Justification* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2007).
39. Krister Stendahl, *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976). For Stendahl’s influence on NPP see Waters, 23–33; Timothy George, “Modernizing Luther, Domesticating Paul: Another Perspective,” in Carson, O’Brien, and Seifrid, *Justification and Variegated Nomism—Vol. II*, 442–448. Though it cannot be stated with certainty, Stendahl was perhaps influenced by Wilhelm Wrede, who stated that justification was not central to Paul’s theology but was only part of his theological discussions about the Jews. See Wilhelm Wrede, *Paul*, trans. Edward Lummis (Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1908), 123, 127–128.

40. Stendahl, 13.
41. *Ibid.*, 27–28.
42. *Ibid.*, 14.
43. *Ibid.*, 13–14.
44. *The Status of the Nicene Creed as Dogma of the Church* (New York/Washington, DC: The U.S.A. National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation and the Bishop’s Commission for Ecumenical Affairs, 1965), 36; Krister Stendahl, “The Focal Point of the New Testament Baptismal Teachings,” in Paul C. Empie and William W. Baum, eds., *Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue II: One Baptism for the Remission of Sins* (New York/Washington, DC: The U.S.A. National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation and the Bishop’s Commission for Ecumenical Affairs, 1967), 23–26; see also p. 87.
45. Ed Parrish Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977); E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); E.P. Sanders, *Paul: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
46. N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991); N.T. Wright, “On Becoming the Righteousness of God: 2 Corinthians 5:21,” in David M. Hay, ed., *Pauline Theology, Vol. 2* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993); N.T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God: Christian Origins and the Question of God, Vol. 1* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1996); N.T. Wright, *What St. Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); N.T. Wright, “Romans,” in Leander E. Keck, ed., *New Interpreter’s Bible: Acts-First Corinthians, Vol. 10* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002).
47. J.D.G. Dunn, “The New Perspective on Paul” in Karl P. Donfried, ed., *The Romans Debate* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 299–308; J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8 – Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, TX: Word Publishing, 1988); J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16 – Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, TX: Word Publishing, 1988); J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the*

work. NPP theology will be examined, though unlike Stendahl most of its proponents are not Lutherans. However, in the 1950s, before NPP appeared, evangelical theologians were blurring the distinction between Luther's early and mature view of justification.⁴⁹ Further, a Lutheran publishing house has printed the works of NPP scholars and many Lutherans that have read their books have been influenced by their theology.⁵⁰

Sanders writes that one enters covenant membership status (the church) by grace (usually in baptism), but one remains in the faith by obedience to "a specific set of commandments." This covenant obedience is what "keeps one in the covenantal relationship."⁵¹ Sanders views righteousness as participation in Christ for "righteousness by faith and participation in Christ ultimately amount to the same thing."⁵² Sanders also described Luther's emphasis on imputed righteousness (forensic justification) as "fictional."⁵³ This is like Holl's description of imputed righteousness (forensic justification) as a pious fiction.

N.T. Wright defines justification in Romans 3:24–26 this way:

When this is cashed out in terms of the underlying covenantal theme, it means that they [Christians] are declared, in the present, to be what they will be seen to be in the future, namely the true people of God. Present justification declares, on the basis of faith, what future justification will affirm publicly . . . on the basis of the entire life. And in making this declaration (3:26) God himself is in the right, in that he has been faithful to the covenant; he has dealt with sin, and upheld the helpless; and in the crucified Christ he has done so impartially. The gospel—not "justification by faith," but the message about Jesus—thus reveals the righteousness, that is, the covenant faithfulness of God.⁵⁴

Wright defines faith as human faithfulness to the covenant into which one has entered as one is joined to the church. Wright also equates faith with obedience. "The 'obedience' which Paul seeks to evoke when he announces the gospel is thus not a list of moral good works but faith . . . This faith is actually the human faithfulness that answers to God's faithfulness. This is the obedience of faith . . . [T]hat is why this 'faith' is the only appropriate badge of membership within God's true, renewed people."⁵⁵

Dunn says that being made righteous and declared righteous are the same thing: "the answer is not one or the other but both." He also believes that the person in a covenant relationship with God has been made righteous ("transformed") by a living relationship with God. To "be righteous was to live within the covenant and within the terms it laid down (the law); to be acquitted, recognized as righteous, was to be counted as one of God's own people who had proved faithful to the covenant."⁵⁶ Like Wright, Dunn does not believe that justification is a declarative act of God. Rather it is a process of transformation. And there is no pious fiction for Dunn—the Christian is transformed into being righteous by his or her covenant faithfulness.⁵⁷

Robert Gundry, another NPP theologian wrote, "[T]he doctrine that Christ's righteousness is imputed to believing sinners needs to be abandoned . . . That doctrine of imputation is not even biblical. Still less is it 'essential' to the Gospel."⁵⁸ Gundry describes himself as one of many evangelical scholars who deny that imputed righteousness is taught in the Scriptures. Instead he advocates "a doctrine of God's righteousness as his salvific activity in a covenantal framework."⁵⁹ He says that "justification does not have to do with an exchange of our sin for the righteousness of Christ; rather, it has to do with liberation from sin's mastery . . . God is the one whose righteousness is at

Apostle (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998); J.D.G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990). In *Jesus, Paul, and the Law*, 10–11, Dunn acknowledges his debt to Stendahl.

48. Robert H. Gundry, "Why I Don't Endorse 'The Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Evangelical Celebration . . . Even Though I Wasn't Asked to,'" *Books and Culture* 7, no. 1 (January/February 2001): 6–9; Robert H. Gundry, "On Oden's Answer," *Books and Culture* 7, no. 2 (March/April 2001): 14–15, 39; Robert H. Gundry, "Grace, Works, and Staying Saved in Paul," *Biblica* 66, no. 1 (January 1985): 1–38; Robert H. Gundry, "The Nonimputation of Christ's Righteousness," in Mark Husbands and Daniel J. Treier, eds., *Justification: What's at Stake in the Current Debates?* (Downers Grove, IL/Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press/Apollos, 2004), 17–45.

49. G.W. Bromiley, "The Doctrine of Justification in Luther," *The Evangelical Quarterly* 24, No. 2 (April 1952), pp. 91–100. Holl was also an accomplished Calvin scholar though it is not sure that his work led to a Calvin Renaissance. [Bense, "Editor's Preface," in Holl, *What Did Luther Understand*, pp. 4, 14, fn. 15; Bense, "Editor's Preface," in Holl, *The Reconstruction of Morality*, p. 12. A modern view of Scripture has contributed to a more analytical view of Calvin; see Thomas Wenger, "The New Perspective on Calvin: Responding to the Recent Calvin Interpretation," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 50, no. 2 (June 2007): 311–328. For analytical justification in some Reformed theologians see Hamann, "Justification by Faith in Modern Theology," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 29, no. 1 (January 1958): 25–37.

50. David L. Balch, "A Review of Udo Schnelle and Francis Watson on Paul," *dialog* 46, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 14–23; David A. Brondos, "Sola fide," pp. 39–57; David A. Brondos, "Did Paul Get Luther Right?" *dialog* Vol. 46, No. 1 (Spring 2007): 24–30; Karl P. Donfried, "Paul and the Revisionists: Did Luther Really Get it All Wrong?" *dialog* Vol. 46, No. 1 (Spring 2007): 31–40; David A. Brondos, *Paul on the Cross: Reconstructing the Apostle's Story of Redemption* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006); A. Andrew Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001); A. Andrew Das, *Paul and the Jews* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003); Stephen Westerholm, "Justification by Faith Is the Answer: What Is the Question?" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 70, nos. 3–4 (July/October 2006): 197–217; Mark A. Seifrid, "The Narrative of Scripture and Justification by Faith: A Fresh Response to N.T. Wright," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 72, no. 1 (January 2008): 197–217.

51. E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Mifflintown, PA: Sigler Press, 1998), 513; Waters, 61.

52. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 506. See also Waters, 62, 73–76. This emphasis on participation in Christ is also seen in Wright and Dunn; Waters, 115, 142–148, 197–198.

53. Sanders, *Paul, A Short Introduction*, 58.

54. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said*, 129. See also Waters, 131–133.

55. Wright, "Romans," 420; also see Wright, *What St. Paul Really Said*, 160 and Waters, 138, 148–149.

56. Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 344 and J.D.G. Dunn, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians; Black's New Testament Commentary* (London: A.C. Black/Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 134–135. See also Waters, 103.

57. Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 386.

