

The Rev. Charles St-Onge, Pastor  
St. Mark's Lutheran Church, LCMS  
Ridley Park, Pennsylvania  
January 9, 2004

**WHAT'S SO ORIGINAL ABOUT SIN?  
The Anthropological State of the Regenerate**

Prepared in Response to a Growing Controversy within the LCMS

1. Introduction

Contrary to the belief of many Lutherans, the Reformation did not end in 1517, 1530, or even 1580. The fact that the Roman Catholic church has still not accepted our faith should be proof enough of this fact. The number of sects which have rejected our biblical teaching in the last five hundred years should be further evidence that the Reformation is far from over.

Few understand what was at stake in the disputes between the Lutherans and Roman Catholics on one side, and the Swiss and Radical Protestants on the other. As a result, the differences between Christian confessions have become more and more downplayed and ignored. It should not be surprising that the melting of all Christian confessions into one great ecumenical pot has now led to the growing belief that all *religions* teach “one true faith.”<sup>a</sup> It is incumbent then for all Lutherans to be able to once again clearly confess the truth on which their spiritual ancestors were willing to stake their life and their church.

The cornerstone doctrine of the Lutheran faith is, of course, justification. It is on the issue of justification that Lutherans are separated from Rome, and indeed separated from all other so-called Christian sects. At the heart of the doctrine of justification lies the issue of the “forgiveness of sins.” In order to understand this forgiveness, we must first grapple with the Lutheran understanding of sin. We may then proceed to an examination of the understanding of sin held by the Roman and other churches. Finally, understanding these positions, we may rightly examine what is at stake in either accepting or rejecting the belief that “we receive forgiveness of sin and become righteous before God by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, when we believe that Christ suffered for us and that for his sake our sin is forgiven and righteousness and eternal life are given to us.”<sup>1</sup>

2. What is the Christian's State after Conversion?

The Latin shorthand for the Lutheran position on the Christian's state after conversion is *simul justus et peccator* – that after conversion, we are both saint and sinner, never only one or the other, but always both. The Scriptural foundation for this belief flows largely from Romans 7, especially verses 15 through 20:

I do not understand what I do. For what I want to do I do not do, but what I hate I do.  
And if I do what I do not want to do, I agree that the law is good. As it is, it is no longer I

---

<sup>a</sup> Consider, for example, the inability of the Missouri Synod to grasp the issues at stake in Dr. David Benke's participation in, and approval of, the interfaith service held at Yankee Stadium on September 23, 2001. In a recent survey conducted Christmas Eve at St. Mark's Lutheran Church, 40% of respondents agreed that “all religions, including Christianity, are true.”

myself who do it, but it is sin living in me. I know that nothing good lives in me, that is, in my sinful nature. For I have the desire to do what is good, but I cannot carry it out. For what I do is not the good I want to do; no, the evil I do not want to do—this I keep on doing. Now if I do what I do not want to do, it is no longer I who do it, but it is sin living in me that does it. (Romans 7:15-20, NIV)

Luther and all subsequent Lutheran interpreters have affirmed that the “I” in this passage clearly refers to Paul, speaking of his own condition. Furthermore, in verses subsequent to verse 14 Paul is speaking of his *post*-conversion, or regenerate, condition.<sup>b</sup> Paul affirms that even after the Spirit has brought about repentance and faith, the Christian remains in a battle with an all-too-real sinful nature. The Christian can rightly be called a “holy one,” or saint, because they are no longer under the condemnation of God (as is shown in the great “therefore” of Romans 8:1). However, sin remains living and active, though not reigning, in the Christian, and therefore he or she is also rightly called a “sinner.” The Christian is justified forensically, by a righteousness that is not properly his or hers, but is Christ’s alone. When the Spirit brings someone to faith that Christ’s atonement is for him or her, Christ’s righteousness becomes their own, and they are declared “not guilty” of sin.

