“There is no more liberating basis for ethics than the doctrine of justification of sinners by faith alone” –Eberhard Juengel, *Justification: The Heart of the Christian Faith*, 259

I. Man’s Attempts to Sanctify Himself in God’s Sight

A. Attempts to attain communion with God have always been made in three ways.

1. The will- sanctification of conduct (moralism).
2. The emotions- sanctification of the soul through (mysticism).
3. The mind- sanctification of the thought or understanding (speculation/rationalism).

B. The Will

1. The will is seen by many as the real center and predominant function of the entire personality (3).
2. Examples: The moral discipline of the teachings of Confucius, the attempt of Buddhism to destroy the enjoyment of sin, the piety of the Pharisaism (see Leonhard Goppelt, *Jesus, Paul, and Judaism* and Hugo Odoberg, *Pharisaism and Christianity*), ethical humanists, free-masonry, Kant, Fitche, Tolstoy, Roman Catholicism (see R. Preus, *Justification and Rome*).
3. All of these attempts have in common the fact that they do not regard the human will as something that is evil and absolutely separates us from God (5).
4. Two figures: the ascetic and anxious penitent and the untroubled, self-confident man (5-6).

C. The Emotions

1. The emotions have been long regarded as the special province of religion (6).
2. A distinction between two forms: (a) a romantic-aesthetic naturalism (b) a delicate, purer form of mystical religiosity (6). See A. Nygren, *Agape and Eros*.
3. “Mysticism arises out of intensified sensation” (7).
4. Mysticism is that form of piety that finds its highest satisfaction in the immediate union of the soul’s essence with the divine essence (9).
5. Pagan and Christian forms of mysticism are united at their center.

D. The Mind
1. “Just as the ‘Jew’ is the type of those who seek salvation by a legalistic morality, so the Greek is the prototype of those who ‘seek wisdom’ and by it would reach God” (12).

2. Note movement from Hellenism to Augustine (via his Neoplatonic past) to medieval philosophy (13).

3. The light of natural reason by self-illumination can establish eternal truth for itself (13).

4. Aristotelian-Thomistic construct of nature and grace attempts to correlate reason and revelation (13-14).

II. God’s Judgment on Man’s Self-Sanctification

A. What traits does the Bible have in common with other religious confessions?

1. The idea that suffering springs from the death pangs and the transitoriness of our unclean lives.

2. Confusion and helplessness of a sick world.

3. Crying out for the overcoming of the remoteness of God (19).

B. The method for overcoming these symptoms of man’s separateness from God are entirely different in the Scriptures than they are in other religious systems.

1. All human devices for achieving reconciliation with God are useless.

2. The penitential prayers of Daniel 9 and Psalms 51 and 130 are a “prophetic, worldwide survey of conscience, a final judgment on all human dreams of moral proficiency….Thus all human claims, all ethical qualifications cease in God’s presence” (20-21).

3. “The stern Biblical judgment of sin as an infinite misery and a guilt separating the soul from God was soon weakened to conform to Neoplatonic and Pelagian ideas that was supplanted by the idea of ‘sin sickness,’ which the free will (the autexousia of the Greek fathers) was to heal and overcome by meritorious and compensating good works, even though in doing so it might require the support of divine grace” (24). In Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, William of Occam, and the German mystics we see that justification becomes defined as a “progressive medicinal, moral infusion of grace by which the sinful defects in man’s soul would gradually be obliterated” (24).

C. Koebelrei identifies “four mighty intuitions that flashed out with irrefutable logic before the terrified conscience” (25) of Luther.

1. Only that is truly good which is done with a glad and cheerful will out of love to God (25).

2. The godlessness of the will that seeks its own way is not a harmless defect, but a real and lethal enmity toward God (25). In other words, sin is not merely something that is negative, a lack of that which is good, but a corrupt opposition to God Himself (25).
3. We cannot compensate for our sinfulness (26). The Roman distinction between venial and mortal sins is impossible and useless. “There is always a remainder that is never balanced, that remains eternally unpaid” (26).