58. Gundry, "Why I Didn't Endorse," 9. These quotations are also in John Piper, *Counted Righteous in Christ: Should We Abandon the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness?* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 2002), 44.

59. Gundry, "On Oden's Answer," 15. Also see Piper, *Ibid.*, 45.

stake . . . in God's case justification translates into reputation, the maintenance of his honor."⁶⁰ "It is our faith, not Christ's righteousness, that is credited to us as righteousness."⁶¹ "[T]he righteousness of faith is a righteousness that by God's reckoning consists of faith."⁶²

NPP scholars are opposed to what they perceive to be the "Lutheranizing" of Paul. This term is shorthand for their rejection of any historic Reformation understanding of justification as forensic.⁶³ NPP advocates believe that the Reformation and post-Reformation debates about justification have turned the doctrine into its very opposite! They also believe that the traditional understanding of Romans and of justification in the mature Luther, Melancthon, and other Reformers "has done violence to the text for hundreds of years, and that it is time for the text itself to be heard again."⁶⁴ NPP advocates reinterpret "justification as an ecclesiological doctrine [this marks me as one who is in the covenant people of God, that is, the church], not a soteriological one [How am I saved from my sin?]."⁶⁵ NPP also understands justification more as an inner sanctifying process over a lengthy period of time rather than as God's gracious saving work in Christ's death and resurrection that is then imputed to sinners by verbal declaration.⁶⁶ Thus there are "two 'grounds' or 'bases' for justification for NPP: the one *objective* (the work of Christ), the other *subjective* (our faith)." This in part bases justification on regeneration and makes the Spirit's sanctifying work one of the reasons for the sinner's justification.⁶⁷ This is like Holl's view of being called righteous since one will become so by the sanctifying and renewing power of the Holy Spirit. Thus for NPP, God justifies people because of something in them (that is, regeneration or sanctification). NPP theology teaches a theology of righteousness that consists in our faith, whereas the Reformation teaches a righteousness credited to us by grace through faith.⁶⁸

Though there does not seem to be a direct line from Holl to Stendahl or other NPP theologians, their theological orientation is very similar, both consisting of a rejection of the mature Luther's emphasis on forensic justification and the imputation of Christ's righteousness for the pardoning of sin, an emphasis on the indwelling of Christ, and an "analytic" view of justification that combines justification and sanctification. NPP theologians see justification as a process of growing more renewed, transformed, and sanctified. One becomes righteous in part because of God's declaration, and in part on the basis

of this transformation or renewal. This emphasis on renewal is in conflict with being *simul justus et peccator*. NPP theology also views future justification as being based on one's obedient covenant faithfulness while also emphasizing God's covenant faithfulness. Thus NPP is not really "new," but is the theology of Osiander and Holl in slightly different dress.

THE FINNISH SCHOOL OF LUTHER STUDIES

In recent years the Lutheran world has experienced another Luther renaissance known as the Finnish interpretation of Luther.⁶⁹ The Helsinki School of Luther studies has set forth the theological concept of *theosis* as a central part of Luther's theology. *Theosis* means "salvation taking place by a process of deification of the individual."⁷⁰ This emphasis on *theosis* is in part a result of ecumenical dialogues between Finnish Lutherans and the Orthodox. *Theosis* or deification is a central theological idea in Greek Orthodoxy.⁷¹

Tuomo Mannermaa is the leading theologian of the Finnish interpretation of Luther. Using the early Luther, Mannermaa writes that the "cross of Christ and the cross of the Christian therefore belong organically together." Further, he writes that the "cross of Christ is identical with the cross of the Christian." This ontic union of the believer with Christ has the sinner taking part in Christ's cross by an *imitatio Christi*.⁷²

60. Gundry, "Why I Didn't Endorse," 7–8. Also see Piper, *Ibid.*, 47.

61. Gundry, "On Oden's Answer," 15.

62. Gundry, "Why I Didn't Endorse," 8.

63. Timothy George, "Modernizing Luther, Domesticating Paul: Another Perspective," in Carson, O'Brien, and Seifrid, *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, Vol. 2, 437–463; Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The 'Lutheran' Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004); Wilfried Harle, "Rethinking Paul and Luther," *Lutheran Quarterly* 20, no. 3 (Autumn 2006): 303–317.

64. Smith, "Justification in 'the New Perspective on Paul,'" 30.

65. Waters, 189.

66. *Ibid.*, 107, 194–195, 210–211.

67. Smith, "A Critique of the 'New Perspective' on Justification," 109.

68. Piper, 61.

69. For works dealing with the Finnish School see Carl E. Braaten and Robert W. Jenson, eds., *Union with Christ: The New Finnish Interpretation of Luther* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998); Anna Briskina, "An Orthodox View of Finnish Luther Research," *Lutheran Quarterly* 22, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 16–39; Mark C. Mattes, "A Future for Lutheran Theology? A Review Essay," *Lutheran Quarterly* 19, no. 4 (Winter 2005): 439–448; Kurt Marquart, "Luther and Theosis," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 64, no. 3 (July 2000): 182–205; Tuomo Mannermaa, "The Doctrine of Justification and Christology: Chapter A, Section One of The Christ Present in Faith," trans. Thomas F. Obersat, *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 64, no. 3 (July 2000): 206–239; Tuomo Mannermaa, *Christ Present in Faith: Luther's View of Justification*, trans. Kirsti Stierma (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005); Timo Laato, "Justification: The Stumbling Block of the Finnish Luther School," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 72, no. 4 (October 2008): 327–346; Mark C. Mattes, *The Role of Justification in Contemporary Theology* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 126–144; Risto Saarinen, *Faith and Holiness: Lutheran-Orthodox Dialogue 1959–1994* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1997); Olli-Pekka Vainio, *Justification and Participation in Christ: The Development of the Lutheran Doctrine of Justification from Luther to the Formula of Concord* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2008); Risto Saarinen, *God and the Gift: An Ecumenical Theology of Giving* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005).

70. Lowell, C. Green, "The Question of Theosis in the Perspective of Lutheran Christology," in Dean O. Wenthe, William C. Weinrich, Arthur A. Just Jr., Daniel Gard, and Thomas L. Olson, eds., *All Theology Is Christology: Essays in Honor of David P. Scaer* (Ft. Wayne, IN: Concordia Theological Seminary Press, 2000), 163. On theosis or deification in Orthodoxy see Veli-Matti Karkkainen, *One With God: Salvation as Deification and Justification* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2004), 17–36.

71. "For the Orthodox *theosis* is a central theological and religious idea, as the title of the book by Georgios I. Mantzaridis, *The Deification of Man*, indicates." John Meyendorff and Robert Tobias, "Introduction," and Michael C.D. McDaniel, "Salvation as Justification and Theosis," in John Meyendorff and Robert Tobias, eds., *Salvation in Christ—A Lutheran-Orthodox Dialogue* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1992), 19, 67–83; Simo Peura, "Review Essay: John Meyendorff and Robert Tobias: Salvation in Christ: A Lutheran Orthodox Dialogue," *Pro Ecclesia* 2, no. 3 (Summer 1993): 364–371.

72. Mannermaa, cited in Green, "The Question of Theosis," 169–170.

This ontic union illustrates the leading idea of the Mannermaa school—Christ present in faith or Christ dwelling in the believer (both in his person and his works). Thus the Christian’s “divine life in Christ” is produced by the indwelling of Christ. For Mannermaa “the righteousness of faith” and *theosis* are analogous. Mannermaa thus equates *theosis* (deification) with justification. The Christian’s union with Christ is union with God. This union is likened to marriage—Christ and the believer become one flesh.⁷³

The Finnish Lutherans say that the Lutheran Confessions and later Lutheran theology have separated Luther’s insight about Christ’s indwelling gifts from justification. Simo Peura writes,

[T]he FC and modern Lutheran theology have not correctly communicated Luther’s view of grace and gift . . . justification includes gift in its broader sense, that is, in its effective aspect as the renewal of the sinner (*renovatio*) . . . God changes the sinner ontologically in the sense that he or she participates in God and in his divine nature, being made righteous and “a god.”⁷⁴

The Finnish Lutheran understanding of Luther is that he teaches a two part understanding of justification like Rome. Karkkainen writes,

