

**Luther's middle course:
balancing freedom and service in *De Libertate Christiana* (1520)**

Neil R. Leroux
University of Minnesota, Morris, USA

Abstract

Luther published *De Libertate Christiana* in 1520, but it was two years before the impact of the work was felt. When he returned from the Wartburg in early March 1522, he preached the *Invocavit* Sermons (9-16 March) thus, in effect, humiliating Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt; as a result, the “Wittenberg Movement” was halted. Contrary to charges that he had abandoned his previous platform for worship reforms, Luther’s earlier writings – “Sincere admonition ... against insurrection and rebellion” (1521) and “On the freedom of a Christian” (1520) – show that he did not change his position and that he had, in fact, argued against offending the weak in faith, urging the distinction between stubborn and simple folk. In *De Libertate Christiana* (1520), Luther’s case for interacting with the stubborn and the weak is grounded in Paul, where Luther finds examples for treating both groups. His *media via* avoids improper motives and attitudes based on a misunderstanding of the Christian liberty one has through the righteousness of faith – a liberty enacted in Christian love.

Introduction

When he returned from the Wartburg in early March 1522, Luther preached the *Invocavit* Sermons (9-16 March) thus, in effect, humiliating Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt; as a result, the “Wittenberg Movement” was halted.¹ In his subsequent complaints to sympathizers, Karlstadt charged that Luther had sold out his own message and had changed his position regarding reforms of the mass and images in churches.² However, careful examination of Luther’s earlier writings shows he did, in fact, not change his position. In *Eine Treue Vormahnung zu allen Christen, sich zu hüten vor Aufruhr und Empörung* (December 1521) (LW 31, 57-74; WA 8, 676-687) Luther had argued that it was wrong to offend those weak in faith and that evangelicals must distinguish between the stubborn folk and the simple. An analysis of *De Libertate Christiana*³ shows that Luther had argued that same distinction before Wartburg and before Worms. In what follows, my analysis of *De Libertate Christiana* will show the roots of this idea, especially in the four-page final section that is not included in the German editions of the document.⁴ What we find in this section of Luther’s book is not only a discussion on why it is important to recognise one’s audience – whether they are the stubborn or the weak – which is what I expected to find and which he argues again a year and a half later, in *Eine Treue Vormahnung*. In addition, what we also find (and which, frankly, surprised me in its depth) is a careful set of arguments about the proper role of works and ceremonies in the Christian life.

Luther’s two theses in *De Libertate Christiana*

For those unfamiliar with this book, Luther’s title can be misleading; one might easily designate the text as “On Christian liberty and Christian service”, for there are two theses Luther argues: Thesis I (The Inner Man), “A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none”; Thesis II (The Outer

¹ On 27 April 1522 a book censorship order, aimed primarily at Karlstadt’s works, was implemented by Wittenberg University (Kruse 2002:383). On 385 Kruse shows how Luther’s own letters written immediately after the *Invocavit Predigten* make Karlstadt and Gabriel Zwilling (of the Augustinian Monastery) responsible for many of the developments in Wittenberg leading up to March 1522.

² E.g. in his letter of 27 March to Hektor Pömer at Nürnberg; see Bubenheimer (2001:44-48).

³ Martin Luther’s Treatise on Christian Liberty (LW 31, 343-377); *Mar. Lutheri Tractatus De Libertate Christiana* (WA 7, 49-73). Latin editions published in 1520 originated in Wittenberg (Nr 755, J Rhau-Grunenberg), Vienna (Nr 756, J Singriener), and Antwerp (Nr 757-758, M H Hoochstraten). In 1521, editions originated in Basel (Nr 759, 761, A Petri), Wittenberg (Nr 760, M. Lotter d J), Antwerp (Nr 762, M H Hoochstraten), Zwolle (Nr 763, S Corver). Numbers of the editions are according to Benzling (1965).

⁴ Due to the concentrated focus of the paper, my analysis will not address the question of Luther’s “Open Letter to Pope Leo X,” which prefaces the document. For a review of the literature, see Grislis (1998:93-118). Neither have I attempted to bring a careful comparison of the German and Latin texts, as have Maurer (1949:65-71) and Stolt (1969:90-117).