4. The conscience grasps “the irrevocable nature of time.” God makes no concessions to sin and it is not possible to remove for man to erase sins already committed (26).

D. The results of man’s attempts at self-sanctification

1. Where the way of the law is followed with absolute sincerity, confidence and fearlessness are transformed into terror in the presence of God (27).

2. The saint who has sought to gain salvation through self-sanctification must perceive that behind his desire is concealed the pride of self-esteem that Luther called the “queen of sins” (27-28).

E. The Biblical evaluation of mysticism/vitalism

1. The doctrine of creation excludes both the “nature cult” (Baal, Astarte, Magna Mater, Artemis, etc.) and mysticism.

2. Underlying mysticism is a dualistic, spiritualistic conception of the relationship of soul to body (28-29). Note examples in classical thought, Gnosticism, and various forms of enthusiasm, both ancient and modern (29).

3. World-renouncing dualism is actually an attempt to escape God (30-31).

4. “God’s judgment on a vitalism that seeks to drift on absorbed in the music of a divine harmony of beauty and enjoyment finds its expression in the terrible fact that just where man thinks he can develop most splendidly into something godlike he turns most easily into the beast (Romans 1:18-32)” (34).

5. Religious eroticism is diseased with a boundless intoxication of worldliness. Mysticism suffers from an erroneous flight from the world (35). Both hold the First Article in contempt (37).

F. The illusion of the intellect: Rationalism’s failure

1. “We are accustomed to admit that God is more powerful than we but not that He is wiser” said Luther (38).


3. Luther: “When God is gone, the fairy tales arrive” (41).

4. Reason wants to reach God within its own realm (44).

5. Speculative philosophy attempts to resolve the separation between “thinking” and “being” into a monistic totality (44).

G. Conclusions regarding God’s judgment on man’s self-sanctification

1. Kierkegaard: “It is not apparent that men will endure anything rather than admit their fault?” (45)
2. Man “would rather benumb his faculties with the ceaseless, feverish intoxication of erotic or mystical excitement so as not to have to see the death sentence that hangs over him” (45).
3. The death blow of the *Formula of Concord* to all egoistic attempts of will, emotion, and intellect to achieve salvation in whole or in part (see FC-SD II:7 et al).
4. The execution of Jesus is God’s final verdict on all attempts at self-salvation.
5. “On the ruins of a perished glory humbled man learns to seek the word of the Gospel” (47).

III. Man’s Justification Before God Through the Word of Forgiveness

A. Misrepresentations of Christ

1. A religious genius who towers above all other *hominis religiosi* (49).
2. Exalted teacher in the Socratic sense who is the giver of new ethical principles (49).
3. Mystical mediator of divine energy (49-50).
4. “All these explanations of the Gospel as the result of an inner evolution forget one thing, namely, that Jesus grew up within Judaism and on a ‘sharply anti-mystical soil,’ where no one had the audacity to attempt to find God or to enjoy Him in the depths of his own soul, or to unite himself with the Cosmos through reflection” (51).

B. How does Jesus differ fundamentally from all others who have founded some form of religion?

1. He does not give rubrics for purification of the soul like the mystery religions (51).
2. He does not point men to the creative springs within themselves by which they might satisfy their cravings for devotion (50-51).
3. He does not make wisdom or virtue a prerequisite for fellowship with Himself (52).
4. He has compassion on a fallen world locked in servitude of sin (52).
5. The uniqueness of the person and message of Jesus cannot be understood apart from the matrix of the Old Testament understanding of God and sin (52-53).
6. The Gospel of Jesus is completely distinguishable from the unhistorical religions of mystical and moral salvation (54).

C. The self understanding of the apostles and the apostolic church

1. Not based on the human heart (see Jeremiah 17:9) that fluctuates between presumption and despair (55).
2. Based on the confidence that the message of reconciliation was both true and new (55).
3. Christ is not a timeless myth but “a *nudum factum* which brings about a sharply defined transition from ‘once’ to ‘now,’ from the past to the present, and which gives a new turn to the whole course of time and history in this eon” (56).
D. The Pauline message of the “justification of the ungodly” (Romans 4:5) spells the end to the bold and proud religious aspirations of man.


