

it all began) and other medieval Churches – no doubt because they are ‘schismatic’. There is no reference to the customaries published on <http://sarumcustomary.org.uk> which corrects some of Frere’s earlier work; no reference to *Late medieval liturgies enacted*; or to the important studies by Matthew Cheung Salisbury on Sarum use. The latter warns that there was no one Sarum use but only Sarum uses. Parish churches could not replicate a customary designed for the architecture of Salisbury Cathedral, and manuscripts vary considerably in their provision. Urquhart is very dependent on Fr Daniel Rock’s work of the nineteenth century, which was an important study in its day. Rock and Pugin urged the reintroduction of Sarum use in the re-established English Roman Catholic Church, but the archbishop of Westminster decided otherwise. Urquhart cites Pope Benedict XVI’s *Summorum pontificum* which allowed the so-called Tridentine rite (actually the Missal of 1962) to be celebrated more frequently as the ‘extraordinary rite’, but Pope Francis’s *Traditionis custodes* now restricts its use, and would seem to rule out any permission for Sarum use.

What, then, are liturgical scholars to make of this ‘careful conjecture’? A useful analogy might be as follows. I am a rail enthusiast, and when I was a teenager the UK still had steam locomotives until 1968, though they were phased out from East Anglia where I lived by 1962. They went for scrap. Some were preserved for the National Collection. Some were purchased by groups who also purchased closed railway lines, and now run steam locomotives on what are called Heritage railways. People love to ride on these, but most of the lines begin nowhere in particular and do not go far or to anywhere else of magnitude. There are one or two exceptions. The Paignton-Torquay line runs regular services and uses steam locomotives, and the Great Central does the same. Running regular passenger service from and to obvious towns and cities does keep alive what until the 1960s was common. The Heritage railways are fun and run for tourists and enthusiasts rather than for regular commuters. For Sarum use to become more than the liturgical equivalent of a Heritage railway, a chapel or church would need to have the ability to celebrate it weekly as a regular service with parishioners who are more like regular commuters than tourists. Urquhart has given us the equivalent of a lovingly restored steam locomotive which has no track for it to run anywhere.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL

BRYAN D. SPINKS

*Simul. Inquiries into Luther’s experience of the Christian life.* Edited by Robert Kolb, Torbjörn Johansson and Daniel Johansson. (Refo500 Academic Studies, 80.) Pp. 270 incl. 4 ill. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2021. €80. 978 3 525 56552 0; 2198 3089  
*JEH* (73) 2022; doi:10.1017/S0022046922000203

The phrase *simul iustus et peccator*, associated with Luther, is familiar and holds ‘a firm position within the Lutheran dogmatic language concerning justification’ (p. 13). But as this collection of essays shows ‘the *simul* dimension of Lutheran theology is not limited to the doctrine of justification but expresses a trait that may be discerned in many other central doctrines as well’ (p. 13).

The twelve essays that follow appear in three parts: ‘Luther’, ‘The Lutheran Tradition’ and ‘Exegetical Perspectives’. As editor, Torbjörn Johansson points

out in his introduction, the question to be explored ‘does not concern the use of the concept, *simul*, but the actual synchronous coexistence of two different objects or principles, the simultaneity of different things, conditions, or aspects. *Simul* describes the relationship between two or more entities’ (p. 13).

Johansson’s introductory piece describes simultaneity as an important dimension of Lutheran theology while showing its function in various Lutheran doctrines: law and Gospel, justification, the certitude of salvation and experience, Holy Scripture as norm, Holy Scripture as means of grace, baptism, the Lord’s Supper, predestination, heavenly and earthly citizenship, and *simul* and *sola*. The essays that follow elaborate these dimensions and add other important perspectives, such as Mark Mattes’s interesting study of aesthetics: ‘Martin Luther on *simul pulcher et turpis*’ which explores Luther’s view that Christians are ‘not only simultaneously righteous and sinful, but also beautiful and ugly at the same time’, since ‘Luther’s view of faith’ is a ‘markedly aesthetic experience growing out of trust in God’s Word’ (p. 104).

Oswald Bayer’s ‘Luther’s “*simul iustus et peccator*”’ points to Rudolf Hermann’s *Luthers These ‘Gerecht und Sünde zugleich’: eine systematische Untersuchung* (1930) as giving importance to Luther’s formula. Bayer says Luther, as ‘a lover and master of dialectics’, saw the formula as ‘very important’ and that it ‘serves as a provocative symbol of his radical understanding of sin’ (p. 32). Luther used it in his first Psalm lectures, developed it in his Romans lectures and often employed it in his later period, especially in his Galatians lectures and disputations. Bayer notes Wilhelm Christe’s ‘table of important *simul* passages in Luther’ where he lists 120 passages (p. 32). Yet, says Bayer, Luther ‘never expressly refers to the *simul iustus et peccator* concept as an “achievement”, not even as his reformational discovery ... He simply uses it and works with it’ (pp. 32–3). In short, Luther says that ‘when I look at Christ, I am holy and righteous’; but ‘insofar as I look at myself and my sin, I am wretched and the greatest sinner’. These two perspectives ‘exist at the same time, simultaneously’ (p. 46). Ultimately, said Luther, ‘Seek yourself in Christ, not in yourself, and you will find yourself in him eternally’ (p. 47).