For Luther himself, the forensic and effective aspects of justification form an indivisible entity . . . The relationship

between effective and forensic justification comes to light in Luther’s theology in his usage of two classic concepts: “grace” (*gratia, favor*) and “gift” (*donum*). The former denotes the sinner’s being declared righteous (the forensic aspect) and the latter the person’s being made righteous (the effective aspect). As early as the beginning of Luther’s career, in his Lectures on Romans (1515–1516), this distinction appears. Following the terminology of Augustine and the Medieval tradition, on the basis of Romans 5:15 (*gratia Dei et donum in gratia*), Luther expresses an opinion that is totally in line with the mainline Catholic teaching, but which has been lost sight of in later Lutheranism . . . For Luther, the distinction between effective and forensic righteousness is not an issue, as it has been in subsequent Lutheran doctrine.⁷⁵

Karkkainen states that this first “forensic” (“alien”) righteousness is “infused” into sinners from the outside solely by grace. This first righteousness is the “righteousness of faith” which “makes the human being just.” This first kind of righteousness is “more than mere forensic imputation,” for it also “brings about the union between Christ and the believer.” The second kind of righteousness (“our” righteousness) results from the first righteousness (Christ’s indwelling) and “makes it effective” or “perfects it.” Because of Christ’s presence dwelling in the believer, “all sin” is absorbed “in a moment.” Thus the Christian’s transformation or renewal is effected. This process continues throughout the Christian’s life.⁷⁶

This ontological union of the believer with God/Christ has the Finnish Lutherans theologically allied with Holl, Osiander, and NPP. Simojoki observes,

As much as Mannermaa and his school have criticized Karl Holl . . . it is the concept of union that amazingly brings Holl’s school (Emanuel Hirsch in particular) and the new Helsinki school close to each other. We can even go back in history. It was not only Andreas Osiander who taught the indwelling Christ is the cause of regeneration and justification . . . To Osiander, the condition for justification was regeneration . . . Christ’s righteousness becomes the legal foundation for our justification only through our participation in Christ. This is precisely what Mannermaa teaches in opposition to the Formula of Concord. Summing up, the new Helsinki school, which parted ways with historical Lutheranism, finds itself in the strange company of Osiander, Calvin, Karl Holl, and the Lundensian school of theology.⁷⁷

There are other ties to Karl Holl in the new Finnish theology. Lowell Green noted,

73. Karkkainen, 45–47. The Finnish School here stands in contrast to the “Common Statement” from the Lutheran/Orthodox dialogues which says that the Orthodox understand “righteousness as an inner transformation of human beings toward ‘God-likeness’ (that is, sanctification in Lutheran terminology)” whereas the “Lutherans say that righteousness is imputed to humans.” “Common Statement: Christ ‘In Us’ and Christ ‘For Us’ in Lutheran and Orthodox Theology,” in Meyendorff & Tobias, 24.

In discussing evangelical Catholic non-negotiables, Chapman uses this Finnish Lutheran marriage analogy to describe the union of Christ and the Christian in the Eucharist. “The Eucharistic Prayer is the great catholic and orthodox denial of and guard against this subjective reduction of the Sacrament to a celebration of the ‘real absence’ . . . the Eucharistic Prayer is *not optional*. We do have a role in the gift of Christ and his grace to us . . . It is in prayer that Word and Sacrament are a unity—a union of Christ and his bride the Church. This is the nuptial mystery of the Eucharist, carried out in a real way in the holy intercourse of prayer and proclamation in the celebration of the Sacrament in the Eucharistic Prayer. The bread and wine really are transformed into the living body and life-giving blood of Christ in the sacramental union of divine Bridegroom and holy-elect Bride. This is the sacred act by which Christ is continually incarnate in the Church, in the faith and life of all who take into themselves the mystery of his holy Presence. Just as on the wedding night, the bride participates as fully as the bridegroom in the union of blessed love, so by the infinitely superior analogy of the Incarnation, Cross, and Resurrection does the Church, the Bride of Christ, fully participate with Christ her beloved and loving Bridegroom, in the Eucharistic sacrament of the union of holy and divine love.” Mark E. Chapman, “Fundamental Unity: Evangelical-Catholic Non-Negotiables,” *Lutheran Forum* 39, no. 4 (Christmass/Winter 2005): 14.

74. Simo Peura, “Christ as Favor and Gift: The Challenge of Luther’s Understanding of Justification,” in Braaten and Jenson, *Union with Christ*, 47–48; Risto Saarinen, “The Presence of God in Luther’s Theology,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1994), 3–13; for the contrast between Luther and Lutheranism see Ken Schurb, “The New Finnish School of Luther Research and Philip Melancthon,” *LOGIA* 12, no. 3 (Holy Trinity 2003): 31–35.

75. Karkkainen, 52–53.

76. *Ibid.*, 53–55.

77. Simojoki, 131. Significantly, Karkkainen, a proponent of the Finnish Interpretation of Luther includes an entire chapter on NPP in his book; see Karkkainen, 10–16.

[J]ustification by *theosis* is an ongoing process. In such a view, the believer is involved in a gradual program of moral perfection and is saved on the basis of an inner or intrinsic righteousness. This is related to ideas of the moral atonement found in Abelard and in Albrecht Ritschel, and to Karl Holl's notion of an "analytic" justification in Luther, that is, one based upon active righteousness gradually developed within the believer. These views obliterate the distinction of law and gospel and are irreconcilable with Luther's view of the believer as simultaneously a sinful and a righteous one (*simul justus et peccator*), sinful in himself but just by the imputed righteousness of Christ. For the mature Luther, justification could not be described as a gradual perfection of the believer while being transfigured into the likeness of God. He did not regard justification as an ongoing process.⁷⁸

THE INTERACTION OF CULTURE AND RELIGION

The intersection of world and church, the secular and the religious realms, has also impacted the church's understanding of justification. This intrusion of the world into the church was mentioned in *Time's* report on the Helsinki LWF meeting. Human beings desire to be involved even in their own salvation. This is not a new trend since human beings always have a tendency towards works righteousness and all religions aside from Christianity involve works righteousness in one form or another. However the innate human desire to save one's self seems to have become a more prominent one today.

The question arose at Helsinki as to whether justification was relevant for modern human beings. This also raised the question as to whether the church itself was relevant to modern human beings. Holl wrestled with similar questions. His Luther Renaissance was intended to help answer those questions positively. Holl's attempt to make Luther and Christianity relevant for the modern person of his day included a personalizing of religion and a more "modern" (analytic) view of justification which would allow for human beings to be more involved in their own salvation.⁷⁹ This trend continues, as Arthur Jay Klinghoffer observes,

Modern religion . . . is based on the decline of doctrinal orthodoxy . . . as the focus shifts to the individual and personal ethical concerns. The church no longer provides "a prefabricated set of answers," but only the environment within which man can seek out his own "ultimate solu-

tions." According to Bellah, "modern religion is beginning to understand the laws of the self's own existence and so to help man take responsibility for his own fate."⁸⁰

Lutherans have been affected by this "modern" trend for self salvation. A Barna survey indicated that 54 percent of Lutherans responded with a "Yes" to this question: "Can a good person earn his way into heaven?"⁸¹ In a major survey of Lutheran Christians, 60.5 percent of them believed that the "main emphasis of the Gospel is on God's rules for right living" and 48.3 percent believed that "people can only be justified before God by loving others."⁸² In another poll 73 percent of the Lutherans surveyed agreed "that if a person is generally good, or does enough good things for others, he or she will earn a place in Heaven."⁸³

In commenting about the National Study of Youth and Religion, Christian Smith said, "It's unbelievable the proportion of conservative Protestant teens who do not seem to grasp elementary concepts of the gospel concerning grace and justification. Their view is: be a good person."⁸⁴ That survey discovered that the *de facto* dominant religion among American teens is Moralistic Therapeutic Deism. The results are sobering. Smith notes,

But we can say here that we have come with some confidence to believe that a significant part of Christianity in the United States is actually only tenuously Christian in any sense that is seriously connected to the actual historical Christian tradition, but has rather substantially morphed into Christianity's misbegotten step-cousin, Christian Moralistic Therapeutic Deism. This has happened in the minds and hearts of many individual believers and, it also appears, within the structures of at least some Christian

78. Green, "The Question of Theosis," 173. See also Carl Beckwith, "Looking into the Heart of Missouri: Justification, Sanctification, and the Third Use of the Law," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 69, nos. 3-4 (July/October 2005): 302-307.

79. R. Scott Clark, "Iustitia Imputata Christi: Alien or Proper to Luther's Doctrine of Justification?" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 70, nos. 3-4 (July/October 2008), 277-279, 307. "Karl Holl . . . [is] one of the leaders of the recently formed Luther Society, which was founded for the express purpose of showing the continuing relevance of Luther in the modern world." Bense, "Editor's Introduction," in Holl, *The Reconstruction of Morality*, 14; see also Stayer, 1-47, 118-124.