That Luther held this view is clear from his many writings. In his explanation of John 17:19, Luther wrote:

The real saints of Christ must be good, stout sinners and remain saints who are not ashamed to pray the Lord’s prayer, “forgive us our sins,”...They are not called saints because they are without sin...On the contrary, they themselves, with all their works, are nothing but condemned sinners. They become holy through a foreign holiness, namely, through that of the Lord Jesus Christ.<sup>2</sup>

In his commentary on Galatians, Luther again confesses that he, in the present tense, remains both by nature a miserable sinner and yet also a holy one of God:

I leave it to the orators to explain, and expand upon, this topic of the inestimable grace and glory that we have in Christ Jesus, namely, that we miserable sinners, by nature children of wrath (Eph. 2:3), may arrive at this honor, that through faith in Christ we are made children and heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ (Rom. 8:17), lords of heaven and earth.<sup>3</sup>

When preaching on baptism, Luther addressed head on the question of the Christian’s status after regeneration. He does so by means of a rhetorical question:

Since original sin has been taken away in baptism, why do you say that it still remains and one must constantly battle with it? To this question Augustine gives the following answer: Original sin is certainly forgiven in baptism; not in such a manner, however, that

---

<sup>b</sup> It is noted from the outset that the Lutheran understanding of these verses is not shared by most other Christian sects, notably the Roman Church and many modern Evangelicals. Indeed, one Lutheran author’s book on this chapter is entitled *The ‘I’ In the Storm*. For a clear and fair exegesis of this passage, which demonstrates that the Lutheran interpretation is the only one possible for a Christian who affirms the clarity and inerrancy of Scripture, the reader is urged to see Middendorf, Michael, *The ‘I’ In the Storm* (St.Louis: Concordia Publishing House, CPH, 1997).

it no longer exists, but rather that God will no longer impute it...When we die, all will be completely healed.<sup>4</sup>

In fact, a search of the American Edition of Luther's writings will find that Luther 16 times refers to Christians as miserable sinners, 82 times as poor sinners, and on at least 10 occasions refers to Christians as both poor and miserable sinners. One will also find that Luther uses the adjectives "condemned," "despicable," "foolish," "weak," and "unworthy."

Melanchthon, drafter of the *Augsburg Confession*, the *Apology to the Confession*, and the *Power and Primacy of the Pope*, concurred wholeheartedly with Luther in this belief that Christians may properly be called sinners after conversion. In his *Loci Communes*, the first ever Lutheran dogmatics, Melanchthon writes the following:

In baptism sin is taken away insofar as it applies to guilt or imputation, but *the disease itself remains, which is an evil in conflict with the law of God, worthy of eternal death unless there is forgiveness*, as it is said, "Blessed are those whose sins are covered" (Ps 32:1)...The testimonies of Paul are clear. In Romans 7 and 8 Paul clearly says, "The law in our members is in conflict with the law of [our] mind and with law of God." No amount of juggling can escape these testimonies (emphasis added).<sup>5</sup>

Melanchthon is also fond of using the Parable of the Good Samaritan as an illustration of this point, an illustration he either took from or loaned to Luther, who also used it. The Samaritan...

...did not all at once cure the wounded man, but first poured wine into his wounds to wash out the blood...and after that, when the wound had been bound up, he had the invalid put on his beast and then cared for in the inn, so Christ puts us on his body, because he carried the punishment for our sins, and pours the Gospel into our wounds, he then binds them up, covers and forgives our sins. But he still wishes the diseases in the church to be cured by continual exercises of the cross and of prayer. This imagery shows that *in the remission of original sin the guilt is taken away, but the wounds are not suddenly healed...*[T]he depravity of the mind, the will, and the heart...which are truly grievous and savage...deviate from the law of God (emphasis added).<sup>6</sup>

Martin Chemnitz, one of the two drafters of the *Formula of Concord*, takes up Melanchthon's arguments in his own *Loci Theologici*. In his locus on original sin, Chemnitz raises the question of the remnants of original sin in the regenerate. The question is not whether the Christian may sin after conversion, but whether the Christian may properly be called a "sinner." If original sin is *remitted* in baptism, can there still *be* sin in the Christian? Chemnitz leaves no room for dispute:

