

The Work and Faith of Theological Scholars: Converging Lessons from James 2 and Luther's Doctrine of Vocation

ELIZABETH MEHLMAN

Elizabeth Mehlman, PhD, JD is a clinical psychologist specializing in the life concerns of early and mid-career professionals. She has published a number of scholarly clinical articles, previously practiced corporate law, and enjoys studying theology.

The second chapter of James and Martin Luther's doctrine of vocation have much in common that is relevant to work, vocation and human flourishing in the Christian tradition. James and Luther address ethical issues concerning the theology of Christian life; both expect good works will flow from one's faith to one's neighbors. Theologians, however, who by vocation write and talk about faith, are often judged by others and themselves as duplicitously lacking the requisite ethical action as called for in James 2 as if their work is tantamount to a "verbal exercise."¹ This article examines the vocation of the theological scholar and the ethical call for good works as an extension of faith in both James 2 and Luther's doctrine of vocation. While theological scholars may doubt if scholarly work alone satisfies the good works required by James to enliven faith, Luther's doctrine of vocation, embracing diverse and unique vocational skills among believers, implicitly affirms the good works of theological scholarship creatively designed by God to serve unique neighbors.

THE DEMISE OF THEOLOGIANS OR THEOLOGY?

Why might theologians need another perspective from which to examine their faith? Kevin Vanhoozer writes, “[t]heologians [do not] get much respect these days, whether in the academy, society or the church.”² In the next sentence, he switches from the topic of theologians to the topic of theology, and queries, “Why are people saying awful things about theology?”³ He implies that theologians do not get much respect because of theology itself, reasoning that the major factor is “the demise of doctrine.” He clarifies that the problem is not with doctrine but with its picture in contemporary society, which has unnecessarily marginalized and diminished it.⁴ Nevertheless, he argues, “Christian doctrine is a vital necessity for doing church, but also for human flourishing.”⁵

If society has marginalized doctrine, it is understandable why theologians may harbor doubts about the usefulness of their work, and wonder what exactly they *do* that is necessary and vital for human flourishing? Andrew Wilson reflects, “Few scholars, at least in theological circles, are motivated by the question, “what shall we *do* [emphasis added]?” reasoning that research generates questions, which generate further research, and that “pragmatic concerns are ancillary at best.”⁶ More derisively, John Gunson describes academic theologians as those “not required to convince anyone of the validity of their views, only to be able to argue persuasively for them in an academic setting and in academically acceptable terms.”⁷

These opinions reflect a broad concern that even theological research, falling short of some necessary but ambiguous pragmatic standard, leaves theologians holding mere words and theories. If theologians do not *do* doctrine, must legitimate scholarly work integrate theology and practice? Accordingly, Millard Erickson notes that the Association of Theological Schools has concluded “the number one problem in theological education [is] lack of integration between the theoretical and practical disciplines.”⁸ In response, Erickson, as seminary dean, instituted a school requirement out of his conviction that theoreticians of theology must practice skills in mentoring others:

To receive tenure, full-time faculty members whose own educational preparation did not include all of the areas their students were required to study would have

to acquire such competencies themselves, and that those who had never engaged in full-time ministry must obtain ministry experience, on a concurrent basis.⁹

The assumption is that theoreticians must do more than doctrine; they should have ministry experience gaining practical skills mentoring others, and that mentoring students is not sufficient. However, mindful that the practical tasks of seminary should not be abandoned, A. J. Conyers views the purpose of seminary to help “people think about life in view of the end.”¹⁰ He fears that rather than a loss of pragmatism, academia, including seminary, is gradually losing the vocabulary and syntax necessary for speaking meaningfully “about nonmaterial values, and non-pragmatic affection.”¹¹ Thus, he encourages more theoretical contemplation of the world in academia and among seminarians, not less.¹²

DUPlicitous CONCERNS OF JAMES: WORK AND FAITH OF THEOLOGIANs

As noted above, there is an underlying expectation that theologians must do more than theology or theoretical contemplation to be useful and practical to anyone. The Epistle of James speaks to these concerns, and ironically, the letter that scholars have criticized as lacking theology causes concern for theologians.¹³ James’s argument in 2:14-26 is derived from the Abrahamic narratives which teach that faith and works belong together.¹⁴ Compared to any other NT book, James is more concerned with Christian ethics and doing good works for our neighbors.¹⁵ For James, good works and faith are inseparable. Regarding James 2, Lorin Cranford states, “believing most ultimately affects one’s lips and hands.”¹⁶

James is troubled by duplicity; people “who claim to have faith but have no deeds to back it up.”¹⁷ He is concerned with speech more “than any other single topic in his letter.”¹⁸ James specifically mentions the vocation of teachers, and professional speakers who, as one commentator describes, are in a rather “hazardous profession,” and will be judged more harshly.¹⁹ James is concerned with speech that takes the form of pious claims without accompanying pious deeds. This kind of faith is dead if it claims to believe one thing but has no actions to substantiate one’s commitment. James addresses two opposing false theologies regarding whether faith can be separated from works, or whether faith is a creedal confession.²⁰ Writing on James 2, John