2. The justification of the ungodly is established by the Holy One of God who is executed as a blasphemer (57).

3. Certainty rests not in man’s efforts but in God’s work in Christ (58). Forgiveness is *extra hominem* (60)

4. Justification by grace through faith is the *cantus firmus* of Reformation hymnody, it permeates “the whole round of Christian thinking” (61).

E. Justification expressed

1. In the irrevocable character of baptism and its foundational place in the Christian life (62-65). Baptism is full and complete justification (Luther).

2. In the clear contrast between the evangelical-gift character of the Lord’s Supper and the sacramental meals of the mystical cults. The Lord’s Supper is not merely a sign of Jesus’ death; it bestows the result of His death-the forgiveness of sins (66-69).

3. In Luther’s teaching on predestination which grew out of his opposition to Pelagianism, scholasticism, and humanism (69-72).

4. In the Lutheran understanding of mission that carries the word of reconciliation into all the world as Christ came to be the Savior of all (73-76).

F. The Relationship of faith to justification

1. Faith is the *organon leptikon* (“receiving organ”) and not the cause of justification (76).

2. Lutheran orthodoxy described the marks of faith as:
   a- *Notitia*: certainty of salvation bound on a historical event. Faith is not founded upon itself.
   b- *Assensus*: subjective assent.
   c- *Fiducia*: trust in the promises of the Gospel (76-77).

3. “Faith itself, because it is divinely produced, remains a completely intangible reality, psychic in its nature, imperceptible to the senses, incomprehensible to mere reason, a miracle of creation that has come out of eternity; that has not come out of the treasures of man’s own heart but is a result of the working of God’s grace” (77). Faith itself is *extra nos*. 
G. Faith and Experience

1. Emotions are affected by the subjective certainty of the objective fact (78).
2. Emotions are not to be confused with faith.
3. True faith is both *qua* and *qua creditur*. They form an “inextricable bond” (81).
4. “Erlangen theology” follows Schleiermacher and begins with “the facts of Christian consciousness and Christian experience” (81).

H. Faith and God belong together

1. “In the *sola fide* our personality is attached to God in a relation of utter dependence. Man no longer tries to bind God to his own self-consciousness; he knows himself wholly bound by God and so faith brings humility with it” (82).
2. Man forsakes his self-righteousness (82).
3. The judgment of grace silences the satanic indictment (83).
4. The “I” of faith is free to serve, because God has freed it from itself (83).

IV. Sanctification as the Work of God in the Life of the Justified Sinner

A. Every ethic is confronted by the double problem of *content* and *energy* (84).

1. The great characteristic of all autonomous ethical systems is that they are grounded on the assumption that morality may be rationally defined and realized in the actions of those who understand it (84).
2. Knowing the law does not mean that one can do it. The example of the Jew (84).
3. The twofold evasion:
   a-Ethical optimism.
   b-Limiting of obligation (84).

B. Christ is the end of the Law (85).

1. No natural development from Law to Gospel (85).
2. Works of the devil overcome in sacrificial conflict (86).
3. His death and resurrection bring a new reality (86).
4. “The curse of the Law has been overcome, peace has again been established with God and the power of God, the living source of a new morality has been made free for the members of the Body of Christ” (86).

D. “Faith and life” corresponds to “death and resurrection” (87)

1. The unity of the Spirit with the death and resurrection of Jesus (88-89).
2. The united operation of cross and resurrection results in the unity of God’s salvific work: reconciliation and salvation, blotting out of guilt and deliverance, liberating judicial decree and maintenance of God’s regal power, amnesty and victory (89)
3. “The forgiveness of sins carries with it the power of the resurrection” (90). Note also the triad at the conclusion of the Apostles’ Creed: “…the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting.”
4. Saving faith receives both justification and sanctification (90).
5. Blasphemy to separate “without Him we can do nothing” from “We can do all things through him who strengthens us” (90)

E. Errors to be avoided (90-95)

1. Making the doctrine of the Spirit the central article of the faith (90).
2. A forensic narrowing of the doctrine of justification (91).
3. Making forgiveness of sins into nothing more than an entrance way to renewal (92).
4. Describing faith as a process, i.e. the ordo salutis (94-95).