Man), “A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all.” Here Luther posits two theses that seem flatly contradictory; scarcely pausing, however, he suggests (in the same sentence) that a beautiful fitting together can be discerned. In fact, he then argues these twin propositions as scriptural, and seems to be little interested in their logical difficulties; he makes it clear that he would rather be the servant of the unlearned.⁵ Luther’s overall argument is in accordance with what we can learn from scholars of argumentation theory: of the key pairs of *lord/servant*, *dutiful/free*, and *none/all*, the latter two clearly are contradictories. However, the first pair can easily be taken as correlatives – each term being necessary for the understanding of the other, “and the two cannot function separately” (Consigny 1974:84).⁶ Since the contrast between these dialectical terms essentially shows incompatibilities *due to the system of natural language*, and not that of a formal proposition and its negation, Luther employs scriptural arguments from Paul to expound the true nature of the crucial term (*Christianus homo*) in both theses (Jüngel 1988:47-48; Perelman 1982:54). Summarising Thesis I (free of all, subject to none), Luther then concludes: “Let this suffice concerning the inner man, concerning his liberty, and concerning its source – justification by faith. Neither laws nor good works does he need; on the contrary, they bring injury to him, if it is in them that he presumes he is justified” (WA 7, 59, 21-24).⁷

Why, then, are good works commanded? Because Man is not wholly “inner” and has only the first fruits of the Spirit. Here Luther begins to argue the second proposition: a Christian is a dutiful servant of all, subject to all. First, he discusses works in general and works for self; next, he covers works for neighbor. Christ is our example of living completely for others, needing nothing. But, just as Christ emptied himself and served others, we offer ourselves as Christ to our neighbors. Our loving, joyful service to others makes no distinctions as to whom it serves or what the outcome. Luther says:

This is what makes caring for the body Christian, that through its health and comfort we may be able to work, to acquire, and lay by funds with which to aid those who are in need, that in this way the strong member may serve the weaker, and that we may be sons of God, each as one who cares for and works for, the other, bearing one another’s burdens and so fulfilling the law of Christ. This is a truly Christian life. Here faith is truly active through love, that is, it finds expression ... in work of the freest service with which a man willingly and without hope of reward serves another; and for himself he is abundantly satisfied with the fullness and wealth of his faith (WA 7, 64, 29-37).⁸

The crucial element in works is not what they are – what kind of works are done –but rather who it is that does them. For works, “being inanimate things, cannot glorify God, although they can, if faith is present, be done to the glory of God” (WA 7, 56, 7-9).⁹

Yet there are others whose lives are examples of Christian service – e.g. the Virgin Mary and the Apostle Paul. Paul’s own example and his teaching in Romans 14 are of great benefit. Very near the close of Part II, then, Luther summarises his case for the Christian’s service to all: “We conclude, therefore, that a Christian man lives not in himself, but in Christ and in his neighbor. Otherwise he is not a Christian. He lives in Christ through faith, in his neighbor through love. By faith he is caught up beyond himself into God. By love he descends beneath himself into his neighbor. Yet he always remains in God and in his love” (WA 7, 69, 12-16).¹⁰ So, Luther argues, one must know *and* preserve this liberty.

Luther’s arguments on the stubborn and the weak

⁵ In an article I just came across, Michael Beyer (2007:53-72) argues that Luther construes the two theses as major and minor propositions in a syllogism.

⁶ Consigny cites Aristotle (1963:11b15-13b35).

⁷ ‘Haec dicta sint de interiore homine, de eius libertate et de principe iustitia fidei, quae nec legibus nec operibus bonis indiget, quin noxia ei sunt, si quis per ea praesumat iustificari.’ This statement was identified by Robert Kolb (1980:149) as one of Luther’s remarks during 1516-1524 that may have influenced Nikolaus Amsdorf with respect to the ‘detrimental nature of good works in regard to salvation.’ For another look at Luther’s *De Libertate Christiana (Freiheitsraktat)*, see Hütter (1992:127-152).