Hart warns, “There is one group of Christians who are most susceptible to the self-deception of talking our faith and not *doing* [emphasis added] it. Teachers of biblical truth!”²¹

Hart, internalizing James 2, writes, “the irony of this is that evangelical teachers and preachers who need to learn this truth most desperately are the very ones who have obscured it the most. By reducing James to a theological treatment on the nature of faith, it is easier for us to avoid the real unsettling challenges of James to help others like the poor.”²² Hart continues with increasing self-disclosure: “Even my own writing on the obligation to move beyond merely talking our faith does not go beyond talking my faith. While I may find a sense of fulfillment from the Lord in exhorting others to do good works, I am not by that writing and teaching released from the obligation to be engaged in good deeds myself.”²³ He disassociates theoretical contemplation, writing and teaching, the tasks of his vocation, with good works. His comment illustrates how a theological scholar devalues and minimizes his own professional tasks as lacking the ethical action required of James by more narrowly defining good works such as helping the poor.

One might, however, dismiss James 2:14–18 as exegetically problematic. Commentators agree there are problems with every interpretative solution.²⁴ On the surface, James seems to contradict Paul with a works-based salvation, given the negative answer expected, according to the rules of Greek grammar,²⁵ to the question in 2:14, “Can that faith save him?” (μη δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶσαι αὐτόν;).²⁶ This is especially relevant if “save” is interpreted to mean eternal life, and “faith” is interpreted to mean something beyond mere intellectual assent such as true faith minus works. One commentator queries, “[i]s it merely ‘right belief’ expressed in a confession of doctrine or is it essentially practical, requiring ‘deeds’ to authenticate its genuineness?”²⁷ There are issues involving textual variants, lack of Greek punctuation obscuring who and for how many verses someone is speaking, making interpretation difficult. Some say it is easier to decipher what the passage does not mean.²⁸ Most agree that Christian faith will bear fruit, and apart from James’s soteriology, James, in effect, is still saying, if you do not show me your good deeds, I cannot see your faith. You can have your theology, but what else are you *doing*?

JAMES 2:18–19: DOCTRINE OF DEMONS AND THEOLOGIAN

Verse 19 distinguishes faith and works by referring to the belief of demons, and has been regarded as the “preeminent argument that true faith comprises more than a superficial, intellectual ‘faith.’”²⁹ Hart says, “the appeal is so widespread that it is difficult to find an author holding to the viewpoint who does not employ 2:19 in this way.”³⁰ For some, this passage also conjures the vocation of theologian. Either theologians are perceived as lacking integration of theology and practice, faith and practice, or they are compared to the demons in 2:19 who claim to believe in God as monotheists but do nothing else. For example, Douglas Moo writes that demons are regarded as “among the most ‘orthodox’ of theologians,” and that they “perfectly illustrate the poverty of verbal profession.”³¹ Moo, easing into a personal admission, first quotes Mitton who says, “it is a good thing to possess an accurate theology, but it is unsatisfactory unless the good theology also possesses us.”³² Then Moo admits, “[t]he warning applies especially to people like me who study and teach theology day in and day out. Those of us in ministry must beware the danger that our theology—accurate and well stated as it might be—degenerates likewise into a verbal exercise.”³³ Here a commentator on James 2 casts doubt on his routine scholarly work. J. I. Packer admits that doctrinal study can become a danger to spiritual life unless one’s motive is to know God better.³⁴ It is unusual to find self-reflection in a commentary; however, Moo’s comments are one way to ensure academic theologians are focused on “knowing God” better via their work.

While not referring to James 2, but as if speaking to theologians about the poverty of verbal expression, it is rather disconcerting to read Gerald Hiestand’s words when presenting before the Society for the Advancement of Ecclesial Theology in 2009. He says pointedly, “it does not take one long to note the difference between the earnest, pastoral tone of a Calvin or Luther, and the more ‘disinterested’ tone one often finds in a contemporary evangelical journal of theology.”³⁵ Similarly, in seminary there is an underlying belief that scholarship creates the danger of being prideful, emotionally disconnected from biblical mandates, and disinterested in actually living out biblical commands. For example, while writing this paper, one professor, intending encouraging sentiment, benignly emailed me, “I hope that your paper can reflect the best of academics and the passion of the practitioner.”

“The ‘passion of the practitioner’”? I queried. What about the passion of the academic? Why the dichotomy? Has theory and doctrine so annihilated passionate faith from scholars that it must be borrowed from others? Who counts as a practitioner, or is that simply a different attitude toward the same work? The same semester in a systematic theology class discussing the attributes of God, a classmate argued that one succumbed to sinful desires by discussing God in an “overly academic” manner, believing such speech distorted God’s gift of human language. I responded that “his notion of overly academic was subjective, and agreed that intentionally creating the aura of intellectual sophistication is sinful pride. However, equating sinful desires with ‘overly academic’ is insulting to scholars, and widens the gap between practical ministry and scholarship.” This particular discussion, along with the confessions of guilt by scholars writing on James 2, prompted a search for a benevolent perspective to understand the faith and work of theologians.