F. Sanctification must be understood as an exclusive act of God (95)

1. “It is not fitting to teach justification evangelically and then in the doctrine of sanctification to turn synergistic” (95).
2. Justification and sanctification must be distinguished but never separated (96).
4. Justification is always complete, sanctification is always being completed (96).
5. Every teaching concerning sanctification that would attempt to reach a point where communion with God is no longer based on justification undermines the Gospel (97-98).
6. Justification carries within itself both the power and certainty of renewal (99).

G. The problem of the relationship between the transcendence and immanence of God (99)

1. Spinoza (1656) equates God with infinite substance, thus this apostate Jew became “the church father of all philosophy and theology of immanence” (99).
2. Kant expresses an epistemological doctrine of the absolute transcendence of God (100).
3. Lutheranism rejects both the pantheism of Spinoza and the critical philosophy that is derived from Kant, taking a road that lies beyond both of these positions (101), that is, the theologica crucis (102-103).
4. “God’s ‘condescension’ to the world in creation, preservation, incarnation, and sacrament does not come from any rational or natural-philosophical relation between God and man” (104).
5. The Deus in nobis is based on the Christus pro nobis (105).
7. The presence of the Triune God to faith by way of the external Word (107).
8. Human emptiness and the fullness of God are not mutually exclusive (109).
9. The place of the *unio mystica* as a dogmatic locus (110-112). Also note the extended treatment of the *unio mystica* in W. Elert, *The Structure of Lutheranism* (154-176). Elert concludes “But the love of God as such is perceived not only as a statement made by God. It calls the heart of the believer into union with itself. It calls the psyche. And the psyche answers. God remains the Other One. He is not the depth of the soul, as the mystics teach. He always remains the You-otherwise there could be no love relationship. But God’s You and the I of the psyche are connected through love, which makes of man and God ‘one thing’” (Elert, 176)


H. Sanctification as life in the Spirit (114)

1. The work of the Spirit can never be perceived as a tangible reality in the old order of existence (the fallen world). This is an offensive contradiction for natural reason (114-115).
2. The Spirit destroys our confidence in our own works (116).
3. “The Spirit does not intoxicate or stupefy but produces a holy sobriety” (116).
4. The Spirit works both *mortificatio* and *vivificatio*. We cannot have the one without the other (119).
5. The Spirit replaces the compulsion of the law with a glad readiness to do God’s will (120). Spirit-given freedom is the answer both to legalism and ethical relativism (121). The Spirit binds constraint and freedom in an indissoluble unity (121).

I. Christian Ethics and the Work of the Holy Spirit (122)

1. Christian ethics can never simply be descriptive (122).
2. “The brother of the Law is compulsion, the sister of freedom is gladness. When the Spirit is the teacher He leads on to a cheerful spirit” (123).
3. The Spirit does not stop with the eradication of evil; He works to implant the good (124).
4. That which is natural is not destroyed but restored (124).

J. The illuminating power of the Spirit (126)

1. For the Christian the renewal of the mind (Romans 12:2) means the surrender of human wisdom.
2. The illumination of the knowledge of the glory of God arises in the face of Christ (II Corinthians 4:6) and is not gained by intuition or mystical ability.
3. The illumination of the understanding goes hand in hand with the renewal of the will.
4. The perception even of the “spiritually minded” remains incomplete in comparison with that which is to be revealed (126-127).

K. The Spirit and the natural world (128)
1. Naturalistic romanticism that sees the “spirit” in nature (128-129).
2. Roman Catholic understanding of nature is close “the mystic-pantheistic transfiguration of nature” as held by the romanticists (129).
3. Reformed thinking furnishes a sharp distinction between nature and grace (130).
4. “Unsacramental legalism and ascetic mysticism in the course of time both developed by an inner necessity out of Calvinism” (130-131)

L. The Spirit made manifest in His saints (134)

1. In weakness the power of God is put on display (134).
2. Living examples of justification and sanctification (135).
3. The same powers that were used to dishonor God by those dead in sin are now used to honor Him by those who have been liberated to the praise of His glory (136).