⁸ ‘Nam et in hoc ipsum corporis curam habere Christianum est, quo per eius salutem et commoditatem laborare, res quaerere et servare possimus in subsidium eorum, qui indigent, ut sic membrum robustum serviat membro infirmo et simus filii dei, alter pro altero sollicitus et laboriosus, invicem onera portantes et sic legem Christi implentes. Ecce haec est vere Christiana vita, hic vere fides efficax est per dilectionem, hoc est, cum gaudio et dilectione prodit in opus servitutis liberrimae, qua alteri gratis et sponte servit, ipsa abunde satura fidei suae plenitudine et opulencia.’

⁹ ‘Opera vero, cum sint res insensatae, non possunt deum glorificare, quamvis ad gloriam dei (si fides assit) fieri possint.’

¹⁰ ‘Concludimus itaque, Christianum hominem non vivere in seipso, sed in Christo et proximo suo, aut Christianum non esse, in Christo per fidem, in proximo per charitatem: per fidem sursum rapitur supra se in deum, rursum per charitatem labitur infra se in proximum, manens tamen semper in deo et charitate eius.’

Because there will be those who will misinterpret Christian freedom, a middle course (*media via*) is needed, with respect to how Christians handle ceremonies and works. This third section (one-sixth of the book), not included in the German editions of *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen* (WA 7, 20-38),¹¹ is no doubt what Luther at some point deemed a necessary clarification. So he turns, lastly [“In fine”] to explaining who might misunderstand and how their behaviors could be better served (WA 7, 69, 24).

Who are these who will misunderstand and be in error? I call them: (1) overzealous Evangelicals; and (2) overzealous Catholics. Luther’s strategy in his explanation of these two groups of “misunderstanders” is to show: (a) the extremes of each in understanding and practice; (b) the carnal motives each has; and (c) the unchristian attitude each displays. Overzealous evangelicals – in trying to show their status as “free men and Christians” by their very challenges to such particulars from which they feel exempt – choose not only the opposite behavior of more conscientious folk, but “with upturned nose scoff at the precepts of men” (WA 7, 31).¹² Contrarily, overzealous Catholics err in relying for salvation solely (*sola*) on the “observance and reverence” of ceremonies. Consequently, both parties have violated the “freedom of faith”.¹³ Thus, Luther has mapped out two extreme camps of offenders, both of which are wrong and which are indicted by nearly identical standards of measure.

The better course

“The Middle Way”, as taught by Paul in Rom 14, is consistent with love and properly respects Old Testament law regarding works/faith; it also shows the error of both extremes. Paul’s teaching here fleshes out – not only with the authority of the apostle but also with evidence of harm caused by extreme behaviors and unchristian attitudes – what was lacking in Luther’s outline just sketched. For authority and teaching, Luther cites Paul (in Romans, Galatians, and 2 Corinthians) and Christ (John 18:36); in addition, Luther paraphrases Deut 28:14 and Psalm 19:8a (18:9a Vulgate) for the divine pattern of the *media via*.¹⁴ Luther quotes Rom 14:3 verbatim – “Let not him who eats despise him who abstains, and let not him who abstains pass judgment on him who eats” – except for the final clause (“for God has welcomed him”), which he omits (WA 7, 70, 4-5).¹⁵ Both sides are equally in error regarding how faith and works function in one’s own life:

Wherefore we ought to listen to Scripture, which teaches that we should not go aside to the right or to the left [Deut 28:14], but follow the statutes of the Lord, which are right, “rejoicing the heart” [Ps 19:8]. *As a man is not righteous because he keeps and clings to the works and forms of the ceremonies, so also will a man not be counted righteous merely because he neglects and despises them* (WA 7, 70, 9-13).¹⁶

That Luther will let neither side begin to relax when the other is corrected is made clear by his use of *Rursum* (“on the other hand”) and *Neutri* (“neither”). Thus, Luther’s exegesis is clearly enwrapped in the authority of Paul and Jesus: ‘Thus what we do, live, are¹⁷ – in works and ceremonies – we do because of the necessities of this life and of the effort to rule our body. Nevertheless we are righteous, not in these, but in the faith of the Son of God’ (WA 7, 70, 25-27).¹⁸

