

the Second Vatican Council (for Cardinal Henri de Lubac on his Ninetieth Birthday," in *Vatican II: Assessments and Perspectives*, ed. R. Latourelle (New York: 1988) 74-105; A. Russo, *Henri de Lubac: teologia e dogma nella storia* (Rome: Edizioni Studium, 1990; French trans.: *Henri de Lubac: biographie* [Paris: Brepols, 1997]); R. Voderholzer, *Die Einheit der Schrift und ihr geistiger Sinn* (Freiburg: Johannes Verlag, 1998); idem, "Dogma and History: Henri de Lubac and the Retrieval of Historicity as a Key to Theological Renewal," *Communio* 28 (2001) 648-68; idem, "Lubac, Henri de," *RGG* 5:532-33; J.-P. Wagner, *La théologie fondamentale selon Henri de Lubac* (Paris: Cerf, 1997); S. K. Wood, *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998); idem, "Lubac, Henri de," in *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Theologians*, ed. P. W. Carey and J. T. Lienhard (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2000) 330-33; idem, "Henri de Lubac, SJ (1896-1991): Theologian of the Church," *Theology Today* 62 (2005) 318-28. S. B. Chapman

LUTHER, MARTIN (1483-1546)

Life. Martin Luther, son of Hans Luther, a miner, and Margrete Lindermann, was born November 10, 1483, in Eisleben, Saxony. After early schooling he attended Erfurt University (1501-1505), earning his bachelor's and master's degrees. While he was returning to Erfurt in July 1505, Luther was thrown to the ground during a thunderstorm; frightened, he declared, "I will become a monk," a promise he honored by entering the Black Cloister of the Augustinian Hermits in Erfurt (July 7, 1505). Ordained February 27, 1507, he was assigned to study theology and was transferred to Wittenberg to study and lecture on moral philosophy in the arts faculty. He received the degree of bachelor of biblical studies in March 1509 from the theological faculty of Wittenberg; he also became a lecturer on *Peter Lombard's *Sentences* that year (his notes from 1509 to 1511 on the *Sentences* are extant). In 1512 Luther received his doctorate in theology and was appointed professor of Bible. In 1513 Luther began lecturing in Wittenberg on the Bible and

did so for more than thirty years.

Context. Luther's reformation was theological and pastoral. A basic presupposition of his reform program is the conviction that external behavior reflects internal attitude. A favorite image for Luther is that a good tree bears good fruit and, conversely, a bad tree, bad fruit. The bad fruits in Christendom could be reformed only by rooting out the bad tree that produced them. Too many reformers had come no further than attacking the bad fruit. A good tree can grow only in the soil of the one, holy, catholic and apostolic faith expressed in the Scriptures, and therefore a reform of the church's life (fruit) could effectively come about only through a reformation of the church's faith (tree).

Luther's theological effort for reformation could be described as his effort to catholicize the church, feeling as he did that the church had ceased to be that one, holy, catholic and apostolic church it confessed to be. The church that Luther sought to bring about by his theological efforts was a church unified by the universal faith of the forebears, rooted in the holy gospel of Jesus Christ.

Luther's self-understanding revolved around his being a doctor of the church, a theologian responsible for the church's faith. Throughout his life, his professorial, pastoral and personal activities reflected his training as a doctor of sacred Scripture and the effort on his part to allow the Word of God to interact with faith and life. Theology must be biblical and vernacular.

The historical context for Luther's thought included his reaction to late medieval currents of thought. His response was both negative and positive.

First, Luther was negative toward nominalism, the philosophy that reality (universals) exists in name only. He had experience with nominalist currents of thought through his education. Because he was antagonistic toward nominalism does not mean that he favored scholasticism (academic theology), nominalism's opponent. Luther rejected scholasticism in general because of its speculative bent (theology of glory), seeking to penetrate into the nature and necessity of divine essence; for the

same reason nominalism also rejected scholasticism. Luther was negative toward nominalism because of its optimistic and nonbiblical view of human, natural powers—that one is able and responsible to initiate and build up good works for salvation. The covenantal model of nominalism placed responsibility on both parties to carry out the obligations of their pact.

Luther later accused humanism of the same anthropological optimism. Humanism and nominalism held to the dignity and freedom of human will and reason. By opposing these two movements Luther was being critical of human, natural abilities to initiate and cooperate with God. In his response to these movements Luther emphasized that human will and reason are in bondage until they are liberated by God's grace.

Second, Luther was positive toward certain late medieval movements. For example, he was impressed with the genuine piety of various mystical treatises, so much so that he edited and published some of them. Luther was a part of the movement of spiritual renewal. He was also inclined to mysticism because of its strong emphasis on the personal (noninstitutional, nonacademic) relationship with God. Like many mystics, Luther felt that pilgrims had been beset with too many roadblocks on their way up the mountain, whereas Christ had come to clear away the many roadblocks of legalism and speculation.

Luther also favored Augustinianism, the revival of Augustinian thought, because he held to the authority of that doctor of the church, *Augustine. Luther often appealed to the great doctor in his quarrels with scholasticism and nominalism and in his opposition to late medieval Pelagianism (works righteousness). What attracted Luther in Augustine was the theology of grace that made humans incapable of earning it and God totally able to give it. Luther was impressed with Augustine's christological interpretation of Scripture: the unity of Scripture in Jesus Christ expressed in one testament of justification. Humans are concupiscent; God is grace.

Luther inclined toward conciliarism, at least through the 1520s, because like other (pre-)re-

formers he felt that Christendom was encumbered with corrupted and corrupting power that would not bring about the necessary reformation. Politically and ecclesiastically Luther felt the best chances for the reform of Christendom lay with a council; but as his and other calls for a council were aborted, he became disillusioned with conciliar possibilities as the 1520s wore on.