V. Sanctification as the Answer of the Justified Sinner

A. Universal atonement and the question of why some are not saved (137). Three unsatisfactory answers:

1. Deterministic monergism that makes conversion simply a raw exercise of God’s sovereign might. In this model both salvation and damnation are determined by God.
3. Synergism that attempts to offer a synthesis between deterministic monergism and Pelagianism. See the condemnation of both crass and subtle synergism in the Formula of Concord (FC-SD II). Also see G. Forde, The Captivation of the Will (Eerdmans) and Robert Kolb, Bound Choice, Election and Wittenberg Theological Method: From Martin Luther to the Formula of Concord (Eerdmans).

B. The paradoxical character of the scriptural answer (142)

1. Man’s responsibility is not lessened.
2. God alone is the author and sole actor in salvation.
3. Nothing precedes conversion but “darkness and opposition, enmity and death” (143).
4. Act of reception is necessary, but it is a “passive act” (actus passivus). “The act of reception is necessary, however it is not the receiving hand but the food that is given that saves and satisfies” (143).
5. “As we men we have the sad possibility of a freedom to do evil. The freedom to do good must be given us….Man cannot save himself but he can destroy himself” (143).
6. “In the final judgment men are placed at the right hand of the Judge; they place themselves at His left side” (144).
7. The biblical position will always be unacceptable to “rationalistic-ethical thinking” (144).

C. Consequences of the paradoxical position for Christian preaching (144)

1. Speaking in both dogmatic and ethical terms (145).
2. The indicative and imperative in Philippians 2:12. The gar of this verse makes it impossible to identify salvation as a joint work of God and man (145).
3. Divine retribution rests on man’s rejection, a rejection that is anchored in unbelief (146).
4. The preaching of the law addresses both the “refined” (Galatians) and “gross” (Corinthian) vices (147). We have the examples of David and Herod, both of whom were adulterers and of the two criminals crucified with Christ (147).

D. The relationship of grace and freedom in the maintenance of faith (148).

1. The distinction made by the Formula of Concord: Man is purely passive in conversion. The regenerate man can be said to “cooperate” with God as long as it is understood that God rules, directs, and guides with His Spirit (148) according to FC-SD II.
2. The word of forgiveness produces faith and a new life. It does not simply aid, support, or strengthen the old will but creates a new will (148).
3. “So sanctification as well as regeneration must be guarded against every form of synergistic misunderstanding” (149).
4. Both justification and the Christian life are by grace through faith in Christ alone (150).
5. “Every lapse from the new life into our old nature is our grievous guilt” (150).


1. NT commands are unlike OT commandments as the OT commandments function as schoolmasters to lead us to Christ (150).
2. The NT parenetic statements are ethical exhortations addressed to believers who already possess what is required of them (151).

F. Sin in the life of the believer (152)

1. “When God accepts a man and endows him with the Spirit He does not destroy the evil within him in an instant, but he is like a dead twig that is grafted into a living tree, to grow and quicken to the increasing mastery of evil” (152).
2. Sin remains until our death but its domination has been broken (152).
3. What is true for the cosmos between Jesus’ resurrection and His return is also true for “the little world of our personal existence” (153). The conflict between flesh and Spirit, death and life, sinful and righteous continues.

4. The believer is always dead and alive at the same time (154).

G. The distinction of motives in the old man and the new man (154)

1. The old man obeys out of bitter compulsion; the new man out of joyful liberty (154).
2. “The difference between Evangelical and Roman Catholic morality has been reduced correctly to the formulas, ‘out of thankfulness’ and ‘for the sake of thankfulness’….When the will of God is done out of thankfulness the whole idea of becoming good through doing good is excluded” (154).
3. The good works of Christians are not accomplishments but fruits that are produced by the creative power of the Word (155). The Christian can only be thankful.