80. Arthur Jay Klinghoffer, *Red Apocalypse: The Religious Evolution of Soviet Communism* (Lanham/New York/London: University Press of America, Inc., 1996), 165; Robert Bellah, *Beyond Belief* (New York: Harper and Row, 1970), 42. Holl believed that Luther's religion was a religion of conscience and ethics; see "Luther's Religion: A Religion of Conscience," Holl, *What Did Luther Understand*, 48; Holl, *The Reconstruction of Morality*, 13ff; Simojoki, 122.

81. Andrew Simcak, "How Do We Get to Heaven?" *Lutheran Witness* 119, no. 7 (July 2000): 26.

82. *Lutheran Brotherhood's Survey of Lutheran Beliefs and Practices—Summer 1998*, 9-11.

83. Bruce Kueck, "Poll: Most Christians' beliefs out of sync with Bible," *Lutheran Witness Reporter* (July 2001): 11.

A group of predominantly ELCA Lutherans reached the following conclusion at a 1990 gathering entitled, "A Call to Faithfulness," held at St. Olaf College in Northfield, MN: "There is a crisis of the gospel in our church as we face the modern secularized world. There is no agreement among us, nor in the ELCA, as to the specific gospel content of the church's proclamation. This crisis has issued in a consequent collapse of the identity of pastoral ministry." "A Call to Faithfulness: Working Group Reports—Ministry—Walter Carlson and Andrew Weyermann," *dialog* 30, no. 2 (Spring, 1991): 163.

Another poll indicated that only 39 percent of ELCA Lutherans still believe that one is justified by God's grace through faith in Jesus Christ apart from the deeds of the Law. See Martha Sayer Allen, "Churches reflect on members' views," *Minneapolis Star Tribune* (Sunday, April 1, 1990), 7B.

84. "What American Teenagers Believe: A Conversation with Christian Smith," *Books and Culture: A Christian Review* 11, no. 1 (January/February 2005): 10.

organizations and institutions. The language and therefore experience of Trinity, holiness, sin, grace, justification, sanctification, church, Eucharist, and heaven and hell appear, among most Christian teenagers in the United States at the very least, to be supplanted by the language of happiness, niceness, and an earned heavenly reward. It is not so much that U.S. Christianity is being secularized. Rather more subtly, Christianity is actively being colonized and displaced by a quite different religious faith

—Moralistic Therapeutic Deism.⁸⁵

THE ECUMENICAL TREND

Just as there was felt to be a need to affirm the relevance of the church in Holl's day, so it is thought that the church must be modern and relevant to continue to exist today. One part of the concern about modern relevancy has to do with the unification of the Christian Church since its disunity is considered a scandal and a detriment to its existence and mission. Though there is broad agreement that the divisions within Christianity are a scandal, there are different thoughts as to how its disunity and divisions should be dealt with. One pathway is that of ecumenism and outward visible unity. As one theologian has written, Holl's "personalizing" of religion, most notably in the area of "the doctrine of justification" should be an encouragement for "dialogue with Christians of all types," and should open doors for dialogue with "non-Christian traditions."⁸⁶ Holl's work focused "on Luther as distinct from Lutheranism and on the Gospel (the expression of God's love) as the perfection of religion and the essence of true morality . . . it was the specific concern of Holl and the Luther Renaissance . . . to study Luther's personal views and development without intertwining them with

the official views and the development of his church." Holl believed that Luther had already established or reestablished the firm foundation of a modern Christianity with the doctrine of analytic justification and the priesthood of all believers.⁸⁷ The dichotomy between Luther and Lutheranism in Holl and the Finnish School, as well as the NPP dichotomy between the "de-Lutheranized" Paul and the historic Reformation understanding of justification, are in line with Holl's views, as is the modern push for ecumenical unity—which separates Luther from Lutheranism.

Though the thrust of Holl's work does not appear to have been reunification with Rome, the Roman Catholic study of Luther has been influenced by the Luther Renaissance.⁸⁸ Forensic justification formerly was the demarcation line between Rome and those of the Protestant Reformation—especially the Lutherans. But this is no longer the case. Holl's promotion of analytic justification has increasingly come to be seen by many Lutherans and other Reformation heirs not only as Rome's theology, but also as the theology of Paul and of Luther.

In ecumenical dialogues justification is not "the central article of faith" since the Bible as seen through the eyes of the new hermeneutic (historical criticism) is believed to set forth many images and facets describing salvation, as well as containing differing theologies. A 1972 WCC report on dialogues including those that Lutherans had with the Reformed and Roman Catholics through 1971 noted the avoidance of focusing on the centrality of a Pauline (forensic) understanding of justification, observing that "Sometimes care is taken to preclude a misleading, purely forensic interpretation [of justification] by explicitly conjoining justification with adoption and sanctification in describing the fullness of the Gospel (L-Reur, Leuenberg, 1969/70)."⁸⁹ The analytic view of justification is evident in both

85. Christian Smith with Melinda Lundquist Denton, *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 171. See also Michael Horton, *Christless Christianity: The Alternative Gospel of the American Church* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2008), especially pages 29–64 which speak of Moralistic Therapeutic Deism. In another poll 61 percent of Christian teens surveyed believed "that a good person can earn eternal salvation through good deeds." "Poll: Teen beliefs not consistent with Bible's truths," *Lutheran Witness Reporter* (December 2000): 7.

86. Bense, "Editor's Introduction," in Holl, *What Did Luther Understand*, 14. "The church is one. Yet the disunity of the visible companies of Christian people obscures this reality. In a world of repression and anarchy, a renewed church is called to a new unity. This oneness in the church is required for the credibility and effectiveness of Christ's mission." *A Plan of Union for The Church of Christ Uniting* (Princeton, NJ: Consultation on Church Union, 1970), 10; William H. Lazareth, "Evangelical Catholicity: Lutheran Identity in an Ecumenical Age," in Carl E. Braaten, ed., *The New Church Debate: Issues Facing American Lutheranism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), 15–38; E. Theodore Bachmann, "Ecumenical Movement," in Bodensieck, Vol. 1, 750–764; James E. Andrews and Joseph Burgess, eds., *An Invitation to Action—A Study of Ministry, Sacraments, and Recognition: The Lutheran-Reformed Dialogue Series III 1981–1983* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 1–7, 25–27, 44–51, 66–67; *The Porvoo Statement and Declaration in Confessional Lutheran Perspective* (St. Louis: The Office of the President and The Commission on Theology and Church Relations—The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1999), 35–44 lines 1–28; Walter Sundburg, "Ecumenism and the Conflict Over Modernity," *Lutheran Quarterly* 4, no. 4 (Winter 1990): 383–403.

87. Bense, "Editor's Introduction," in Holl, *The Reconstruction of Morality*, 10, 22, 23. Theodor Dieter, "Luther Research and Ecumenism," *dialog* 47, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 157–166.

88. Richard Stauffer, *Luther As Seen By Catholics* (Richmond, VA: John Know Press, 1967); Peter Manns, "Absolute and Incarnate Faith—Luther on Justification in the Galatians' Commentary of 1531–1535," in Jared Wicks, ed., *Catholic Scholars Dialogue with Luther* (Chicago: Loyola University Press 1970), 121–122, 125–126–128; James Atkinson, *Martin Luther: Prophet to the Church Catholic* (Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press/Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983), 12–13; Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor*, 40–42; Klaus Penzel, "Ernst Troeltsch on Luther," and James Luther Adams, "Paul Tillich on Luther," in Pelikan, *Interpreters of Luther*, 296, 298, 307, 317–318; R. Scott Clark, 278; Peter Manns, Carter Lindberg, Harry McSorley, eds., *Luther's Ecumenical Significance: An Interconfessional Consultation* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); Wm. Dallmann, "Kiefl on Luther," *Concordia Theological Monthly* 14, no. 7 (July 1943): 481–488. For an example of the examination of justification in Rome, see Hans Kung, *Justification: The Doctrine of Karl Barth and a Catholic Reflection*, trans. Thomas Collins, Edmund E. Tolk, David Granskou (New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964); Kung references Holl and the question as to whether Luther really taught synthetic (forensic) justification, 217; Fred W. Meuser, "The Changing Catholic View of Luther: Will Rome Take Him Back?" in Fred W. Meuser and Stanley D. Schneider, eds., *Interpreting Luther's Legacy: Essays in Honor of Edward C. Fendt* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1969), 40–54; David S. Yeago, "The Catholic Luther," *First Things* 61 (March 1996): 37–41.