It is not a matter of some quality which is poured into us once and for all and only in Baptism, or when we are converted from a state of mortal sin, but as in this life we always carry around with us the body of sin, so the remission of sins consists in the fact that the Son of God daily overshadows us and *covers in His members our flesh in which dwells nothing good* unless our sin be imputed to him (emphasis added).<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, he adds that this belief that the Christian remains a sinner is absolutely necessary for the Christian faith, so that

[W]e may learn to lament over the evil effects of sin which still dwell within us, and thus we should be even more diligent in purging out the old leaven, in crucifying the old man, and in despoiling this body of sin. For he who thinks that the concupiscence (ie: inclination to sin, ed.) remaining in him is not sin, why does he crucify and put to death a thing which is either good or at least a matter of indifference? Why does he cry, "Oh wretched man..." Rom. 7:24? Therefore these points are relevant to the matter of...sin: (1) to acknowledge that nothing good dwells in our flesh, (2) to mourn over our impurities, (3) to fight against them, (4) to pray that these impurities may be covered for the sake of our mediator.

It is most certainly true that neither the writings of Luther, Melanchthon or Chemnitz are doctrinally binding on the Lutheran. However, as has been noted, the *Book of Concord* was authored by these individuals. One must assume that what is confessed in that book is also the personal confession of these three theologians. Any interpretation given to any writing of the *Book of Concord* that conflicts radically with the other writings of its authors would seem to be suspect. One cannot interpret Galatians in such a way that it conflicts with Romans or Ephesians, for example, and continue to claim a belief in the inerrancy of Scripture. Given this, what does the *Book of Concord* say with regard to the question of the anthropological condition of the regenerate?

In Melanchthon's length apology for the article on justification in the *Augsburg Confession*, he stresses that even the godly are sinners who must be constantly seeking forgiveness through Christ Jesus:

All the Scriptures and the church proclaim that the law cannot be satisfied. The incipient keeping of the law does not please God for its own sake, but for the sake of faith in Christ. Without this, the law always accuses us. For who loves or fears God enough? Who endures patiently enough the afflictions that God sends? Who does not often wonder whether history is governed by God's counsels or by chance? Who does not often doubt whether God hears him? Who does not often complain because the wicked have better luck than the devout, because the wicked persecute the devout? Who lives up to the requirements of his calling? Who loves his neighbor as himself? Who is not tempted by lust? Therefore Paul says (Rom. 7:19), "I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do." Again (Rom. 7:25), "I of myself serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin." Here he openly says that he serves the law of sin. And David says (Ps. 143:2), "Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for no man living is righteous before thee." Even this servant of God prays God to avert his judgment. Again (Ps. 32:2), "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes no iniquity." Therefore in our present weakness there is always sin that could be imputed to us; about this he says a little later, "Therefore let every one who is godly offer prayer to thee" (Ps. 32:6). Here he shows that even the godly must pray for the forgiveness of sins.<sup>8</sup>

Luther, in his *Smalcald Articles*, speaks of the true need for the binding and loosing key given to the disciples (John 20:23). The sins of our flesh are so numerous and subtle as to be impossible to enumerate. Yet we who cry out to God through faith in Christ will always be acquitted even of our hidden sins:

The keys are a function and power given to the church by Christ, to bind and loose sins, not only the gross and manifest sins but also those which are subtle and secret and which God alone perceives. So it is written, "Who can discern his errors?" (Ps. 19:12). And Paul himself complains (Rom. 7:23) that in his flesh he was captive to "the law of sin." It is not in our power but in God's alone to judge which, how great, and how many our sins are. As it is written, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for no man living is righteous before thee" (Ps. 143:2) and Paul also says in 1 Cor. 4:4, "I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted."<sup>9</sup>