The historical context of Luther's thought was to carry on in the doctoral tradition of Augustine and the Fathers, monasticism and mysticism (Benedictinism to *Bernard), seeking theological renewal of his one, holy, catholic and apostolic church based on Scripture.

Major Writings. Early exegetical writings were *Lectures on the Psalms* (1513-1515), preceded by the *Preface of Jesus Christ* and lectures on Romans (1515-1516), Galatians (1516-1517) and Hebrews (1517-1518). The first writing in German was *The Seven Penitential Psalms* (1517). Here the major Augustinian themes are present throughout as in all of his work: grace, faith, Christ, the testament of Christ, Scripture interpreting itself and the centrality of the Word.

The *Heidelberg Disputation* (1518) is the major source for Luther's theology of the cross. He issued several polemics on indulgences (1517-1518), including the Ninety-five Theses (October 31, 1517). Important instructional treatises appeared in 1519 and 1520: penance, baptism, Lord's Supper, death, good works and the Lord's Prayer. Famous Reformation treatises were issued in 1520: *To the Christian Nobility* (on social reform), *Babylonian Captivity* (on sacraments) and *Freedom of the Christian* (Christian life). *The Magnificat* (1521) shows Luther as a medieval theologian whose Mariology, typical of the age, was lost in later Lutheranism.

Luther's *Bondage of the Will* (1525), which along with his commentary on Galatians he regarded as his two most important works, is a fierce appeal for the freedom of God to save without any interference from will, reason or good intent. His sharp rhetoric sought to establish that before God we come with nothing; if we were to come with something, then God would not be totally free to save and totally Sav-

ior. It is a positive treatise on the power of the electing will of God to save.

Beginning in 1519 Luther published more commentaries on Galatians and the Psalms. He had a lifelong attachment to the Psalms, Paul and John. The prefaces to the Old Testament (1523) and New Testament (1522), continuing into the 1530s and 1540s, provide excellent entry into Luther's view of individual books of the Bible. An excellent overview of Luther's theology for church and home are his Small and Large Catechisms of 1529. Luther's major writing on the history of the church and the marks of the church is his 1539 treatise *On the Councils and the Church*. Luther's last major exegetical course was on Genesis (1535-1545).

Approaches and Methods of Biblical Interpretation. From early times through the Reformation, theology was practiced as the discipline of the sacred page (*sacra pagina*). The monastery became the place and the monks' daily liturgy was the context for the practice of theology. Holy Writ was the sacred page; the canon of Scripture was the rule of faith. The goal of life for the medieval pilgrim (*viator*) as well as the final goal of theology was to go home, home to God, home to the Trinity (in Augustine's words).

The sacred page was seen as coming directly from God, about God and for the pilgrim's journey to God. Theology, whether expressed in doctrine, liturgy or catechesis, was the discipline of the sacred page. The sacred page was the record of God's creation and redemption. Theology, Scripture, commentary and God were bound up in one world and were focused on the sacred page.

The rise of scholastic theology in the twelfth century was linked to the discipline of dialectic and its use of the question. The discipline of scholastic theology practiced in the schools (universities) was the discipline of faith seeking understanding. In the universities in the twelfth century, theology shifted to sacred doctrine (*sacra doctrina*). The schoolmen wrote Bible commentaries, and they wrote sacred theology.

Scholastic theology was based on the method of *quaestio* (question) and dialectic. By

the later Middle Ages, a caricature of the scholastic question was, How many angels can dance on the head of a pin? Such a question cannot be found in scholastic sources, although scholasticism, described as decadent by sixteenth-century Reformers, may have become too abstract by the eve of the Reformation. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the final goal of theology was still the Beatific Vision. The shift from sacred page to sacred doctrine was the shift from locating the substance of theology in Scripture to locating the substance in doctrine.

The scholarship of Christian humanists and the invention of the printing press in the latter part of the fifteenth century contributed to a shift within theology: the sacred letter as literature. Theology was seen not as the monk's work of prayer and praise or as the professor's academic questions and propositions but as the educative task of reviving the pagan and Christian classics. The study of the sacred letter of Scripture was intended to lead men and women not so much to God as to a better society, church, education and government. Theology as the study of the philosophy of Christ (Desiderius *Erasmus) was to lead to piety, morality and justice.

The goal of the historical-critical method beginning with the sixteenth century is to understand the letter of the original text. The goal of sacred doctrine is to understand the faith of the church. The goal of the sacred page is to understand and reach God (the Trinity).

These approaches to the sacred page (monastery), sacred doctrine (university) and sacred letter (printing press) continued in the early and late Reformation. Luther continued the monastic discipline of the sacred page minus monastic rules. The Council of Trent and Lutheran orthodoxy continued the discipline of sacred doctrine. Philipp *Melancthon approached Scripture as sacred letter (literature).

It is often assumed that Luther ended the medieval approach to the Bible and started the modern methods, but Luther approached Scripture in a manner appropriate to what the document is (*sacra pagina*). Luther did not superimpose his agenda onto Scripture; he took

out and applied the message of Scripture as he claimed to do and thus was consistent with the grammar and vocabulary of Scripture.

Major Themes. Several major themes emerge in Luther's works.

Bible and theology. Luther was concerned to place the Bible in the center of everything: church, theology and especially preaching. The main point of the Reformation was that the gospel must be proclaimed. Along with the important pamphlets, the pulpits of the evangelical cities (Wittenberg, Zurich, Geneva) were the media for information. The Reformation was a movement of the Word: Christ, Scripture and preaching—in that order. They all are the Word of God. The Reformers used the printed Word, studied the Word, prayed the Word; but their concern was to bring preaching back into the Mass, preaching in the vernacular and preaching on the text of Scripture. When Luther said that the church is not a pen-house but a mouth-house, he meant that the good news cannot properly be put in (dead) letters but is to be proclaimed loudly (in German).