89. Nils Eherenstrom and Gunther Gassmann, *Confessions in Dialogue: A Survey of Bilateral Conversations among World Confessional Families*

the Reformed and Lutheran essays and in the “Summary Statement” of the Lutheran/Reformed III dialogue. The summary statement says: “We are agreed that each tradition has sought to preserve the wholeness of the gospel as including the forgiveness of sins and the renewal of life.”⁹⁰ Holl’s analytic view of justification is the understanding of justification that Lutherans have primarily brought to their ecumenical dialogues.

Carl Braaten studied the results of the Lutheran ecumenical dialogues with Rome, the Reformed, Anglicans and others until 1990. One Lutheran and Anglican common statement said “that we are accounted righteous and are made righteous before God only by grace through faith because of the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and not on account of our works or merits. Both our traditions affirm that justification leads and must lead to ‘good works’; authentic faith issues in love. We understand sanctification in relation to justification not only as an expression of the continuity of justification, the daily forgiveness of sins and acceptance by God, but also as growth in faith and love both as individuals and as members of the Christian community.” Braaten expressed concern that in this formulation of justification, the Christian’s inner renewal has a role in determining if one is truly righteous and justified. Braaten concluded by saying that “Trent [Rome] would have had no problem with these Lutheran-Anglican statements” on justification, but Chemnitz and all those true to the Augsburg Confessions would.⁹¹

Writing about the joint Lutheran-Roman Catholic statement on justification in 1985, Braaten concluded that the Catholics still included the “sanctification of the inner life through a voluntary cooperation with the grace of God” in their definition of justifying faith. He expressed concern about unclear theological statements that could have two meanings. Ultimately he noted that Rome’s participants never yielded on the point that “justification is a process of gradual inward transformation on the way to final salvation,” and that “justification is something that happens at the end of a conversion process, and that it involves not merely the divine acceptance through the forgiveness of sins, but also sanctification of the inner life through a voluntary cooperation with the grace of God.”⁹²

Braaten believed that in all these dialogues the Lutherans had not understood the “great chasm between their own view [on

justification by faith] and those views held by Catholics and Protestants.” He further stated that Lutherans do not “stand somewhere between Catholics and Protestants” regarding justification by faith. Rather “most Protestants stand with Catholics” because they both teach “free will, in order to preserve the human role in bringing about salvation.” He believed that both Rome and the Reformed desire to integrate “love and good works into justifying faith.” He noted that most Protestants and Roman Catholics “are allergic to the concept of forensic justification.”⁹³

The trajectory of the Finnish School’s reshaping of the doctrine of justification, which is very similar to Holl’s view, has also been reunification with Rome. The theological work of the Finnish school has been “rapidly introduced into ecumenical conversations, first between the Russian Orthodox Church and the Finnish Lutheran Church, and then into the international Orthodox-Lutheran dialogues . . . What makes it so appealing is its explicitly ecumenical orientation with regard to the Orthodox view on the one hand and the Roman Catholic on the other hand.”⁹⁴

Reunification with Rome is also one of the aspects of NPP. Waters writes that the sympathies of the adherents of NPP “are not with Protestantism, but with Roman Catholicism” and are rooted “in the historical-critical tradition’s previous departure from the Reformational doctrine of justification by faith alone.”⁹⁵ Waters concludes, “If we examine their [NPP theologians] arguments carefully, we see that what they are really and increasingly saying is that Luther and Calvin were mistaken [about justification], and that Trent was right.”⁹⁶ And lest one believe that the above comments are whistling in the dark, these words from an NPP advocate are plain and blunt:

Accompanying this appreciation for patristics is a realization that the Protestant Reformation arose within a particular historical context that has shaped subsequent Reformation beliefs and practices in ways that have not always been equally beneficial. More and more evangelical scholars are looking to Catholicism to correct some of the unhealthy emphases that have taken root among the heirs of the Reformation . . . my use of Catholic theology goes beyond a desire that Catholics and Protestants might learn from each other. My hope is ultimately ecumenical in character: the unity of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.⁹⁷

1962–1971 (Geneva: World Council of Churches, Faith and Order Paper No. 63, 1972), 103.

90. “Summary Statement,” in *A Reexamination of Lutheran and Reformed Traditions-III: Justification and Sanctification: Liturgy and Ethics—Creation and Redemption: Law and Gospel* (New York: U.S.A. National Committee of the Lutheran World Federation and the North American Area of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches Holding the Presbyterian Order, 1965), 55. See also Henry Stob, “Justification and Sanctification: Liturgy and Ethics,” 13–16; Conrad Bergendoff, “Justification and Sanctification: Liturgy and Ethics,” 21–24. In his essay Bergendoff invokes Holl, and speaks about “renewal,” “full unity with God,” and being in Christ. Also Paul C. Empie and James I. McCord, eds., *Marburg Revisited: A Reexamination of Lutheran and Reformed Traditions* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1966), 37, 113–116, 120–124, 152, 177, 182.

91. Carl E. Braaten, “An Examination of the United States Lutheran Ecumenical Dialogues on Justification by Faith,” in Braaten, *Justification*, 123; see also 116–117; *The Porvoo Statement*, 45–46.

92. *Ibid.*, 123.

93. *Ibid.*, 125.

94. Karkkainen, *One With God*, 38. See also Veli-Matti Karkkainen, “Drinking from the Same Wells with Orthodox and Catholics: Insights from the Finnish Interpretation of Luther’s Theology,” *Currents in Theology and Mission* 34, no. 2 (April 2007): 85–96; also Lisa Dahill, “Christ in Us: A Response to Veli-Matti Karkkainen,” *Currents in Theology and Mission* 34, no. 2 (April 2007): 97–100; Laato, 327.

95. Waters, xi.

96. *Ibid.*, 212; Waters also expressed concern about the almost total ecclesiological (effective) view of justification in NPP, as opposed to the historic soteriological (forensic, alien) view, and wonders whether the “proponents of the NPP have forced this dichotomy in order to permit rapprochement with Rome.” Waters, 190.

97. Hans Boersma, *Violence, Hospitality, and the Cross: Reappropriating the Atonement Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 14–15. For his adherence to NPP see 18–20, 153–179.

The return to Rome is also an explicit goal in some Lutheran circles. Mark Chapman writes,

The unity of the Church *is* the truth of the Gospel. Whenever the Church is divided within or against herself, the truth of the Gospel somewhere somehow is being compromised or constrained. The visible unity of the Church is the sign and the promise of the flourishing of the truth of the Gospel. That visible unity is manifest by the full, prayerful celebration of the liturgy of the Eucharist; by the ministry of holy orders of ordained pastors; by the apostolic commission and mission of bishops in succession from the apostles; and by the circle of the communion of the church having its center in the Bishop of Rome by virtue of his Petrine office, where unity in doctrine and morals is discerned and taught. This visible unity shows forth the truth of the Lordship of Jesus Christ, and therefore is freedom in Christ, and not bondage. This is the non-negotiable ground of the evangelical catholic Lutheran witness.⁹⁸

This outward unity under the Papacy also includes “a fundamental orientation to Roman Catholicism as embodied in a positive reception of the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*” for the JDDJ is “a non-negotiable statement for the right interpretation of the central concern of Reformation doctrine [justification].”⁹⁹

The encouragement for Protestants to return to Rome was put forward even before Vatican II. As one scholar put it:

[T]he only way to preserve the positive and proper truths of the Reformation is to hold them within the balanced structure of justification and sanctification, of the glory of God and the dignity of man, of reason and faith, Bible and tradition, individual and church, which is represented by Roman Catholicism. So this Roman Catholic author concludes that in the future, even if not in the past, the positive aspects of the Reformation have a better chance of prospering inside the Roman church than outside. The future of the Reformation lies within Romanism, and the best way to be a good son of Luther or Calvin is to join the Roman Church.¹⁰⁰

Movement to Rome was enhanced by the Helsinki assembly which was influenced by Karl Holl. Atkinson notes,

It is also signally important to note that at the plenary meeting of the Lutheran World Federation in Helsinki in 1963 it was concluded that it can no longer be said that the Catholic teaching on justification is wrong, or against the Gospel. The 1972 Malta Report of the International Lutheran/Roman Catholic Study Commission came to the same conclusion. Does this not suggest that already Luther is being brought back within the framework of Catholicity? It is within this living organism (Rome) that Luther’s protest will be fully understood and finally effective in achieving the ends to which God called him in the sixteenth century.¹⁰¹

An integral part of this movement towards outward unity and reunification with Rome has been Holl’s understanding of Luther, and Holl’s view of analytic justification which was evident at Helsinki, and is evident in the Finnish Luther and in NPP.