In his article on repentance, Luther writes of the "false repentance of the papists," who believe they are able to "get a handle" on their sins:

In the case of a *Christian such repentance continues until death*, for all through life it contends with the sins that remain in the flesh. As St. Paul testifies in Rom. 7:23, he was with the law in his members, and he does this not with his own powers but with the gift of the Holy Spirit which follows the forgiveness of sins. This gift *daily* cleanses and expels the sins that remain and enables man to become truly pure and holy (emphasis added).<sup>10</sup>

It is worth noting that both of these quotes come from the section of the *Smalcald Articles* to which Luther gave the following preface: "The following articles treat matters which we may discuss with learned and sensible men, or even among ourselves. The pope and his court do not care much about these things; they are not concerned about matters of conscience but only about money, honor, and power."<sup>11</sup>

In the *Formula of Concord*, the issue of the sinfulness of the regenerate is dealt with most clearly in Article III, on the Christian's righteousness before God. At stake was the question of whether the Christian is *made* righteous before God by the indwelling of Christ through his Holy Spirit, or whether the Christian is *declared* righteous forensically for the sake of Christ's by faith. The Formula states:

When we teach that through the Holy Spirit's work we are reborn and justified, we do not mean that after regeneration no *unrighteousness in essence and life* adheres to those who have been justified and regenerated, but we hold that Christ with his perfect obedience covers all our sins which throughout this life still inhere in our nature. Nevertheless, they are regarded as holy and righteous through faith and for the sake of Christ's obedience, which Christ rendered to his Father from his birth until his ignominious death on the cross for us, *even though, on account of their corrupted nature, they are still sinners and remain sinners until they die* (emphasis added).<sup>12</sup>

### 3. What are the Contrary Positions?

What were the positions of the Roman Catholic church and other Protestant sects on this issue? The concept of forensic justification, that we are declared righteous for Christ's sake even though we remain sinners until death, was bitterly opposed by the Roman church. <sup>c</sup> They clung

---

<sup>c</sup> Chemnitz, in his *Loci Theologici*, and Melancthon in his various works including the *Apology to the Augsburg Confession*, did their best to show from the teachings of Augustine and other church fathers that their teachings were in no way novel, but to little avail. It is interesting to note, however, that the Augustinian order within the Roman

tenaciously to their view that “the infusion of grace [at conversion] so completely transforms the sinner that he is changed from an unjust to a just person.”<sup>13</sup> Rome claims that “sanctifying grace is ‘a splendor and light that effaces all the stains of the soul.’”<sup>14</sup> To reinforce their view, the theologians of the Papacy did not rely so much on tradition but more so on their interpretation of the Scriptures,<sup>d</sup> notably 1 Corinthians 9:24-27<sup>e</sup> and 2 Peter 1:10.<sup>f</sup> The 21<sup>st</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> *Canons of the Council of Trent* point to the clear disagreement the Roman church had with the Lutheran concept of forensic justification:

CANON XI.-If any one saith, that men are justified, either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of the grace and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and is inherent in them; or even that the grace, whereby we are justified, is only the favour of God; let him be anathema.

CANON XXV.-If any one saith, that, in every good work, the just sins venially at least, or – which is more intolerable still – mortally, and consequently deserves eternal punishments; and that for this cause only he is not damned, that God does not impute those works unto damnation; let him be anathema.<sup>15</sup>

In other words, anyone who believes the sinful nature still exists after conversion, and that despite this continuing sinful nature a Christian is forgiven, for Christ’s sake by faith alone, is outside of salvation. The following was written in a recent article on the *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification* signed by the Lutheran World Federation and the Roman Catholics on October 31, 1999 in Augsburg:

For Catholics, the formula “at the same time righteous and sinner” (a notoriously Lutheran expression jointly affirmed in the JDDJ) is not acceptable. Even though the JDDJ claims that the 16<sup>th</sup> century anathemas – from both sides – on justification have now been laid to rest, [Cardinal] Cassidy says, “it remains difficult to see how this doctrine on ‘simul justus et peccator’ (simultaneously righteous and sinner) is not touched by the anathemas of the Tridentine Decree (Council of Trent) on original sin and justification.”<sup>16</sup>