What the scholastics separated—theology and commentary on Scripture—Luther sought to bring together again along the lines of *sacra pagina*. Scripture alone is the sole authority for the church, the discipline of theology and the life of faith. Luther continued the call for the reform of the church on the basis of Scripture. Every office and activity in the church falls under the judgment of Scripture. All of theology is contained in Scripture. God has revealed all that we need to know about God in Christ. Theology must be biblical theology; any other kind is human invention.

Scripture is its own authority because it is clear. No other authority is needed to see through its meaning. Luther was not concerned about a theory of inspiration. That came later. In his view the Bible is the Word. The Reformers were aware of the critical discussions among the humanists about the text, authorship and language, and Luther engaged in some of this. The point of the Word is the presence of the Word in Scripture, church and preaching. The humanist sense of the distance of Scripture from the present was not accepted.

The scholastic separation of theology from Scripture was attacked. The purpose of theology is to serve preaching, the main task of the church.

Interpretation of the Bible. Luther was premodern; he continued the general medieval understanding of interpretation as commentary, annotation and exposition. The modern interpreter continues to develop the humanist perspective of the historical past; thus interpretation in modern time is bridging the gulf between ancient literature and modern thinking. The early Reformers continued the monastic approach of total immersion into the thinking and language of Scripture so that there is only one language, one biblical theology.

Luther emphasized that Scripture is its own interpreter. He argued that the papacy had built a wall of authoritative interpretation around itself so that Scripture could be read only as the papacy interpreted it. One late medieval synthesis maintained that Scripture is to tradition as foundation is to interpretation (Ockham). Strong in the sixteenth century was the question of an authoritative interpretation of Scripture. Summarizing the Roman position, the Council of Trent decreed later in the century: No one, relying on his or her own skill in matters of faith and morals, "wresting" the sacred Scriptures to his or her own senses, should presume to interpret the said sacred Scripture contrary to the sense that holy mother church, whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the holy Scripture, has held and does hold.

For Luther, Scripture itself attests to its message and meaning. Christ and the Spirit are at work in the Word. The Reformers insisted that postapostolic claims of authoritative interpretation were precisely the reason the Word of God lost its central place in the life of the church.

The Reformation interpretation of Scripture was engaged in theological polemics. The humanists used Scripture to attack the church, but they were not so much interested in the pure doctrines of Scripture as they were in exposing the corruption and folly of the present situation in the light of the piety of Scripture. The early Reformers fought for pure doctrine

on the basis of Scripture and the Fathers. The doctrine of justification by faith alone, by grace alone, by Christ alone was seen as the central doctrine of Scripture. The doctrine of justification by faith is the criterion by which all other doctrines, offices and practices in the church are judged. The criteriological priority of justification by faith is established in Scripture. The church stands or falls, said Luther, on the scriptural teaching of justification. There were other issues, other polemics, but the procedure was the same. Doctrinal reform was forged and pleaded on the basis of Scripture.

Law and gospel. Basic for Luther's understanding of Scripture was his distinction between law and gospel. The gospel of Jesus Christ is the fulfillment and end of the Mosaic law. Law and gospel are in all books of the Bible. The gospel is the good news that salvation is in Christ alone. Abraham and others saw that gospel in the promises; they believed and were justified. Luther transposes Augustine's distinction between Old Testament and New Testament as ways of salvation to law and gospel. The way of the law is do this, and do not do that. The way of the gospel is believe, and it has already been done for a person in Christ. The law is command; the gospel is gift, the gift of forgiveness. When the law commands, failure results because one cannot fulfill the law on one's own power ("The good I would, I do not"). The law humbles; the gospel picks up. One cannot be picked up unless one is put down to size. Being brought low (law) and being raised up (gospel) are the downs and ups of the Christian life, the experience of sin (brought by the law) and the experience of forgiveness (brought by Christ). The distinction between law and gospel, the doctrine of justification by faith apart from works and the understanding of the core of Scripture are all the same for Luther.

Christ the center of Scripture. The center of Scripture for Luther is Christ, present in both the Old and New Testaments. Christ is the eternal Word of God, present in Old Testament times in the form of promise, present in New Testament times in the person of Jesus and present in the church through Word and sacrament. In all cases Christ the Word is the effec-

tive means of grace. The center or core of Scripture is "what drives Christ" (*was Christum treibet*), that is, what preaches Christ, what promotes or points to Christ. Christ is at the core of God's plan of salvation. God promises through prophets; God delivers in person. All of Scripture leads to Christ, and Christ leads to salvation.

The simple sense. Luther's response to the various senses of meaning in the Middle Ages (fourfold, double-literal) was that Scripture has one simple sense (most often, Christ). Or Luther will talk about the grammatical sense as the meaning of the text, that the grammatical meaning and theological meaning are the same. Luther availed himself of humanist scholarship and was a part of a late medieval trend to highlight (once again) the christological meaning of a text. Luther also used allegory, not to establish a doctrine but to embellish it. He also used the other spiritual senses. Luther on Scripture is often presented as a total break from the medieval world. That came later. In the area of the senses of meaning, Luther is a part of the medieval trend to call for a return to the letter of the text and then in practice to go on and find other senses of meaning. After all, and medieval scholars knew this, the New Testament uses allegory.

Theology of testament. Luther's distinction is his construction of Scripture as containing a single testament (will, promise) of Christ. God's last and only will and testament is that he would die for our salvation. The promise is the declaration of the will and testament. The death of the God-man validates his testament. The inheritance is the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. The (new) testament of Christ is eternal. It is played out in time, but there is no development in the eternal. Augustine and medieval theologians generally saw a development and transformation within and between the Old and New Testament. Luther held that the New Testament is older than the Old because it is the oldest (eternal). The Old Testament begins and ends in time.