Robert Kolb’s ‘Old Adam, new Martin: the fatal and resurrecting consequences of baptism in Luther’s use of Romans 7’ examines Romans vii as ‘the biblical *locus classicus* for Luther’s understanding of his conviction that believers are simultaneously both righteous and sinful’ (p. 66). In the tension of the believer’s inheritance of sin in the old Adam and the new reality of redemption as one is ‘baptized into Christ Jesus’ (Romans vi. 3–4) and lives the results of that baptism in the present (p. 67), believers can know ‘the righteousness of the believer that rests upon the solid rock of God’s re-creative pronouncement of forgiveness and new life’ (p. 77). Believers are ‘the righteous children of God’ and ‘their eternal future is secure on the basis of Christ’s work and the Holy Spirit’s delivery of the Father’s promise’ (p. 77). This promise was bestowed ‘in the baptism of an infant’, says Kolb, and ‘for comfort, security, and his sense of identity as God’s chosen child, Luther looked to his baptism and God’s personal pledge to him first delivered in baptism and renewed daily in the Holy Spirit’s opening his ears again each day to that promise’ (p. 77).

Bernd Wannewetsch’s essay on ‘The simultaneity of two citizenships: a theological reappraisal of Luther’s account of the “Two Regiments” for our times’ examines the *simul* in relation to political theology and ethics (p. 177). He

emphasises the *simul iustus et peccator* image ‘draws on the distinction of two different perspectives: the “empirical” – what a human being can perceive when looking at him- or herself per se – and that of faith, which adopts God’s own perspective by looking at the sinner in the light of Christ and what he has won *pro nobis* at the cross’ (p. 177). This means that ‘while both perspectives are kept in play during the life of any Christian, there is strictly speaking no simultaneity of these two perspectives possible. When looking at oneself, one must always adopt *either* the empirical *or* the divine perspective ... The gospel invites us to choose precisely the “in Christ” perspective – and reality – over the empirical one’ (p. 177). Wannenwetsch contends that ‘soteriologically speaking, *simul* can hence only be translated as “both-and” and not as “at the same time” ... In a nutshell: I am both sinner and justified, but never at the same time’ (pp. 177–8).

This means for Luther’s teachings on political theology a ‘duality of citizenship that marks the life of a *Christenmensch* in the world’ (p. 179). Luther modified Augustine’s ‘two kingdoms’ to ‘two regiments’ which ‘presupposes one and the same ruler, God’ (p. 180). Luther’s ‘two regiments’ grounded both political and ecclesiastical existence in ‘God’s love’ which ‘allows an embrace of the goodness of the created order, including its political form’ (p. 181). It is the ‘sojourning church’ which is ‘God’s new *politeuma*, a political community that, although not of this world, has a defined place in the world and is thus opposed to any *ou-topia* – a non-place in this world, reserved for future hope only’ (p. 181). God’s ‘regiment’ is ‘not at all external to the church but the very form in which the church exists’. ‘Dual citizenship’ invites people to live ‘trusting that both regiments are salutary provisions of a loving God’ (p. 185).

This fine collection of essays is a most welcomed addition to Luther studies.

GERMANTOWN,  
TENNESSEE

DONALD K. MCKIM

*Enemies of the cross. Suffering, truth, and mysticism in the early Reformation.* By Vincent Evener. Pp. xii + 420. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2021. £64.978 0 19 007318 3  
*JEH* (73) 2022; doi:10.1017/S0022046922000641

The quincentenary in 2017 of Martin Luther’s publication of his Ninety-Five Theses occasioned celebrations as well as a wide range of publications, amongst them best-selling biographies of Luther (for example by Lyndal Roper, or new editions of those by Volker Leppin and Thomas Kaufmann). Vincent Evener’s monograph is part of this stream of publications, though it offers a comparative perspective rather than a biography. Evener’s primary aim is to demonstrate how Luther, his less well-known contemporary Andreas von Karlstadt and Thomas Müntzer read and developed late medieval mystical writing, in particular the works of Meister Eckhart and Johannes Tauler, even if they reached different conclusions. Evener argues that despite major differences between the reformers, for example in their views on the ontology of the *unio mystica*, all three ‘wanted Christians to interpret and respond to their own suffering, whether spiritual or corporeal, in new ways reflecting what they regarded as newly rediscovered divine truth’ (p. 7).