Application of Paul’s middle course

What should be done with this proper understanding of Christian liberty? Luther seems to have abandoned the group of overzealous Evangelicals, perhaps in the hope that they are now more ready to follow the middle way; if they are not yet ready, they can still profit from hearing what he says. So the two groups are now found *within* those zealous Catholics who misunderstand the gospel: some are

¹¹ German editions in 1520 originated in Wittenberg (Nr 734, J Rhau-Grunenberg), Leipzig (Nr 735-736, M Lotter d Ä), Augsburg (Nr 737, M Ramminger; Nr 738, J Nadler), and Straßburg (Nr 740, J Prüß). In 1521 editions originated in Wittenberg (Nr 743, J Rhau-Grunenberg; Nr 744, M Lotter d J), Augsburg (Nr 745, S Otmar), and Basel (Nr 746, A Petri).

¹² ‘suspensio naso praecepta hominum illudentes.’

¹³ *Libertatem fidei* is a signal phrase here used for the first time, but is hardly a new idea in this work, and a locution Luther will use at least three more times.

¹⁴ WA 7, 70 does not cite either OT reference; LW 31, 372 and PE 2, 344 do.

¹⁵ ‘Qui manducat, non manducantem non spernat, Et qui non manducat, manducantem non iudicet.’

¹⁶ ‘Quare hic audienda est scriptura, quae docet, ut nec ad dextram nec ad sinistram declinemus, sed sequamur iustitias domini rectas laetificantes corda: ut enim non iustus est quisquam, quia operibus et ritibus cerimoniarum servit et addictus est, ita nec iustus ex eo censibutr solo, quod illa ommitet et contemnit.’

¹⁷ There is no conjunction in this triplet, contra LW 31, 373 and PE 2, 344.

¹⁸ ‘Sic, quod facimus, vivimus, sumus in operibus et cerimoniis, necessitas huius vitae facit et corporis regendi cura, non tamen in his iusti sumus, sed in fide filii dei.’

stubborn and some are confused (Luther will return to these two classes of men in *Eine treue Vormahnung*). The first group is “unyielding, stubborn” ceremonialists who are unwilling to hear about Christian freedom and are “deaf adders”. His advice for responding to this group: “resist, do the very opposite, and offend them boldly” – not to inflict offense per se, but rather to avoid offending others, those many who, with their impious views, they drag with them into error. Luther extracts from Jesus the principle that those who *teach others* false doctrine, as the Pharisees did, are leading other victims into a ditch and must not be permitted to go unchallenged. So Luther’s advice here is that, when facing the stubborn, one may need to offend them in order to prevent greater damage to those who may be misled by their wrong actions and teaching.

The simple-minded and ignorant have not yet grasped the liberty of faith and need more instruction. Their weakness is not their fault, but rather that of the pastors who taught them. This category of audience seems new here and will be important for *Eine treue Vormahnung* and the *Invocavit Predigten*. The “simple-minded, ignorant, inexperienced, and weak” in faith, however, may come around, when they are further instructed. The “fasts and other things” they therefore consider necessary must be observed to avoid giving them offence (*scandalum*). This is what love demands and “would harm no one but would serve all men” (WA 7, 71, 7-8).¹⁹ Luther quotes Paul: “So the Apostle teaches us in Romans 14: ‘If my food causes my brother to fall [*scandalisat*], I will never again eat meat’; and again, ‘I know that through Christ nothing is unclean except to him who esteemeth anything to be unclean, but it is evil for the man who eats it and is offended’” (WA 7, 71, 10-14).²⁰

Summary

Against the wolves, those teachers of traditions and laws of the popes, one must fight strenuously against, render bold resistance, sharp censure, and constantly use one’s freedom in their sight. For the sheep – the people of God, the timid multitude, the weak – one must spare them, avoiding offence. These actions are necessary, Luther says, “until they are set free” and “until they also recognise tyranny and understand their freedom”.