Luther's response to his contemporary situation was the response of a theology of testament. Testament or will is the model that ac-

counts for most of the pieces in Luther's supposedly nonsystematic theology. The word *testament* is a short summary of all God's grace fulfilled in Christ. Testament or will is the testament of God promised throughout the Old Testament era and books that he would send a testator (Christ) to bring the inheritance of forgiveness of sins and eternal life, which is received in faith. The death and resurrection of the testator, God in flesh, validates the testament.

Promise, one ingredient in the category of testament, is God's announcement of redemption. Redemption as well as creation is *ex nihilo*. The totality of the testament from promise through inheritance is a reality present from the beginning to the end of time. The New Testament is the eternal testament of Christ.

The second ingredient in testament is Luther's theology of Word. The Word is the dynamic manifestation of the person of God. Important for Luther is the passage in Isaiah that God's Word will not return void, which means that the Word will accomplish that which it sets out to do. The Word accomplishes a faithful response that brings about the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. The promise is God's Word that he will one day die and rise and validate his testament.

The third part of Luther's testament theology is a theology of the cross. The theology of the cross has an antispeculative force to it which is directed against a theology of glory. The theology of the cross is contextual, working within what God did in Christ on the cross. Rather than using philosophical terms, Luther talks about the wounds of Christ on the cross and Christ as a worm on the cross, thus emphasizing the total humiliation of the God-man. The humiliation of the cross is God's total identification with the human situation in order to redeem that situation so that we can live by faith.

The fourth aspect of Luther's theology of testament is grace. Grace for Luther is a unilateral gift. One of the primary functions of testament is that the testator makes out his will without the recipient having done anything to deserve the inheritance. Testament, at least

God's way, is gratuitous. The heir in no way merits the inheritance. Testament for Luther stands in contrast with covenant. Often Luther will use covenant as a synonym for testament and understand it as unilateral gift. In late medieval covenant theologies, the covenant is a bilateral, two-way pact, bond or agreement. These various covenant theologians were at least semi-Pelagian because they called for some human action as a necessary part of the pact. The grace of the unilateral testament, however, is the cross and resurrection. A covenant does not require death. The unilateral act of grace proves that God's promise is true. The cross is final proof that God's testament is valid. The resurrection completes God's action. For Luther, then, grace is God's self-actualizing Word that accomplishes its purpose without requiring any act on our part.

The fifth aspect of testament is faith or trust in the inheritance. One receives faith through the Word accomplishing its purpose. Faith is a gift of grace. Trust is confidence that Christ not only died for the sins of humankind but also he died for me. Trust is intimately bound up with Luther's notion of the certitude of salvation. Christians are certain of their salvation because their salvation is in Christ, and Christ is for me and for us. If salvation were dependent on something that we were to do, free will, free reason, then Luther in no way could have any confidence. Confidence rests in Christ alone.

Principles of Biblical Interpretation. Technically Luther did not have a hermeneutic because hermeneutics is a nineteenth-century discipline that presupposes the distance of the biblical text and the need for the interpreter to bridge the gap and make any interpretative moves necessary to bring the text into modern linguistic jargon understandable in post-Enlightenment philosophy.

To be a theologian, the three rules (1539) of prayer (*oratio*), meditation (*meditatio*) and temptation or experience (*tentatio*) need to be practiced every day. These show Luther indebted to the sacred reading (*lectio divina*) of Scripture deep in the theological tradition of the church.

The core of Scripture is what drives, teaches and pronounces Christ (*was Christum treibet*).

Treiben has to do with transportation; so that in Scripture, the important thing is to see that the sacred page drives us and brings us to Christ.

Canon within the canon is a principle often associated with Luther. The danger of this dictum for Luther would be that some subjective principle of selectivity would choose the inner canon and force everything into that mold. And yet several scholars feel that Luther did exactly that with his insistence that the first article, justification by faith, interprets the whole. Christ, not a doctrine or principle, is at the center of Scripture; Luther consistently maintains that Christ is the babe in the manger and Scripture is the manger that supports him.

Scripture alone means Scripture as the sole authority as opposed to the human traditions of the papacy. Scripture alone means Christ alone.

Scripture has a single, christological meaning. Luther recognized and used the biblical and medieval fourfold sense (literal, allegorical, tropological, anagogical) where it embellished the single simplest, that is, the grammatical sense.

Scripture is the living voice of the gospel (*viva vox evangelii*); it can never be contained in a writing, much less a law; nor can an interpretation take the place of the text itself (himself).

Scripture is its own interpreter (*scriptura sacra sui ipsius interpres*) means Scripture is to be used to interpret itself based on the echo of Scripture within Scripture. The Old Testament is ruminating over the Psalter, exodus, covenant and law, as the New Testament interprets the Old Testament and its own articles of faith.

Scripture confirms (authenticates) itself (*Die Schrift verbüßt sich selbst*) means no outside authority is needed to bring credibility to Scripture. Scripture attests to its own veracity.

Scripture is clear because the message of salvation delivered by the Holy Spirit is overwhelmingly clear and persuasive.

Significance. Luther's understanding of his discipline of theology was that it was the discipline of the sacred page (*sacra pagina*). The linkage of Luther with the tradition of *sacra pagina* goes counter to much of modern effort to see Luther as the first Enlightenment figure,

the first rationalist, nationalist, romantic, liberal, historical critic or hermeneutician. The distinctive feature of this discipline is that it sees sacred matters as a page, which is a more logical approach to Holy Writ than are the efforts of the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Enlightenment to interpret the Bible as ancient literature because it is consistent with the text of Scripture. The sacred page is the work of God directly and immediately; it bears the imprint of God, God's will, God's action, God's Word.