JDDJ

The JDDJ was preceded by a document entitled “Justification by Faith (Common Statement).”¹⁰² “Justification by Faith” referenced the Regensburg Colloquy (1541), a joint Lutheran-Roman Catholic document which set forth a two pronged teaching on justification: an inherent righteousness understood as infused charity which heals the will of sin, and an imputed righteousness based on Christ’s merits. This document was rejected by Lutherans because it attempted to tie together “biblical justification and the Scholastic doctrine of ‘faith animated by love.’”¹⁰³

“Justification by Faith” also noted the fact that Helsinki questioned the dichotomy between forensic justification and a “transformationist” view of justification because God truly brings about “rebirth.”¹⁰⁴ Karl Holl’s influence is also mentioned.¹⁰⁵ This document also emphasized the Greek concept of *theosis* (deification) for a proper understanding of Rome’s concept of justification (renewal, transformation).¹⁰⁶ The “obedience of faith” or faith active in love is also emphasized.¹⁰⁷ “Justification by Faith” also emphasizes God’s “covenant loy-

98. Chapman, “Fundamental Unity,” 19. The liturgical uniformity needed for outward unity includes mandatory eucharistic prayers in the liturgy.

99. *Ibid.*, 12, 18–19. In the same article Chapman emphatically states that whatever “may be the case for other issues, *the Reformation is over*” since eucharistic prayers (the Roman Canon of the Mass) have been inserted into Lutheran liturgies. This liturgical change has restored continuity with Rome and “with the undivided Church of the first millennium. This ought to be a doctrinal point, not an aesthetic one. It is not a matter of taste but of truth.” *Ibid.*, 13–14 (italics original).

100. George A. Lindbeck, “Roman Catholicism on the Eve of the Council,” in Kristen E. Skydsgaard, ed., *The Papal Council and the Gospel: Protestant Theologians Evaluate the Coming Vatican Council* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), 78.

101. Atkinson, 139.

102. “Justification by Faith (A Common Statement),” in Anderson, Murphy, Burgess, *Justification by Faith*, 13–74. Significantly, the book *Justification by Faith* is listed in a bibliography of works on the New Perspectives on Paul. Dennis M. Swanson, “Bibliography of Works on the New Perspective on Paul,” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 16, no. 2 (Fall 2005): 318. The whole issue of this journal was devoted to the New Perspective on Paul.

103. *Ibid.*, 32–33. The Regensburg Colloquy is discussed and the Regensburg Agreement paragraphs on justification are in Anthony N.S. Lane, *Justification by Faith in Catholic-Protestant Dialogue: An Evangelical Assessment* (London: T & T Clark, 2002), 46–60, 233–237; for Melancthon’s reply concerning the Book and the Articles Accepted and Rejected during the Colloquy (1541), Eric Lund, ed., *Documents from the History of Lutheranism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 73–74; the Regensburg Colloquy section on justification is also included on 72–73.

104. “Justification by Faith (A Common Statement),” in Anderson, Murphy, Burgess, *Justification by Faith*, 45–46, 61.

105. *Ibid.*, 41, 47.

106. *Ibid.*, 39, 52.

107. *Ibid.*, 45, 57, 58, 62, 69, 73.

alty” or faithfulness.¹⁰⁸ Working with an historical-critical understanding of the Scriptures, forensic justification is combined with an effective or analytic view of justification which purportedly renders sinners righteous in God’s sight. The document sets forth a righteousness “based on works” which its authors do not believe is in conflict with justification by faith. Paul is seen to “speak of both judgment in accordance with works and justification by faith apart from works of the law.”¹⁰⁹

Thus “Justification by Faith” concluded that to “be saved one must be judged righteous and be righteous . . . by justification we are both declared righteous and made righteous. Justification, therefore, is not a legal fiction. God, in justifying, effects what he promises; he forgives sin and makes us truly righteous.” God will render to Christians “according to their works.” This document speaks of being saved by God’s promise and the saving work of Christ, but includes in that understanding “the grace-wrought transformation of sinners” which is “a necessary preparation for final salvation.” Justification is defined as both God’s declaring the sinner righteous and salvation by “the change wrought in sinners by infused grace.”¹¹⁰

Coming then to the JDDJ, one sees the same theological emphases as is in the document that came before it. This should not be surprising since the JDDJ states up front that it “is not a new independent presentation” of justification, but is firmly based on the arguments and theology of all the dialogue documents that had come before it.¹¹¹ The JDDJ walks in the footsteps of the new hermeneutic—the “new insights” gained through the use of historical criticism which many theologians believe has revealed a number of different ways to speak about righteousness and justification in Scripture, with the forensic understanding of justification being only one.¹¹²

Like Holl and others mentioned above, the JDDJ speaks about justification in part by God’s declaration (“the forgiveness of sins”) and in part by renewal, transformation, or being made righteous (“liberation from the dominating power of sin and death . . . and from the curse of the law”). This is accomplished by the indwelling righteousness of Christ. There is a constant emphasis on faith “active through love,” on living “righteously in accord with God’s will,” and “the renewal of life which God will bring to completion in eternal life.”¹¹³

Justification is defined “as Forgiveness of Sins and Making Righteous.”¹¹⁴ Justification is set forth as something that Christ does, and as something that happens in human beings that human beings do—the renewal of the heart and the bringing forth of good works and the new life. This thus prevents God from enacting a pious fiction on human beings who are still sinful, for they are in the process of becoming righteous, as Holl stated. This also makes justification a process rather than a declaration of God. Justification as a process pronounces as true now what will be true in the future at God’s declaration on the last day because of the transformed renewed living (being made righteous, effective righteousness) in Christ.

This concept of being in Christ (being united with Christ) is further emphasized when the JDDJ in a number of paragraphs states that Christians are “in faith.”¹¹⁵ Perhaps this terminology rather than the more traditional “by faith” or “through faith” is meant to emphasize our effective justification, our active union with Christ, being in Christ, Christ being in us, our being in a relationship with Christ and living a sanctified, renewed, transformed life, and ecclesologically being in a loving relationship with our fellow believers in the church.

The JDDJ struggles to explicate properly the concept of being at the same time both sinner and saint, but allows to stand alongside it Roman theology which states that sin in its proper sense is taken away from the Christian.¹¹⁶

Though it struggles to place the assurance of salvation solely on the work of Christ, the JDDJ does not accomplish that goal. The JDDJ says that Christ’s redeeming work given in Word and sacrament is only something the Christian can “build on” in order to “be sure of” God’s “grace.”¹¹⁷ For the JDDJ, the assurance of salvation depends on both God’s work in Christ and on living a renewed and transformed life since for the JDDJ good works are “an obligation” Christians “must fulfill.”¹¹⁸ The JDDJ

108. *Ibid.*, 59, 61.

109. *Ibid.*, 62, 63.

110. *Ibid.*, 71, 72.

111. *The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification in Confessional Lutheran Perspective* (St. Louis: The Commission on Theology and Church Relations – The Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod, 1999), 50; *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification (JDDJ)*, No. 6.

112. *JDDJ in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 50–52; *JDDJ*, No. 8–13. The rejection of forensic justification is tied to the acceptance of eucharistic prayers in Lutheran liturgies. “What Lutherans [who wish to put eucharistic prayers in their liturgies] must learn anew in all of this is that Luther was not nearly so lock-step rigid about justification being a forensic act of imputation as his faithful followers after him have often been . . . The case for the ‘bare Verba’ rests on the forensic metaphor for justification being the normative one.” Mark E. Chapman, “The Eucharistic Prayer in Lutheran Liturgy,” *The Bride of Christ* 15, no. 3 (Pentecost 1991), 25.