Why ceremonies cannot simply be halted

Maintaining the *media via* requires not only regulation of proper behavior, through “works”, toward those who disagree with us, but also requires good teaching, on the part of ministers, especially regarding faith – so that works do not convey a false estimate of their worth. Ceremonies and works contribute to the Christian life because, in addition to restraining the lusts of youth, they also test one’s righteousness of faith, prevent evil and foster instruction. As a child needs the mother’s nourishment to grow, so ceremonies are necessary for controlling adolescence (which I think he means metaphorically). But ceremonies and works bring with them certain risks, unless proper teaching is also brought. Luther now completes his argument, considering the teaching role that must also accompany the ceremonial observances; however, he does not attempt to extract a teaching role from his “mothering” analogy:

On the other hand, it would be death for them always to be held in bondage to ceremonies, thinking that these justify them. They are rather to be taught that they have been so imprisoned in ceremonies, not that they should be made righteous or gain great merit by them, but that they might thus be kept from doing evil and might more easily be instructed to the righteousness of faith. Such instruction – if the impulsiveness of their youth were not restrained – they would not endure (WA 7, 72, 10-14).²¹

Luther also likens works and ceremonies to the crucial “models and plans” that “builders and artisans” need, for without them nothing could be “built or made”: “When the structure is complete, the models and plans are laid aside. You see, they are not despised, rather they are greatly sought after; but what

¹⁹ ‘hoc enim charitas exigit, quae neminem laedit sed omnibus servit.’

²⁰ Translation by PE 3, 345; ‘sic Apostolus Ro. 14. “Si esca mea scandalisat fratrem meum, non manducabo carnes inaeternum” [1 Cor 8:13; cf Rom 14:15, 21]; Et iterum “Scio, quod per Christum nihil est commune, nisi illi qui putat commune esse, sed malum est homini qui per offenculum manducat.” The underlined clause is Luther’s addition to Rom 14:14 and is not translated by LW 31, 374.

²¹ ‘praeceptis eat et tamen mors eis fuerit, si in opinione iustificationis in eis perseveraverint, cum docendi potius sint, non ideo se fuisse sic incarceratos, ut per hoc iusti sint aut multa meriti, sed ne mala facerent et ad iustitiam fidei facilius erudirentur, quod prae impetus aetatis, nisi premeretur, non ferrent.’

we despise is the false estimate of them, since no one holds them to be the real and permanent structure” (WA 7, 72, 17-20).²²

Summary

Only God’s own teaching (written in our hearts) will save us; this is the antidote for pride. As Luther wraps up the argument about the relative contribution of ceremonies in helping restrain the impulsive nature of the immature, in distinction from the teaching that inculcates righteousness through faith, he restates earthly lawgivers as being blameworthy in fostering an overblown concern for ceremonies, and a concomitant starvation of righteousness through the *libertatem fidei*.

Since human nature and natural reason, as they are called,²³ are by nature superstitious and ready to imagine, when laws and works are prescribed, that righteousness must be obtained through them [*per ea*]; and further, since they are trained and confirmed in this opinion by the practice of all earthly lawgivers, it is impossible that they should of themselves escape from the slavery of works and come to a knowledge of the freedom of faith. Therefore there is need of the prayer that the Lord may draw us and make us *theodidacti*, that is those taught by God [John 6:45],²⁴ and himself, as he has promised, write his law in our hearts; otherwise there is no hope for us (WA 7, 73, 1-8).²⁵

Conclusion

Luther’s case for interacting with the stubborn and the weak is grounded in the teaching of Paul and finds examples of how to treat both groups in Paul’s own behavior.²⁶ The *media via* strives to avoid the improper motives and attitudes that are grounded in a false understanding of the Christian liberty one has through the righteousness of faith, a liberty lived out in Christian love. Such love requires patience with the weak and their ceremonies, not only because works and ceremonies have their place as restraint, but also because they furnish opportunities for faith to be exercised and tested. Patient deference, however, cannot replace teaching the gospel, which alone is what both the stubborn and the weak need if ever they are to grow beyond their immaturity or admit their errors.²⁷

The *media via* represents a teaching Luther would advocate for the next three years. While doctrines of the weak and the strong (Rom 14:1-8) have been discussed since the early Christian centuries,²⁸ Luther’s *media via* seems to be coincident here with his strong confidence in the Word –

²² ‘perfecta enim structura deponuntur. Hic vides, non ipsa contemni, immo maxime quaeri, opinio autem contemnitur, quia nemo existimat haec esse veram et permanentem structuram.’