The discipline of the sacred page, not new to Luther, assumes the unity of God's Word. The view of God is thoroughly trinitarian. The Christian confession of faith is based on the sacred page. The form that the confession or creed or rule of faith takes is trinitarian. The unity of Scripture thus is trinitarian. The action of God as recorded from beginning to end is the action of Three-in-One.

Scripture has a unique grammar. Luther was concerned to promote that grammar, that faith. Faith is the shape or form that the words take. It is true that Luther clung only to the grammatical meaning (*sensus*) of the words. He did so to preserve the single and simple sense, which most often is Christ. But Christ is not a meaning or sense. Christ is the *res*, the very thing itself of God.

Luther frequently urged the reader to pay special attention to the peculiar phrase, idiom, example or expression that Scripture employed. The grammatical sense points to Christ. The vocabulary of the sacred page takes the form of the creed. The faith of the church based on the grammar of faith is trinitarian. Thus the unity of the grammar of faith is the unity of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. Luther was the doctor of faith.

When Luther used the word *interpret*, he attacked the idea and argued instead that Scripture is to be promoted and applied to the present age but not interpreted. Luther's work of commenting on Scripture continued the medieval genre of *enarratio*, which means to narrate and apply the message of Scripture in public. The use of Scripture is not to provide evidence or proof for an interpretation. Rather,

Scripture is used to promote God.

To work with Scripture as Luther did is to employ the discipline of the sacred page. Theology for Luther employs the discipline of prayer, meditation and temptation. Such a discipline comes from the Psalter. Luther was consistent to follow Scripture's lead for the discipline of theology. The goal of this discipline is God.

Medieval commentators have been described as walking concordances. The same must be said for Luther. For Luther it was necessary that God's Word be consistent in its grammar, rhetoric and theology. The importance of Luther for our time is his clear perception and practice of theology in the tradition of *enarratio* and *sacra pagina*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Works. *Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (104 vols.; Weimar: Herman Bohlau, 1883-); *Luther's Works*, ed. J. Pelikan and H. Lehmann (55 vols.; St. Louis: Concordia; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1955-).

Studies. H. Bornkamm, *Luther and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969); K. Hagen, *Luther's Approach to Scripture as Seen in His 'Commentaries' on Galatians* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1993); B. Hall, "Biblical Scholarship: Editions and Commentaries," *CHB*

3:38-93; W. J. Kooiman, *Luther and the Bible* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1961); B. Lohse, *Martin Luther: An Introduction to His Life and Work* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); idem, *Martin Luther's Theology: Its Historical and Systematic Development*, trans. and ed. R. A. Harrisville (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999); H. de Lubac, *The Sources of Revelation* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1968); D. K. McKim, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Martin Luther* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); J. Pelikan, *Luther the Expositor* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1959); idem, Luther Academy, *Luther Digest: An Annual Abridgement of Luther Studies*, ed. K. Hagen (St. Louis: Luther Academy, 1993-); J. Reumann, ed., in collaboration with S. H. Nafzger and H. H. Ditmanson, *Studies in Lutheran Hermeneutics* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979); D. C. Steinmetz, *Luther in Context* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); idem, "Luther, Martin (1483-1546)," *DBI*, 2:96-98; E. Vogelsang, *Die Anfänge von Luther's Christologie nach der ersten Psalmenvorlesung* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1929); J. W. Zophy, "Martin Luther, 1483-1546," in *Research Guide to European Historical Biography*, ed. J. Moncure (Washington, DC: Beacham, 1993) 8:3705-19. K. Hagen

M

MACHEN, J(OHN) GRESHAM (1881-1937)

Life and Work. Better known for his opposition to liberal Protestantism in the Northern Presbyterian Church (PCUSA) during the fundamentalist-modernist controversy, J. Gresham Machen was foremost a professor of New Testament, a well-respected member of the guild of professional biblical scholars and throughout his career produced solid work from a conservative perspective. After studying Greek classical literature as an undergraduate (B.A., 1901) and a year of graduate work at Johns Hopkins University in his hometown, Baltimore, Machen went on to Princeton Seminary, where he completed the bachelor of divinity degree (1905) along with a master of arts in philosophy at Princeton University (1904).

While he was a seminarian Machen honed his interest in ancient languages and literature to focus on the study of the New Testament's history and texts. To that end he went to Germany for a year, studying for a semester at both Marburg and Göttingen. Though he was uncertain about ordination, Machen returned to the United States to become lecturer in Greek and New Testament at Princeton Seminary (1906). On his ordination to the ministry (1914), Princeton's directors promoted him to assistant professor of New Testament, a position he held until 1929, when he left Princeton to found Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. There he was professor of New Testament until his death.

Context. Machen labored at a time when traditional Protestant interpretations of the Bible were coming in for serious revision. Though

many biblical scholars continued to be ministers and so oriented to ecclesiastical concerns, professional biblical scholarship during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries became increasingly a specialized discipline within the new academic environment of the research university. In this context, biblical scholars emulated the scientific methods that dominated research in the natural and social sciences.

The effects of this process were twofold, both with serious consequences for believers who looked to the Bible as the norm for matters of faith and practice. The first was to move the study of Scripture away from the theological categories of the churches and to put Bible on a par with other texts from antiquity, whether sacred or not. Scholars increasingly ignored the Bible's divine character and attended instead to its human qualities.

The second consequence of professionalization, which fed the first, was the triumph of naturalistic perspectives in the study of Scripture. As definitions of science narrowed to restrict legitimate knowledge to only what was observable, biblical scholars increasingly overlooked or explained away the miraculous events and accounts of divine intervention into human history narrated in the biblical writings.