Scripture’s testamental theology (see above, footnote 17) and forensic justification are tied to a rejection of eucharistic prayers. “It is only in fairly recent times that a Eucharistic Prayer has been introduced into Lutheran liturgies. One cannot help but observe that at the same time as there has been this growing interest in a Eucharistic Prayer within Lutheranism, there has been a corresponding decline in the understanding of the doctrine of justification as the central and controlling principle in theological matters.” Robin A. Leaver, “Theological Consistency, Liturgical Integrity, and Musical Hermeneutics in Luther’s Liturgical Reforms,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 9, no. 2 (Summer 1995): 129–131. See also Paul Rorem, “Luther’s Objection to a Eucharistic Prayer,” *The Cresset* 38, no. 5 (1975): 12–16; Bryan Spinks, *Luther’s Liturgical Surgery and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass* (Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books – Grove Liturgical Study, No. 30, 1982), 27–34. This is also emphasized by Dorothea Wendebourg’s and

Reinhard Schwarz’ opposition to JDDJ and their opposition to eucharistic prayers in Lutheran liturgies. Both Wendebourg and Schwarz signed the document objecting to JDDJ. See German Professors Protest JDDJ,” <http://wordalone.org/docs/wa-german-professors.shtml>. For their opposition to eucharistic prayers, see Wolfgang Simon, “Worship and the Eucharist in Luther Studies,” *dialog* 47, no. 2 (Summer 2008): 143–144, 146–147.

113. *JDDJ in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 51–59; *JDDJ*, No. 11–12, 15–18, 22–28, 33, 37–39.

114. *JDDJ in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 52; *JDDJ*, Sec. 4.2.

115. *JDDJ in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 52–53, 55–57; *JDDJ*, No. 14–18, 26–29.

116. *JDDJ in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 56–57; *JDDJ*, No. 28–30.

117. *JDDJ in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 58; *JDDJ*, No. 34.

118. *JDDJ in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 58; *JDDJ*, No. 37.

moves from stating the fact of justification by God's grace to the Christian's obligation of renewal and good works. Thus justification is seen—as in the Regensburg Colloquy, Holl, NPP, Finnish Luther studies, and others—to be made up of two parts: God's declaration, and our need or obligation to live renewed, transformed, loving lives. If humans live faithfully in their covenant obedience with God, then God can be relied on to be faithful to his covenant promises. Thus the JDDJ speaks about the God "who remains true to himself, so that one can rely on him."¹¹⁹

One advocate of JDDJ, Veli-Matti Karkkainen, wrote about the noteworthiness of the JDDJ's definition of justification as the forgiveness of sins and communion with God/union with Christ. Such a definition and understanding of justification forms a "common bridge between two opposing orientations, namely, the Lutheran Confessions' forensic definition and the Catholics' effective view of justification." This truth is affirmed in the title to 4.2 "Justification as the Forgiveness of Sins and Making Righteous." What does this mean?

Clearly the Lutheran partner has taken a significant ecumenical step in mutually agreeing that justification is not only forgiveness of sins but also internal change, even effecting love through the Spirit. The focal point is the union with Christ . . . This statement attempts to steer a middle course between the one-sided forensic view and the sanative view of Luther himself . . . the Lutheran comment is interesting in that it dares to use the Catholic language of 'impartation' of God's love . . . The Catholic counterpart statement reiterates the standard Catholic position according to which justifying grace is always sanative, effective grace, or it is no real justification at all (No. 27).¹²⁰

Holl's early-Luther theology has become codified in the JDDJ by its inclusion of analytic (effective) justification, justification through union with Christ or Christ in the believer, the Christian being made righteous in a gradual sanctifying, renewing or transforming process, the avoidance of the pious fiction of forensic justification, and Luther being placed outside of Lutheranism. The concepts of *theosis* and God's covenant faithfulness are also included in the JDDJ. Thus the JDDJ has given its answer to the question that Pelikan said was raised by Holl's Luther Renaissance: "What is the true Lutheran understanding of justification and righteousness?"

CONCLUSION

The following words from a Lutheran theologian who served as a secretary for interconfessional relations in the Lutheran World Federation, and who was a participant in the Lutheran Roman Catholic dialogues, underscore all of the implications and meaning of the signing and acceptance of the JDDJ—namely, the triumph of Holl's theology. Peder Norgaard-Hojen writes:

By signing the Joint Declaration, the Lutherans have in fact abandoned their centuries-old conviction that the doctrine of justification is the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* and have given in to an incessant Roman pressure to accept a plurality of basic criteria, primarily of an ecclesiological nature, by which doctrinal opinions are to be judged. This fact may be interpreted in different ways—and not necessarily as a disaster—but Lutherans should realize what has happened and should perceive that the signing of the *Joint Declaration* has probably promoted a development towards a definite surrender to what has for centuries been understood as the contrast to authentic Reformation theology. In that sense the Catholic-Lutheran dialogue—unintendedly from the Lutheran perspective—may have reached a point of no return.

On the one hand, this shift in Lutheran theology, brought about through intensive ecumenical contacts with the Roman Catholic Church, is not necessarily detrimental to a renewed and indispensable reflection on the proper place of the doctrine of justification within the whole doctrinal system. It seems, indeed, difficult to contradict the statement of the Annex that the doctrine of justification 'has its truth and specific meaning within the overall context of the church's fundamental trinitarian confession of faith'. On the other hand, this to a certain extent necessary relativization of the doctrine of justification will obviously give rise to heavy Roman Catholic impact on Lutheran understanding of the church, its ministry and authority.

The signature of the Joint Declaration at Augsburg has paved the way to a remarkable Lutheran openness to Roman Catholic positions in issues that will quite obviously be part of the ecumenical agenda in the years to come (concept of the church, ministry, apostolic succession, papacy, etc.). In this respect Lutheranism is about to change notably. The question is whether it will do so with open eyes or whether it will be led to walk where it traditionally has not wanted—or for theological reasons could not want—to go. And is the Lutheran step towards Rome taken in Augsburg (of all places!) compatible and consistent with the strong ecumenical commitment of Lutheran churches to other confessions and denominations, primarily those of the Reformed tradition (cf. the Leuenberg Agreement)?

The entire ecumenical future and the authentic proclamation of the gospel depend on a careful and scrupulous analysis of the actual ecumenical scenario. This is where we stand at present. The Joint Declaration has been signed. Continued resistance against it, therefore, does not make sense. This document . . . could cause the dialogue partners (and more specifically the Lutherans) to consider very carefully the next steps to be taken on the road towards doctrinal unity.¹²¹ **LOGIA**

119. JDDJ in *Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 55; JDDJ, No. 27.

120. Karkkainen, 104–105. See also Anthony N.S. Lane, *Justification by Faith in Catholic-Protestant Dialogue: An Evangelical Assessment* (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2002), 157–158.

121. Peder Norgaard-Hojen, "A Point of No Return? The Joint Declaration and the Future of Lutheran-Catholic Dialogue," *The Ecumenical Review* 52, no. 2 (April 2000): 220–221.

One of the documents leading up to JDDJ was Karl Lehmann and Wolhard Pannenberg, *The Condemnations of the Reformation Era: Do They Still Divide?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990). A response to this document came from the faculty of Goettingen called *An Opinion on the Condemnations of the Reformation Era*. This work was serialized in English as “An Opinion on the Condemnations of the Reformation Era. Part One: Justification,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 1–62; “An Opinion on the Condemnations of the Reformation Era. Part Two: The Sacraments,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (Autumn 1991): 337–371; “An Opinion on the Condemnations of the Reformation Era. Part Three: The Office of the Ministry,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 5, no. 4 (Winter 1991): 493–512. See also Wolfgang A. Bienert, “Do the Condemnations of the Reformation Era Still Confront the Contemporary Ecumenical Partner?” *Lutheran Quarterly* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1994): 53–70.

After JDDJ's publication, there was a Roman Catholic objection to the document called “Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification—The Lutheran World Federation and the Catholic Church—Presentation to the Vatican Sala Stampa of His Eminence Edward Idris Cardinal Cassidy President of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity—25 June 1998,” available at: <http://www.katolsk.no/info/jp2/19981024.htm>. This document noted that Rome could not speak of a “consensus” because of the “major difficulties” theologically that still existed. Thus the condemnations of Trent still applied in those areas. Two Catholic condemnations came in the area of *simul justus et peccator* and of justification by imputation rather than by “inner transformation.” See Cassidy, No. 8. The Lutherans responded. Then came “The Official Common Statement,” and “The Annex to The Official Common Statement.” “The Annex” did not change JDDJ and though it addressed both Lutheran and Catholic concerns, the Lutherans moved more towards the Roman positions as Norgaard-Hojen noted above.