H. The imitation of Christ (156)

1. The imagio Dei cannot be understood in Christianity apart from the atoning work of Jesus and the sanctifying work of the Spirit (156).
2. Only as the Spirit works faith in us do we regain the image lost in Paradise (156).
3. The Christian wears two robes as Luther puts it. He wears the robe of “justification and redemption” and “the robe of imitation” (157).
4. Imitation not be understood in either a caustic or moralistic sense (157).
5. Christians bear the imprint or image of Christ not as a demand but as a gift (157).
6. “Because the image of Caesar is stamped on the coin it is his property. Through the hidden operation of the Spirit the lost image of God has again been stamped on the believer by means of baptism and regeneration. Henceforth the motive that impels him to sanctification must be: ‘Render to God the things that are God’s’” (158).
7. The theologia crucis is both gift and pattern (159).
8. We are saved by Christ’s sufferings and conformed to His sufferings (160-161).
9. Conclusion: “So in the sanctification of one who has been justified by faith as it is worked out in thankfulness and through the power of the example of Christ. The truth of the Kingdom of God comes indeed of itself, without our efforts, again finds its realization” (162).

I. The law and the opposition of the old man (162)

1. We do not yet live in the new aeon but live in this “time of transition” in between the old and the new (162). Our existence is that both of sons and servants.
2. Only at the final judgment will the old man be completely done away with and the need for the law with its terrifying fear cease (162-163).
3. In this life, where we are not compelled by “the love of Christ” then the law compels the old nature with its harsh demand for obedience (163).
4. The believer continues to live in the fear of God as the exposition of the conclusion of the Decalogue in the Small Catechism reminds us: “God threatens to punish all who break these commandments. Therefore we are to fear his wrath and not disobey these commandments” (Kolb/Wengert, 354). This fear of God is more than “numinous trembling” before the divine; it is life lived with the recognition of “the somber possibility of being lost” (165).
5. In light of God’s eschatological judgment there is no room for antinomianism (166).

J. Sanctification and death (167).

1. Death is the wages of sin and the door to judgment (167).
2. For the believer, the judgment of every evil deed does not destroy the acceptance that is promised to faith (168).

K. The paradox of freedom and obedience (168).

1. The freedom of the new life is lived without compulsion or fear and is exercised through gratitude and the power of Christ’s example (168). Yet at the same time “stern ethical rigor” is called for in the on-going warfare with sin “through obedience and fear” (168).
2. “…to make ethics depend only ‘on the slender thread of thankfulness’ (Schlatter) would be to underestimate the terrible power of sin” (168).
3. The distinction between Luther and Calvin on the ordering of thankfulness and obedience. For the Reformed, the primary motive for sanctification is obedience. For Lutherans it is “thankful certainty” (169).
4. The Christian life is both gift and responsibility (170).

L. Sanctification and the discipline of prayer (171).

1. The duality of prayer as both command and promise (171).
2. God gives both the right and the strength to pray (171). Prayer is both a necessity and a duty (172).
3. Luther’s advice to Peter the barber (174-176)
4. “A prayer life that does not stick to Scripture will soon become poor in ideas, poor in faith, poor in love, and will finally die” (177)
5. Oratio arises out of the meditatio of Scripture (177).
6. “…the ability and readiness to pray comes from justification; sanctification through Word and Spirit brings the right preparation for prayer and its true content” (179).
7. Prayer is united with the study of Scripture. Scripture cannot be properly studied apart from prayer (181).
8. “Speaking with God gives more power to human speech than any rhetorical gifts” (182).
9. Prayer is the manifestation of the life and activity of the new man God has created within us (184). The arena for this manifestation is our vocation under the cross (185-186).

M. Sanctification and asceticism (186).

1. Asceticism is not a pietistic exercise designed to bring merit, but a patient endurance of temptation within ones vocation (186).
2. “What is allowable for one may ruin another” (186).
3. Pietism neglected freedom, neo-Protestantism ignored the need for discipline (187).
4. The need for watchfulness over words, thought, and deeds (188-189).
5. The bodily nature of Christian existence (190-191).
6. The exercise of discipline “can give salvation to no one but its neglect can corrupt anyone” (194).
7. An evangelical understanding of discipline does not lead to “egoistic sanctification” or withdrawal from the world (monasticism) but to the love that is born of faith and active in the life of the neighbor (195).