These changes in the study of Scripture were important for the antagonism between fundamentalists and liberal Protestants. While the latter still attached great religious significance to the Bible, especially as it contained the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, liberals did make large concessions to the new scholarship. Their hope was to retain the Bible's uniqueness and author-

ity but to place that uniqueness and authority in those aspects of Scripture uncontaminated by the supernatural or miraculous, those things that to the modern scientific mind seemed incredible. Fundamentalists saw such concessions as gross infidelity and stressed the Bible's divine origin and scientific truthfulness. Thus the Protestant community polarized between those who opposed and those who embraced the new learning of the research university.

Despite Machen's reputation as one of the leading and certainly the most scholarly of fundamentalists, his work on the New Testament fell into neither of the competing camps within Protestantism but mediated elements on both sides of the modernist-fundamentalist divide. With fundamentalists he affirmed the historical truthfulness of the biblical narratives and defended the necessity of the supernatural to scriptural teaching. Yet Machen eschewed dispensationalism, the method of interpretation that dominated fundamentalist circles throughout much of the twentieth century, calling it by the end of his life a menace to Presbyterian orthodoxy.

As much as Machen underscored the supernatural and miraculous in the biblical text, he nevertheless shared with liberal Protestants a genuine interest in the human aspects of Scripture and strove to use the variety of scholarly methods to understand the Bible better. In this regard he leaned heavily not just on the theological tradition at Princeton Seminary but also on his training as a classicist at Johns Hopkins University.

Yet, despite his appreciation for academic approaches to the study of ancient texts, Machen did not hesitate to repudiate the naturalistic assumptions that often accompanied professional studies. Thus with fundamentalists Machen affirmed the divine and supernatural aspects of the Bible, and with liberal Protestants he recognized the importance of exploring the human dimensions of Scripture.

Although it is commonly identified with naive and simplistic readings of the Bible, Princeton Seminary's doctrine of Scripture provided Machen with a stable foundation for his scholarship. While Princeton notables such as

Charles *Hodge and B. B. Warfield did articulate a doctrine of biblical inerrancy that claimed that the original autographs of Scripture were entirely free from error, the Princeton doctrine of inerrancy was also rooted in the broader Reformed understanding of special revelation. Rather than restricting critical study, Princeton's teaching on the nature of biblical writings generated close reading and rigorous study of Scripture.

What was crucial to the Princeton doctrine of the Word were Reformed notions about *con-cursus* and providence. Princetonians readily confessed that God intervened in human history to reveal himself and save his people, hence their affirmation of the supernatural aspects and miraculous content of the Bible. But they also believed that God ordinarily worked through secondary causes. In the case of Scripture this meant that God used human or natural developments to produce the text, and to understand the Bible, scholars could not be content with explanations that focused on the Bible's divine origin. They also needed to attend to the human qualities of the text. At both levels, then, the divine and the human aspects of the Bible, God was the sovereign author. But Princetonians recognized that God used human vessels to reveal himself, thus making critical research into questions of authorship, date, linguistics and history necessary. The Princeton doctrine of inerrancy was not a defensive tactic but a remarkably supple device for incorporating many of the advances in biblical scholarship.

Major Works. In addition to many articles, both popular and scholarly, and instructional material written for Christian education, Machen wrote two books. Both stemmed from endowed lectureships at southern Presbyterian seminaries. The first, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (1921), originated as the Sprunt Lectures for 1921 at Union Seminary (Richmond). The second, *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (1930), was originally delivered as the Thomas Smyth Lectures for 1927 at Columbia Theological Seminary (South Carolina). Both books display Machen's commitment to conservative Protestant theology and careful scholarship.

In the first Machen addressed the critical question of Christianity's historical origins. The question could be answered in two ways, either through a study of the Gospels or through the Pauline epistles. The early date and genuineness of the apostle's writings, Machen argued, made the epistles the best evidence for understanding the character and history of early Christianity. As a contemporary of Jesus and a member of the disciples only a few years after Jesus' death, Paul had an extensive knowledge of the church before and after his conversion and therefore abundant opportunity to acquaint himself with the facts of Jesus' life and death. Unlike German scholars and, increasingly, American students of the New Testament, Machen argued that Paul was not a second founder of Christianity who had departed from and added to the teaching of Jesus. Rather, he concluded that Paul's religion was essentially the same as that of the other apostles and the early church.

Moreover, the substance of the early church's religion was "perfectly plain": Jesus Christ was a heavenly being who came to earth, died on the cross for the sins of believers, rose again from the dead and was present with the church through his spirit. Along the way, Machen marshaled extensive linguistic, historical and exegetical evidence to refute the arguments of liberal and radical scholars who tried to explain away Christianity's uniqueness and supernaturalism as either the product of Greek mystery religions or the outcome of tendencies within Jewish apocalypticism. Machen believed that in the end the conclusions of the most radical scholars vindicated the teaching of historic Christianity while discrediting liberal Protestantism by making supernaturalism essential to the gospel.

In *The Virgin Birth of Christ* Machen employed a similar argument in trying to account for the early church's belief in the miraculous conception of Jesus. Again he interacted extensively with the available scholarship on the birth narratives. He also demonstrated a keen understanding of the literary and historical dimensions of the debate. But in the end, Machen's erudition served the conventional belief

that Christ's birth was no mere natural phenomenon but involved the intervention of God into human history. Naturalistic explanations, he argued, were finally unsatisfactory; the historical evidence pointed to the conclusion that the early church believed exactly what the narratives in Matthew's and Luke's Gospels declared, namely, that Christ was conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit in the womb of the virgin Mary and was born of her, yet without sin.