²³ ‘(ut vocant)’; WA 7, 73. 1. Both PE 2, 348 and LW 31, 376 read ‘as it is called,’ perhaps taking Luther to be writing as though the two terms of the doublet are identical and therefore a singular entity. If so, however, why would each translator then use a plural copulative in the main verb (‘are superstitious’)? Luther’s doublet is chiasmic (abb,a).

²⁴ Both LW 31, 376 and PE 2, 348 cite John 6:45, while WA does not. Luther’s ‘dociles deo’ may also have in mind the entire passage of 41-51 of John 6, for in v 44 John uses *traherit* (‘draws’; e’lku/shØ, GNT), and Luther uses the same root verb (*trahat*) at WA 7, 73, 6. An expression of being taught by God is also in 1 Thess 4:9 and numerous prophetic passages in the OT.

²⁵ ‘Verum cum natura humana et ratio (ut vocant) naturalis sit naturaliter superstitiosa et propositis quibusque legibus et operibus prompta sit in opinionem iustificationis per ea adipiscendae, his adde, quia usu omnium legislatorum terrenorum in eundem sensum est exercita et firmata, impossibile est, ut per seipsam se exuat a servitute illa operaria in libertatem fidei cognoscendam: ideo oratione opus est, ut dominus nos trahat et theodidactos, idest dociles deo, faciat et ipse in cordibus nostris, sicut promisit, legem sribat: alioquin actum est de nobis.’

²⁶ Luther explicitly uses Scripture texts fifty-seven times, employing forty-eight texts; nearly one-third (thirteen) of those texts are Pauline. Aside from the authorities of God, Christ, Scripture, Luther cites Moses (three times), Peter (three times), and Paul (sixteen times). On Paul’s influence upon Luther, Kenneth Hagen says: ‘Luther became so engrossed with Paul’s theology that he ended up imitating Paul’s style’ (1993:150).

²⁷ See Luther’s ‘Treatise on Good Works’ (1520), sec 14-15, which speaks of four kinds of men, with regard to the law: ‘Until the others [the second, third, and fourth class] become like them the first class must tolerate and instruct them. Therefore, we must not despise these men of little faith who cling to their ceremonies as though they were lost souls. These men would gladly do right and learn something better, but they are as yet unable to grasp it all. Rather we must blame their ignorant blind teachers who have never taught them what faith is, and have led them so deeply into a doctrine of works. They must be led back to faith again in a kindly manner and with gentle patience, just as a sick man is nursed’ (LW 44, 36); ‘und sie von den ersten szo lange geduldet und underweisset werden. Darumb sol man die selbigen schwachgleubigen, die gerne wolten wol thun und bessers leren, und doch nit begreifen mugen, in yrhen Cerimonien nit vorachten, szo sie dran klebenn, als se yes mit yhnen gar vorloren, sondern yhren ungelerten blinden meistern die schult gebenn, die sie den glaubenn nie geleret, szo tieff in die wreck gefuret haben, und sol sie senfftiglich unnd mit seuberlicher musz wider erausz in den glauben furen, wie man mit einem krancken umbgaht, unnd zulassen’ (WA 6, 214, 35—215, 6).

²⁸ See commentary on Rom 14:1-8 by Origen, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, Pseudo-Constantius, Chrysostom, Pelagius, Theodoret of Cyr, and Gennadius of Constantinople in Gerald Bray, *Romans* (1998:336-343).

preached, taught, and written.²⁹ His frequent references in this document to the need for patience with the weak “for a time [*ad tempus*]”,³⁰ or “until they are set free [*donec explicentur*]”,³¹ or “until they recognize tyranny and understand freedom”,³² are mostly consistent with Pauline teaching in Rom 14 for continued patience. In *Eine treue Vormahnung* (1521), Luther’s similar remarks – bear with them ‘for a time [*tzeyt lang*]’,³³ “with some time [*mit der tzeytt*]”,³⁴ – are also accompanied by more specific statements about what the Word has already accomplished in “this one year [*dit eynige jar*]”,³⁵ or even his bold prediction that “two years [*tzwey jar*]”,³⁶ [more] would see impressive results. So that, in the *Invocavit Predigten*, Luther would boast that he did nothing, the Word did everything. How much longer he would continue with such firm confidence in the Word and a concomitant patience with the weak, and what precise developments in Wittenberg influenced that programmed are matters for another paper.