This movement in a Roman direction has been noted by others as well. “First, apart from some concessions to Lutheran phraseology, like ‘faith alone’ and *simul justus et peccator*, the Annex is harmonious with Roman Catholic teaching as found in the Council of Trent. For example, with the help of text from JDDJ and from biblical verses laden with traditional Roman Catholic interpretations, the first paragraph of Annex 2.A reflects a Roman Catholic understanding of sin . . . The justified do not remain sinners in this sense . . . In short, Lutherans can approach Roman Catholic teaching from a different perspective, but an agreement on matters of sin and justification entails accepting theological interpretations directed by Roman Catholic doctrine.” Mark D. Menacher, “Confusion and Clarity in Recent German Ecumenism,” *LOGIA* 13, no. 2 (Easteride 2004): 26.

251 German professors protested JDDJ and the Annex in “Position Statement of Theological Instructors in Higher Education to the Planned Signing of the Official Common Statement to the Doctrine of Justification,” available at <http://www.wordalone.org/docs/wa-german-professors.shtml>.

Questions have been raised as to where the Lutherans and the Catholics go after the acceptance of JDDJ. See Mark D. Menacher, “Current Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogues,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 20, no. 4 (Winter 2006): 373–408; Margaret O’Gara, “The Significance of the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification and the Next Steps in Ecumenical Dialogue,” in Wayne C. Stumme, ed., *The Gospel of Justification in Christ: Where Does the Church Stand Today?* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006), 27–41.

Like Norgaard-Hojen, and Menacher, Avery Dulles (a Roman Catholic) also states that JDDJ is not really a consensus document: “It cannot be denied that Catholics today continue to hold the doctrines of Trent that the editors of the *Book of Concord* cite in footnotes as being contrary to Lutheran teaching, and the Lutherans with whom I have spoken generally take positions contrary to the canons of Trent. Therefore, I wonder how the *Joint Declaration* could conclude that the condemnations pronounced by Trent and the Lutheran Confessions, even on the selected issues treated in the *Joint Declaration*, no longer apply.” Avery Dulles, “Justification: The *Joint Declaration*,” *Josephinum: Journal of Theology* 9, no. 1 (Winter/Spring 2002): 108–119. Dulles has also stated his belief that JDDJ “exaggerated the agreements” in “Saving Ecumenism from Itself,” *First Things* 178 (December 2007): 25. See also Avery Dulles, “Justification and the Unity of the Church,” in Stumme, *The Gospel of Justification*, 126–127.

For the LCMS reactions to JDDJ see *The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification in Confessional Lutheran Perspective*, 7–48. Other works about JDDJ are Gottfried Martens, “Agreement and Disagreement on Justification by Faith Alone,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 65, no. 3 (July 2001): 195–223; George Lindbeck, “Martens on the Condemnations: Review Essay,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 59–66; Meg Madson, “The Incredible Shrinking Doctrine of Justification,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 103–118; Louis A. Smith, “Some Second Thoughts on the *Joint Declaration*,” *Lutheran Forum* 31, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 8; Gerhard Forde, “The Critical Response of German Theological Professors to the *Joint Declaration on Justification*,” *dialog* 38, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 71–72; Gerhard Forde, Pat Kiefert, Mary Knutsen, Marc Kolden, Jim Nestingen, Gary Simpson, “A Call for Discussion of the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*,” *dialog* 36, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 224–229; “Luther Seminary Faculty Statement on the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*,” *dialog* 36, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 218; James Arne Nestingen, “Anti-JDDJ: Visions and Realities,” in *dialog* 39, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 140–141;

Hans L. Martensen, “The *Joint Declaration on Justification*,” *The Ecumenical Review* 52, no. 2 (April 2000): 204–210; Mark Worthington and Vic Pfitzner, “Pro-JDDJ: Another Look at the JDDJ,” *dialog* 39, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 141–143; Kenan B. Osborne, “Pro-JDDJ: Justification and the World Religions,” *dialog* 39, no. 2 (Spring 2000): 143–144; David P. Scaer, “*L’osservatore Romano*,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (October 1999): 301–305; Paul McCain, “Regensburg Redivivus?” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (October 1999): 305–309; David E. Aune, *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Books, 2006); Bruce L. McCormack, *Justification in Perspective: Historical Developments and Contemporary Challenges* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic Books, 2006)

Works about justification that also touch on JDDJ or the documents that came before it include John Henry Paul Reuman, Jerome D. Quinn, Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, eds., *Righteousness in the New Testament: Justification in the United States Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); Joseph A. Burgess and Marc Kolden, eds., *By Faith Alone: Essays on Justification in Honor of Gerhard O. Forde* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004); Gerhard Sauter, “God Creating Faith: The Doctrine of Justification from the Reformation to the Present,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 17–102; The Committee on Doctrine of the National Council of Catholic Bishops, “Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogues: Critique,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 125–136; The Present Roman Catholic Members of the Lutheran Catholic Dialogue, “Observations on the Critique Submitted by the Committee on Doctrine of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 137–158; The Roman Catholic Bishop’s Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs, “Evaluation of the U.S. Lutheran-Roman Catholic Dialogue,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 1, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 159–169; The Roman Catholic Bishops of the United States, “An Evaluation of the Lutheran-Catholic Statement, *Justification by Faith*,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 63–71; Eugene F. Klug, “Reflections on the Lutheran-Catholic Dialogue Today,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 52, nos. 2–3 (April–July 1988): 81–97; Oswald Bayer, “Twenty-Four Theses on Renewing Lutheranism by Concentrating on the Doctrine of Justification,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1991): 73–75; Oswald Bayer, “Justification as the Basis and Boundary of Theology,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 15, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 273–292; Irene Dingel, “The Debate Over Justification in Ecumenical Dialogue,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 15, no. 3 (Autumn 2001): 293–316; Wilfried Harle, “Living Out of Justification,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 18, no. 4 (Winter 2004): 455–466; Robert Kolb, “God Kills and Makes Alive: Romans 6 and Luther’s Understanding of Justification (1535),” *Lutheran Quarterly* 12, no. 1 (Spring 1998): 1–31; Wolfhart Schlichting, “Justification and Responsibility for the World: Report on an International Consultation,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 7, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 19–44; Winfrid Herbst, “The New Regulations on Indulgences,” *Lutheran Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (Autumn 1991): 315–336; “The Gospel and the Church—The Malta Report (1972),” in Harding Meyer and Lukas Vischer, eds., *Growth in Agreement* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1994), 168–189; *Church and Justification—Understanding the Church in the Light of the Doctrine of Justification* (Geneva: The Lutheran World Federation, 1994); Gabriel Fackre and Michael Root, eds., *Affirmations and Admonitions: Lutheran Decisions and Dialogue with Reformed, Episcopal, and Roman Catholic Churches* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998); Oswald Bayer, *Living By Faith: Justification and Sanctification*, trans. G. W. Bromley (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company—Lutheran Quarterly Books, 2003); H. J. Iwand, “The Righteousness of Faith According to Luther (Introduction and Chapter One),” *Lutheran Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 27–58; H. J. Iwand, “The Righteousness of Faith According to Luther (Chapter Two),” *Lutheran Quarterly* 21, no. 2 (Summer 2007): 211–237; H. J. Iwand, “The Righteousness of Faith According to Luther (Chapter Three),” *Lutheran Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (Autumn 2007): 320–336; H. J. Iwand, “The Righteousness of Faith According to Luther (Chapter Four),” *Lutheran Quarterly* 21, no. 4 (Winter 2007): 444–459.

Clarity in the doctrine of justification is important since it is foundational to all other articles of the Christian faith. See David P. Scaer, “Flights from the Atonement,” *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 72, no. 3 (July 2008): 195–210; Martin H. Franzmann, “Documentation: Seven Theses on Reformation Hermeneutics,” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 50, no. 4 (April 1969): 235–246. This Franzmann paper was also issued as a document of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod. Forde notes, “[J]ustification, if it is to mean anything at all in the Lutheran tradition, must be forensic in character . . . For Luther . . . [j]ustification can be effective only when it is forensic, imputed, a judgment of God that breaks in upon human life ending the old and beginning the new.” Gerhard Forde, “Forensic Justification and Law in Lutheran Theology,” in Anderson, Murphy, and Burgess, 291.

When analyzing JDDJ, these questions must be asked: Is JDDJ’s understanding of justification the biblical teaching of justification? Is JDDJ’s understanding of justification the teaching by which the people of Christ’s Church desire to stand before Christ and be judged on the Last Day? Is JDDJ’s doctrine of justification truly that of Luther and Lutheranism? Is the doctrine of justification truly the central doctrine of Christianity or is it merely one doctrine among many?