In both of these books Machen added to his defense of traditional interpretations of the Bible a poignant criticism of liberal Protestantism, a stricture that he developed at length in *Christianity and Liberalism* (1923), his most popular and polemical book. He believed that the most recent scholarship, that of the so-called history of religions school, demonstrated the folly of liberal attempts to separate the ethical instruction of the Bible, especially Christ's teaching, from the book's supernatural elements. Machen was convinced that ultimately the church would have to choose between the Christ of the Bible, complete with his miraculous birth and resurrection, or an altogether different religion. The supernatural and the natural were so closely interwoven as to make all efforts at separation impossible.

Machen, Commonsense Realism and Fundamentalism. Scholars have long attributed Machen's biblical studies to the early modern scientific outlook commonly associated with fundamentalism. By stressing the factual, historical, scientifically true character of the New Testament, some argue, Machen exhibited the fundamentalist habit of reading Scripture in a wooden and rationalistic manner. Unlike liberal Protestants, who were open to developmental models of truth (that truth was relative to time and place), fundamentalists held on to older Enlightenment conceptions of science and stressed that scientific truths, including the historical facts narrated in Scripture, were static and enduring. Because Machen appealed to the facts of Christ's life and ministry and argued that historical truths cannot with the passing of time be denied, historians have often equated his defense of the New Testament narratives with fundamentalists' defense

of the first chapters of Genesis.

Machen, who refused to testify at the Scopes trial and avoided the controversy over creation and evolution, used methods in the study of the New Testament that he had learned not just at Princeton Seminary but also at Johns Hopkins University. Reviews of his books indicate that Machen's methods were standard fare in the academy of his day, even if the conservative theological conclusions to emerge from those methods were not. Indeed, the dominant interpretation of the fundamentalist controversy as one between rival conceptions of truth (static versus progressive) and also rival ways of reading the Bible (literal versus figurative) misses the degree to which students of ancient writings employed similar techniques to figure out the authorship, date and even meaning of a given text. On this score Machen's methods differed little from those of historians, philologists and related scholars in the humanities who also conceived of ancient texts as having a fixed meaning that changed only in the light of new discoveries.

Where Machen differed from other biblical scholars was not in deciphering the meaning of a given passage but rather with what to do with that meaning in the modern context. Machen argued that the original meaning of the Bible was binding on twentieth-century believers, while liberals often resorted to the symbolic or spiritual meaning of the Bible in order to free the modern church from difficult, if not incredible, teachings. What Machen did in arguing that the teachings in Scripture were binding on Christians throughout all times and places was no different from the expectation of philosophers that modern-day Platonists conform to Plato's original teachings.

Significance. Estimates of Machen's abilities and importance as a New Testament scholar run the gamut of theological opinions and historical perspectives. For fundamentalists who clung to inerrancy severed from the confessional Presbyterianism of the Princeton theology, Machen was an important source who showed the holes in the so-called science of professional biblical scholarship. For conservative Presbyterians who supported and studied

at Westminster Seminary, founded in 1929 by Machen and others to carry on the ideals of Old Princeton, he was a model of rigorous scholarship always informed by theological reflection. And for mainline Protestants, whether liberal or moderate, Machen and his efforts to oppose theological liberalism in the Presbyterian church were examples of where a commitment to inerrancy logically led.

Convenient though it may be to pigeonhole Machen on the far theological right with the rest of the fundamentalists, the estimate of F. V. Filson, professor of biblical theology at McCormick Theological Seminary, bears some consideration. Writing at the height of the influence of neo-orthodoxy on mainstream American Protestantism, Filson declared that Machen's argument that traditional Christian theology was the necessary outcome of faithfulness to the message of the New Testament looked "far truer" than much of the "shallow theology" that characterized liberal Protestantism and the social gospel (Filson, 60).

Indeed, good reasons exist for connecting Machen's defense of the theology of the New Testament in the 1920s with the return in the 1940s to biblical theology among mainline Protestants. Despite different conceptions of the doctrine of the Word of God, both recognized that Scripture is more than morality, that it primarily narrates dramatic events in the unfolding of redemptive history. In turn, both criticized liberal Protestantism for reducing Christianity to little more than ethics and religious experience. And both Machen and the biblical theology movement strove to preserve the Bible as the church's book, as the norm for God's people, as opposed to liberal Protestantism, which too often took its cues from the academy and had trouble arguing that the Bible was different from other religious writings of the ancient Near East.

But where Machen veered significantly from the later biblical theology movement was in this matter of the church and its claims on the Bible. Unlike biblical theologians and neo-orthodox leaders who criticized the witness of mainline Protestantism but continued to work under its auspices, Machen took his case

against liberal Protestantism directly to the assemblies of the church, challenging whether a theology that compromised the witness of Scripture had a rightful place in a body that claimed Scripture as its norm and guide. It is Machen's attempt at consistency—between what he taught in the classroom and what he preached in the church—that is responsible for the various assessments of his significance. Nevertheless his scholarship stands as a testimony to the impossibility of separating the study of Scripture from theological conviction or ecclesiastical witness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Works. *J. Gresham Machen: Selected Shorter Writings*, D. G. Hart, ed. (Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2004); *The Christian Faith in the Modern World* (New York: Macmillan, 1936); *The Christian View of Man* (New York: Macmillan, 1937); *Christianity and Liberalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1923); "Forty Years of New Testament Research," *USR* 40 (1928) 1-11; *God Transcendent, and Other Sermons*, ed. N. B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949); "Karl Barth and 'The Theology of Crisis,'" *WTJ* 53 (1991) 197-207; *The New Testament: An Introduction to Its Literature and History*, ed. W. J. Cook (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1976 [1914-1915]); *New Testament Greek for Beginners* (New York: Macmillan, 1923); *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1921); "The Relation of Religion to Science and Philosophy," *PTR* 24 (1926) 38-66; *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (New York: Harper, 1930); *What Is Christianity?* ed. N. B. Stonehouse (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951); *What Is Faith?* (New York: Macmillan, 1925).