N. Sanctification and the life of love (195).

1. Luther: “Each one shall be the other’s daily bread” (196).
2. To sin against the neighbor is to sin against God (196).
3. “Lutheran ethics has maintained the principle that love for one’s neighbor must be exercised in what ‘lies close at hand’” (197). See G. Wingren’s Luther on Vocation.
4. The church engages in works of mercy as a fruit of her calling to proclaim the Word of Christ (198-199).
5. Christians adopt the posture both of “abstinence and attack” in reacting against evil in the world (201).
6. The need not only to avoid the evil, but to cultivate the good (202). The formation of a “liturgical culture” (201-202).

VI. The Significance of Sanctification in the Preservation or Loss of the State of Faith

A. Sin and sins (207).

1. “Whoever wishes to provide a doctrine of justification must first possess a doctrine of sin ….Whoever wishes to provide a doctrine of sanctification must also furnish a doctrine of sins” (207).
2. The double-character of sin as both guilt before God and enslaving of human beings (207).
3. Rome, the classical liberalism represented by Albrecht Ritschl, and various spiritual movements have displaced the doctrine of sin with teaching about sins (208).

4. The diabolical tactics of satan in temptation to particular sins (209).

5. Sins are both internal and external. The classical threefold division of sins of the heart, tongue, and hand (210).

6. Vilmar: “The word is worse than the thought, the deed worse than the word” (212). This statement is made relative to the consequences of the particular sins.

7. God does not necessarily remove the consequences of sin in those who are forgiven (213).


9. Certain sins are especially weakening and coercive (215).

10. “Sin has its own hidden law of gravitation” at work in those it takes captive (216).

11. Sin is forever contagious. It penetrates the depths of a person’s existence (217).

12. The utter wretchedness of sin can only be understood with a proper biblical satanology (220).

B. Sin and faith (220)

1. Sin attacks the certainty of faith (220).

2. Faith and continuance in sin are irreconcilable (221).

3. Repentance involves a break with evil intentions (222).

4. The life of faith is daily crucifixion of the old nature (225).

5. Like a tree, faith can die-frozen overnight or slowly wither away (227).

6. The Reformed teaching of “the perseverance of the saints” does not do justice to the biblical reality of faith as being engaged in constant and dangerous conflict (227). Again note how Luther’s profound satanology informed his understanding of faith (228). See Heiko Oberman, *Luther: Man Between God and the Devil*.

7. There may come a time in the life of an individual when the Spirit ceases to call to repentance (230).

8. The paradoxical nature of certainty without security, of consolation and warning (230).

9. The need for private confession and absolution so that the sins might be named and forgiven (232-233).

C. Justification and sanctification in the life of faith (234).

1. The debate between the Philippists and the Gneiso Lutherans (235).

2. The solution of the *Formula of Concord* preserves the biblical paradox (236).

3. “Because sanctification is the work of God in the justified sinner; because it is not the creative cause but the consequence of grace it cannot produce faith” (236).

4. “Faith can preserve the Christian in sanctification, but sanctification cannot preserve him in faith” (236).
D. Growth in sanctification (238)

1. The “third use of the law” takes the place of the Torah in the life of the believer (238). See the essay by Reinhard Huetter, “The Twofold Center of Lutheran Ethics” in *The Promise of Lutheran Ethics* edited by K.Bloomquist and J. Stumme (31-54).
2. The law does not have the power to sanctify (238).
3. The paradox of sanctification as both “harmful to salvation” and “necessary to salvation” (239).
4. Dangers inherent in images of natural processes such as “growth” and “healing” (239).
5. “Growing in the Spirit means a continual growing less before the bar of justifying faith” (240).