Works consulted

- Aristotle 1963. *Categories and De Interpretatione*, trans by J L Ackrill. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Benzing, J & Claus, H 1965. *Lutherbibliographie: Verzeichnis der gedruckten Schriften Martin Luthers bis zu dessen Tod*. Baden-Baden: Heitz.
- Beyer, M 2007. Theologische Grundlagen für Martin Luthers Sozialengagement, in Oehmig, S (ed.), *Medizin und Sozialwesen in Mitteldeutschland zur Reformationszeit*, 53-72. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Bray, G 1998. *Romans*. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity. (ACCS 6.)
- Bubenheimer, U 2001. Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt und seine fränkische Heimat: Mit einem Brief Bodensteins an Hektor Pömer vom 27. März 1522, in Bubenheimer, U & Oehmig, S (eds.), *Querdenker der Reformation: Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt und seine frühe Wirkung*, 15-48. Würzburg: R & K.
- Consigny, S 1974. Rhetoric and its situations. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 7, 175-186.
- Grislis, E 1998. Martin Luther’s ‘The freedom of a Christian’ revisited. *Consensus* 24, 93-118.
- Hagen, K 1993. *Luther’s approach to scripture as seen in his ‘commentaries’ on Galatians*, 1519-1538. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hütter, R 1992. Martin Luther and Johannes Dietenberger on ‘good works’. *Lutheran Quarterly* 6, 127-152.
- Jüngel, E 1988. *The freedom of a Christian: Luther’s significance for contemporary theology*, trans R A Harrisville. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Knakke, JKK et al (eds.) 1883-. *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Abteilung Werke*, 67 vols. Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger. (=WA).
- Kolb, R 1980. ‘Good works are detrimental to salvation’: Amsdorf’s use of Luther’s words in controversy. *Renaissance & Reformation* 16, 136-151.
- Kruse, J-M 2002. *Universitäts-theologie und Kirchenreform: Die Anfänge der Reformation in Wittenberg 1516-1522*. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.
- Maurer, W 1949. *Von der Freiheit eines Christenmenschen: Zwei Untersuchungen zu Luthers Reformationsschriften 1520-1521*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pelikan, J & Lehman, HT (eds.) 1955-1986. *Luther’s works: American edition*, 55 vols. St. Louis: Concordia. Philadelphia: Fortress. (=LW).
- Perelman, C 1982. *The Realm of Rhetoric*, trans by W J Kluback. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Steimle, A (ed.) 1916-1943. *Works of Martin Luther*, 6 vols. Philadelphia: Holman. (=PE).
- Stolt, B 1969. *Studien zu Luthers Freiheitstraktat*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

²⁹ ‘I will preach it, teach it, write it, but I will constrain no man by force, for faith must come freely without compulsion ... I simply taught, preached, wrote God’s Word; otherwise I did nothing. . . . I did nothing; the Word did everything’ (LW 51, 77; second *Invocavit* Sermon, 10 March 1522); ‘predigen wil ichs, sagen wil ichs, schreyben wil ichs. Aber zwingen, dringen nit der gewalt wil ichs nyemants, dann der glaube wil willig, ungenötigt angezogen werden ... jch hab allein gottes wort getrieben, geprediget und geschrieben, sonst hab ich nichts gethan ... Jch hab nichts gethan, das wort hatt es alles gehandelt und ausgericht’ (WA 10[3], 18, 10–19, 3).

³⁰ Twice at WA 7, 67, 13-14.

³¹ WA 7, 71, 18.

³² ‘donec et ipsi tyrannidem cognoscant et libertatem suam intelligant’ (WA 7, 71, 21).

³³ WA 8, 686, 2.

³⁴ WA 8, 687, 9.

³⁵ WA 8, 684, 8.

³⁶ WA 8, 684, 2.