Studies. T. Cris hope, *Toward a Sure Faith: J. Gresham Machen and the Dilemma of Biblical Criticism, 1881-1915* (Ross-shire, UK: Mentor/Christian Focus, 2000); J. A. Dearman, "Machen, John Gresham (1881-1937)," *DBI*, 2:107-8; F. V. Filson, "The Study of the New Testament," in *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century: Whence and Where?* ed. A. S. Nash (New York: Macmillan, 1951) 47-69; R. A. Harrisville and W. Sundberg, *The Bible in Modern Culture: Theology and Historical-Critical Method from Spinoza to Käsemann* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995); D. G. Hart, *Defending the Faith: J. Gresham*

Machen and the Crisis of Conservative Protestantism in Modern America (1994; Phillipsburg, NJ: P & R, 2003); B. J. Longfield, *The Presbyterian Controversy: Fundamentalists, Modernists and Moderates* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991); G. M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980); idem, "J. Gresham Machen, History and Truth," *WTJ* 42 (1979) 157-75; M. A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelical Scholarship and the Bible in America* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1986); J. B. Rogers and D. K. McKim, *The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: An Historical Approach* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979); E. R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism: British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); N. B. Stonehouse, *J. Gresham Machen: A Biographical Memoir* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954). D. G. Hart

MANSON, T(HOMAS) W(ALTER) (1893-1958)

Life. T. W. Manson was born on July 22, 1893, in Tynemouth, England. His early education prepared him well for the effective ministry and academic career that was to follow. The influence of his father, T. F. Manson, was particularly important. His father operated a private school, which he attended for his elementary education. During high school in Tynemouth, he showed interest in being an educator, serving as a peer instructor for his fellow students. His acumen was already apparent in his excellent results in examinations for Oxford and London University. He matriculated at the University of Glasgow in 1912, however, with a view to preparation for ministry in the Presbyterian church.

Manson's university studies at Glasgow were interrupted by World War I, during which he served and was wounded in France. After the war, he completed a master's degree in philosophy, in the process having several awards conferred on him for his academic excellence, a harbinger of things to come.

From Glasgow, Manson proceeded to Westminster College, Cambridge, as part of his

training for ministry, while at the same time reading Oriental languages at Christ's College. His studies there provided an important background for his later work, not only in the area of assessing the historical materials for the history of Jesus but also for work on the Septuagint, an area of particular interest of his teacher at Christ's, N. McLean. Manson's interest in teaching was again apparent in his serving as a tutor in Westminster College during the three years before he began pastoral ministry.

Manson was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1925. He filled pastoral posts in London and then, after marrying in August 1926, in northern England before beginning his full-time career as a professor. His first position was at Mansfield College, Oxford, where he succeeded C. H. *Dodd as Yates Professor of New Testament Greek and Exegesis in 1932. Four years later he was chosen to succeed Dodd a second time, becoming Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in Manchester in 1936, where he served for the remainder of his career.

Manson's commitment to excellence as a teacher and scholar, and the increasing recognition these brought, did not lead him to neglect opportunities to serve the broader needs of church and country. While maintaining all his normal responsibilities as a teacher at Manchester, during World War II he again served in the war effort, this time on the home front as operations officer and later as an intelligence officer. He was also responsible for St. Aiden's Presbyterian Church during this time, both the Sunday services and the ongoing duties of the presbytery.

Though his ordination and main pastoral work were through the Presbyterian church, Manson's primary commitment was to the church of God without respect to denominational lines. He provided leadership for the Manchester Free Church Council for many years, as well as for the Manchester and Salford Council of Churches, and he was elected as moderator of the Presbyterian Church of England in 1953. He was still well-regarded by those within the Anglican church who knew him, including the bishop of Manchester, who spoke at

a memorial service for him in Manchester Cathedral.

His work for the university extended beyond Manson's academic production. As dean of the theological faculty for many years, chair of many committees and through extensive work for the libraries, including the John Rylands Library, he was a tireless advocate for the promotion of the education available at the university he served so well.

Manson also played an important role in the birth of Studiorum Novi Testamentum Societas. He was among a group of scholars in Edinburgh to whom J. de Zwaan suggested the idea of such a society in 1937. At a gathering in September 1938, Manson read a paper, "The Idea of a Society for New Testament Studies," in which he suggested various benefits and projects the society could promote. Those who gathered laid plans for a formal organization in September 1939, but the beginning of World War II prevented that meeting from occurring. Manson was elected to chair the group on the sudden death in 1940 of J. M. Creed, and he guided the newly formed organization through the years of the war until 1947, when at the first general meeting de Zwaan was inducted as president. Manson served as president in 1949 and 1950, and for a time he chaired the editorial board of *New Testament Studies*.

Work. Manson's first and most well-known book, *The Teaching of Jesus*, was written in 1931 while he still occupied a pastoral position in the Presbyterian church. It demonstrates his careful approach to the text, as well as the value of his background in the Oriental languages, rabbinic literature and the Hebrew Scriptures for elucidating the meaning and significance of Jesus' teaching. In this work he argued significantly for a collective meaning of "the Son of man" as used by Jesus, derived most directly from its use in Daniel 7. Though the disciples initially failed to live out the requirements of the ideal presented by the term, leaving Jesus alone to embody the Son of man, after the resurrection the church now assumes the role of the Son of man being brought into being by God. His argument on this point became an important theme of discussion on the meaning of