VII. The Relationship of Justification and Sanctification (245)

A. The right distinction of law and Gospel is essential in the relationship of justification and sanctification (245).

1. Easier to distinguish law from Gospel than it is to distinguish the liberating work of sanctification from the redeeming work of justification (245).
2. The distinction of justification from sanctification is made more difficult because both are the work of the same Christ (245).
3. Sanctification is essentially different from obedience to the law (245).
4. Both sanctification and justification must remain part of Christian preaching (246). Also note the excellent essay by Gerhard Forde, “The Lutheran View” in *Christian Spirituality: Five Views of Sanctification* edited by Donald Alexander (InterVarsity Press), where Forde argues that sanctification is “the art of getting used to the unconditional justification wrought by the grace of God for Jesus’ sake” (13); Also see Forde, “Justification and Sanctification” in *Christian Dogmatics* II edited by C.Braaten and R.Jenson, Fortress, 425-444, and “Luther’s Ethics” in *A More Radical Gospel: Essays on Eschatology, Authority, Atonement, and Ecumenism*, Eerdmans, 137-155.

B. Indispensable significance of sanctification for Christian faith can be described in three statements (246).

1. Faith that does not heed and use the divinely given gift of renewal dies of self-imposed poverty. Luther: “The liberty of faith does not give license to sin.”
2. Faith that proves its vitality in sanctification grows thereby in strength and constancy.
3. Faith that exercises itself in holiness is just the faith that turns men to repentance and teaches the one who is doing good works to seek after the promises of forgiveness (246).
C. “Where sanctification is missing the knowledge of sin is also missing” (248).

1. Sanctification has the character of an “alien work” in the life of the Christian (248).
2. Without sanctification, forgiveness of sins is reduced to a “mere amnesty” (249).
3. In times of laxity and decadence, one needs to be careful as to how one deals with attempts at self-sanctification (249-250).

D. The right relation between justification and sanctification is summarized by two statements (250).

1. “Without the continual return to justification, sanctification falls into Pharisaism and the wildest exaggeration” (250). This happens in two ways: meritoriousness and legalism. The desire for self-righteousness is rooted in our sinful nature. Note Koeberle’s examples of what happens when sanctification is divorced from justification: Confusion of cosmos with Creator, spirits with the Holy Spirit, erotas with agape etc. (251-252).
2. “When, however, we hold fast to the condemning and pardoning word of forgiveness, sanctification receives its true modesty and its true vitality” (250).

E. Sanctification without justification (252)

1. Makes men self-satisfied and then self-tormenting (252).
2. Brings false security and then false anxiety (252).

F. “The more truly we hold fast to the ‘God-for-us,’ the more ‘our-being-for-God’ grows and is strengthened” (253).

1. Justification is always the “mother” of sanctification (253)
2. The Gospel must be protected against both legalism and antinomianism (254).
3. “Justification robs all conduct of its appearance of holiness, sanctification guards men against sinning against grace” (254).
4. The paradox of God’s redemptive acceptance of sinners and the obligation of discipleship must be maintained (256).
5. The double note of faith and life (257).
6. Lutheran hymnody as an expression as genuine dialectic of justification/sanctification (260)
7. Avoidance of both zealously and laziness (261)
8. Examples in the preaching of Heim, Althaus, Ihmels, Bezzel (261-262)

G. Eschatology (263)

1. “We find a true Christian eschatology only where the decree of justification and sanctification, possessing and not possessing, perfection and imperfection are ever experienced together” (263). To attempt to dissolve the paradox is to betray
either Good Friday or Easter. It is a failure to understand our life as lived in between Pentecost and Parousia (263).

2. Relationship of faith and hope (263-264)
3. Pastoral care as both consolation and reproof (264)
4. “The message of the Cross forbids us to transform the First Article of the Creed into the Third Article by omitting the Second” (265).

CONCLUSION: The Personal Decision (266)

A. The “middle course” is not the path of compromise but of paradox. Note Luther. He was accused of being both “too free” and “not free enough” (267). Here also see E. Juengel’s *The Freedom of a Christian: Luther’s Significance for Contemporary Theology.*

B. Both justification and sanctification are to be completely maintained not as a fusing of two halves, but in a genuine unity existing above both (268).
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