---

church cautiously agrees with many of Luther’s teachings. “To avoid the notion of a gradual process of healing and transformation, Luther did not draw a distinction between justification and sanctification. The Lutheran *simul* (the Christian is both sinner and justified) is central to his theology...If Roman Catholics recognize an authentically evangelical thrust surging through the more or less adequate formulas of Luther and Reformation anthropology in general, then they must see in it a theology of grace that is a valid complement to their own and other traditional formulations.” In Michael Scanlon, “Martin Luther: The Separated ‘Son’ of Augustine.” *All Things Augustine: Villanova Magazine* (St. Davids, PA. Villanova University Press, Winter 1999).

<sup>d</sup> To suggest as is so often done glibly by Protestants that Roman Catholics are “unscriptural” is to do them a grave injustice. The Roman church too, claims the Scriptures to be inerrant, infallible, and a true (although not sole) norm of faith and life. Most Protestants do not realize that the Catholics fought long and hard to demonstrate, from clear Scriptural texts, that the Protestants and especially the Lutherans were in error.

<sup>e</sup> “Do you not know that in a race all the runners run, but only one gets the prize? Run in such a way as to get the prize. Everyone who competes in the games goes into strict training. They do it to get a crown that will not last; but we do it to get a crown that will last forever. Therefore I do not run like a man running aimlessly; I do not fight like a man beating the air. No, I beat my body and make it my slave so that after I have preached to others, I myself will not be disqualified for the prize” (1 Cor. 9:24-27, NIV).

<sup>f</sup> “Therefore, my brothers, be all the more eager to make your calling and election sure. For if you do these things, you will never fall...” (2 Peter 1:10, NIV).

Unfortunately, it is not only the Roman Catholics who have disputed with the Lutherans regarding this statement. While many Protestants pay lip service to the Lutheran formulations on justification, most have returned to understandings which practically, if not theologically, are closer to Roman Catholicism. Methodists and Baptists who follow the teachings of John Wesley – the majority of American Evangelicals – believe that...

...the Christian is so perfect that he does not commit sin. [Wesley] held that Christian perfection implies being so crucified with Christ that the believer loves God with all his heart, that no wrong temper, none contrary to love, remains, but that the Christian is motivated by pure love...[While] Luther never fails to emphasize that as long as the Christian is in this world he is at once both just and sinful (*simul justus et peccator*)...[Wesley] actually anticipated the perfection of the saints in heaven...It is not clear whether Wesley believed that sin is merely suppressed or that it is eradicated.<sup>17</sup>

Wesley believed that a true Christian life would result in the Christian having “the mind of Christ, as walking as Christ walked, it is to have a heart so all-flaming with the love of God as continually to offer up every thought, word, and work as a spiritual sacrifice.”<sup>18</sup> “Against the Lutheran...view, the Wesleyan view of sanctification emphasizes the power of God to transform believers in the present. God’s promise to believers that they can live victoriously is not...an eschatological [future] promise.”<sup>19</sup> An excellent example of this view is found in prominent Evangelical philosopher Dallas Willard:

Spiritual formation in Christ would, then, ideally result in a person whose reflective will for good, fully informed and possessed by Christ, has settled into their body in its social context to such an extent that their natural responses was always to think and feel and do as Christ himself would...In such a person, the saying of the apostle which we all know, ‘The things that I would not do, and the things that I would that I do not,’ is reversed: “The good that I would I do, and the evil that I would not I do not.” Romans 7:19 is reversed [sic].<sup>20</sup>

The Lutheran believes justification to be forensic, outside of him or herself, and views the Christian life as a daily process of crucifying the sinful nature that is constantly trying to destroy faith. Most American Evangelicals, in contrast, believe a “thorough cleansing from the pollution of inbred sin” is possible.<sup>21</sup> Like Dallas Willard, they deny that Paul was speaking of himself as a regenerate Christian in the latter half of Romans 7, despite the hermeneutical evidence against their interpretation. Since, however, these are the same Christians who believe the “is” in “this is my body” means “represents” or “symbolizes,” this is not altogether surprising.

#### 4. What is at Stake in the Controversy?

Perhaps no one has put their finger on the stakes of this issue better than Chemnitz in his *Loci Theologici*: “It is manifest how absolutely necessary this doctrine is. For those who say that concupiscence is not sin, but only a matter of indifference, do not acknowledge their sin, do not mourn it, and do not pray to have it covered.”<sup>22</sup> Those who deny that we remain, in Luther’s words, “poor, weak, miserable sinners”<sup>23</sup> even after regeneration have lost their need for Christ, will eventually no longer seek his daily and full forgiveness, and gradually turn away from him in their quest for a more spiritual life.

Ironically, as Christian history has shown, the end result of a denial of this teaching on the nature of the Christian is a return to the monster of uncertainty created by Rome, and toward which American Evangelicalism is slowly but surely returning. Certainty of salvation will be gone, and replaced with the need for spiritual formation, striving for perfection, and questing after a greater portion of the Holy Spirit to assure one of one's place in Christ's kingdom. Like the Roman Catholic, the Evangelical Christian of the near future will look not to Christ but to their own works and feelings for the assurance of their salvation. In the church, the preaching of reliance on Christ alone for salvation – both our justification and our sanctification – will be replaced with a preaching of laws and methods a Christian must follow in order to become a “better” Christian. Down such a path leads the eventual construction of places where Christians can increase their holiness through “spiritual formation.” Perhaps at first they will be called camps or retreat houses. Eventually, though, they may well be called “monasteries” or “convents.”

When the monastery was first developed in the dawn of the middle ages of the church, it was a place of great spirituality and holiness. But when these places lost their focus on Christ and his salvation by grace alone through faith alone, and became focused on the spiritual formation of the Christian through disciplines such as fasting, prayer, and study, they drifted quickly into places of works-righteousness. It does not take long for a Christian who is “working hard” at “working out his salvation” to see himself as better than his neighbor who is not, especially if the one working harder is constantly told that they are primarily a saint while their neighbor is still sinning. The road to hell is paved with good, even spiritual, intentions. The Augsburg Confession offers this stern warning to those who would once again start down that path:

Formerly the monasteries had conducted schools of Holy Scripture and other branches of learning which are profitable to the Christian church, so that pastors and bishops were taken from monasteries. But now the picture is changed. In former times people gathered and adopted monastic life for the purpose of learning the Scriptures, but now it is claimed that monastic life is of such a nature that thereby God's grace and righteousness before God are earned. In fact, it is called a state of perfection and is regarded as far superior to the other estates instituted by God.<sup>24</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

In the introduction to the question of whether sin remains in the regenerate, Chemnitz writes this, which we do well to remember:

Many assert that this is only an argument about words...Therefore...we must give consideration to why the papists object so strenuously that the concupiscence that remains after baptism is not sin properly speaking, even though Paul repeatedly calls it sin. It is not merely a question over a term, but in this entire discussion the papists are trying to construct a position...that regenerate man in this life can satisfy the law of God with perfect obedience...For in this way they say that the concupiscence which remains is not sin but only a deformity which is not against but only alongside the law of God. But the entire teaching of justification and good works is thus subverted. Therefore this controversy is not merely a matter of terminology but concerns substantive teachings, the correct understanding of which is necessary in all respects of the church.

In shorter and more poignant words, as only Luther can write,

Ignorance of sin of necessity brings in its train ignorance of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, and of all things. For let no one think that he will become a theologian or a good reader or hearer of Holy Scripture if he minimizes the evil of original sin or does not correctly understand it. The fact is that no man can sufficiently grasp and understand its power. For we should not consider a trifle that matter because of which God's sent His Son to become a sacrifice for our redemption. <sup>25</sup>

Let us not underestimate the enemy against which we continue to fight, and who wishes only to dominate and rule over us. Let us continue to battle against the sinful nature, that it may daily drown and die, and a new man arise to live before God in righteousness and purity forever.

Not only so, but we ourselves, who have the firstfruits of the Spirit, groan inwardly as we wait eagerly for our adoption as sons, the redemption of our bodies. For in this hope we were saved. But hope that is seen is no hope at all. Who hopes for what he already has? But if we hope for what we do not yet have, we wait for it patiently. In the same way, the Spirit helps us in our weakness. (Romans 8:23-26).

Christ have mercy on me, a sinner.

**Soli Deo Gloria**

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Tappert, T.G. "Augsburg Confession Article IV: Justification, German Translation." *The Book of Concord*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959)
- <sup>2</sup> *What Luther Says*. Edwald Plass, ed. (St.Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1959) p.1247
- <sup>3</sup> Luther, M. "Lectures on Galatians, 1535" *Vol. 26: Luther's works, Lectures on Galatians*, J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann (eds.). (St.Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1963) Galatians 3:26
- <sup>4</sup> *What Luther Says*, *ibid*, p.1299
- <sup>5</sup> Melancthon, P. "Original Sin" as quoted by Martin Chemnitz in his *Loci Theologici*, J.A.O. Preus (trans.) (St.Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1989) p.275
- <sup>6</sup> Melancthon. *ibid*, p.273
- <sup>7</sup> Chemnitz, M. "Original Sin" *Loci Theologici*, J.A.O. Preus (trans.) (St.Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1989) p.308
- <sup>8</sup> Tappert, T.G. "Apology to the Augsburg Confession, Article IV:166" *The Book of Concord*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959)
- <sup>9</sup> Tappert, T.G. "Smalcald Articles 3:VII" *The Book of Concord*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959)
- <sup>10</sup> Tappert, T.G. "Smalcald Articles 3:III" *The Book of Concord*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959)
- <sup>11</sup> Tappert, T.G. "Smalcald Articles 3:Introduction" *The Book of Concord*. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959)
- <sup>12</sup> Tappert, T.G. "Formula of Concord: Solid Declaration, Article III:22" *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959)
- <sup>13</sup> Mayer, F.E. *Religious Bodies in America*. (St.Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1961) p.57
- <sup>14</sup> Mayer, *ibid*, p.57
- <sup>15</sup> *The Councils of Trent: Canons on Justification*. <http://ic.net/~erasmus/RAZ195.HTM>, last accessed January 9, 2004
- <sup>16</sup> *Vatican "Clarifications" on the Catholic – Lutheran Joint Declaration on Justification*. <http://www.crossings.org/thursday/thur0723.htm>, last accessed January 9, 2004
- <sup>17</sup> Mayer, *ibid*, p.293
- <sup>18</sup> Boyd, A. Gregory, Paul R. Eddy. *Across the Spectrum*. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002) p.161
- <sup>19</sup> Boyd, *ibid*, p.162.
- <sup>20</sup> Willard, Dallas. "Spiritual Formation: What It Is, and How It Is Done." <http://www.dwillard.org/articles/chrislist.asp>, last accessed January 9, 2004
- <sup>21</sup> Boyd, *ibid*, p.160
- <sup>22</sup> Chemnitz, M. "Original Sin" *Loci Theologici*, J.A.O. Preus (trans.) (St.Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1989) p.309
- <sup>23</sup> Luther, M. "Lecture on the Psalm 23" *Vol. 12: Luther's works, Lectures on the Psalms*, J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald & H. T. Lehmann (eds.). (St.Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1963) Psalm 23:2
- <sup>24</sup> Tappert, T.G. "Augsburg Confession, Article XXVII: Monastic Vows, German Translation" *The Book of Concord* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959)
- <sup>25</sup> *What Luther Says*, *ibid*, p.1301