The faith of scholars cannot be assessed by academic tone, or associated with James’s orthodox demons in 2:19 who believe “God is one” but do nothing more, or equated to a mere verbal exercise without devaluing scholarly work and academic traditions, which have no bearing on the validity of one’s faith. Genuinely faithful theologians who are pondering, writing and teaching doctrine are not intellectualizing creed at the expense of works done in faith. Rather intellectual work can sufficiently encompass both faith and action, a position which is clarified by Luther’s doctrine of vocation.

ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE: LUTHER’S DOCTRINE OF VOCATION

What actions are proper for theologians who speak and write about God as a vocation? Luther’s doctrine of vocation sidesteps the problems of theory versus practice. It views one’s unique talents as gifts from God designed providentially for a person’s life which are directed outward, not toward God, but toward neighbors on earth.³⁶ Gustaf Wingren notes how Luther found special support in his oath when appointed doctor of theology, believing that although we are all alike before God in faith, the tasks of our vocations fit unique circumstances ordained by God, and as such, all work will differ greatly.³⁷ An underlying assumption of Luther’s doctrine is that vocation does not constitute good works for the glory of God, but for the good of one’s neighbor.³⁸ Thus, faith is directed toward a heavenly realm, whereas

vocation is focused in the present.³⁹ However, it is through a believer's faith that love is focused on one's neighbor,⁴⁰ bearing the cross for the sake of others out of love for Christ.⁴¹ For Luther, Christ is present in the works of vocation and allows faith to emerge as one carries the cross of vocation. Faith and works are inseparable; if a person works for others, he needs God's help which drives him to faith.⁴² However, Luther is clear that all works in vocation are not equated with a relationship with God, through which good works flow to neighbors. Indeed, he believes one should not be anxious that one's works are not sufficiently righteous.⁴³

Wingren interprets Luther to mean that faith does not require specific work because faith is demonstrated by doing work best suited for each moment and occasion.⁴⁴ If one good work is as good as another, believers should not compare their works to others. Ethical work lies behind the ordinary tasks of vocational life, and right ethics is not found in specific outward behavior imposed on all.⁴⁵ Luther's doctrine demonstrates how good works fit practically into the life of the justified believer, not as works of the law (Gal 2:16) but as an inevitable extension of an acting living faith relatively consistent with James. If someone has been called, for example, to be a theologian, God's purpose is providentially fulfilled in them particularly when the good works of theologians are for the good of one's neighbors.⁴⁶

THE THEOLOGIAN'S NEIGHBORS

Who are the neighbors of theologians? This constituency includes other theologians, colleagues, administrators, editors, publishers, assistants, pastors, students, lay people reading theological works, and the church at large. While the theologian may prefer abstract ideas, Gene Veith explains that good works and moral actions are located in "the real, messy world of everyday life, in the conflicts and responsibilities of the world."⁴⁷ Yet, is the espousal of doctrine messy enough? As if to legitimize the work of theological scholars, Veith adds, "I write books and articles and teach college students."⁴⁸ Certainly, conflicts and responsibilities are part of teaching and writing. Given the focus on individual differences, the doctrine of vocation validates the theoretical work of the theologian within their own academic social location.

Thus, when theologian Hart laments earlier, "[e]ven my own writing on the obligation to move beyond merely talking our faith does not go beyond

talking my faith,”⁴⁹ in light of Luther’s doctrine, Hart is doing good deeds by the activities of his own vocation through theoretical contemplation, writing, teaching and presenting papers. The doctrine of vocation frees him from the guilt that he is not doing good works, and allows him to view his unique contribution in the way God works through him. Similarly, when the previously mentioned classmate argues that one gives into sinful desires by discussing God in an “overly academic” manner, academic language can be viewed as a unique gift allowing communication with other colleagues and students, rather than distorting God’s gift of human language, as relevant neighbors are served.

VOCATION AND SIN: A THEOLOGIAN OF GLORY VS. A THEOLOGIAN OF THE CROSS

For Luther, both good works, as well as sin, are done in vocation. As Veith notes, sin can be viewed as “a violation of one’s calling,” and “every vocation has its unique temptations and capacity for sin.”⁵⁰ Accordingly, Luther discusses two ways of being a theologian: “a theologian of glory,” leading toward sin, and “a theologian of the cross, leading toward Christ.”⁵¹ Luther explains, “A theologian of glory calls good evil and evil good.”⁵² When Luther first introduced this concept, he named it *theologia illusoria* meaning “to make believe, play at, or self-amusement” belittling the Aristotelian scholastics.⁵³ Vanhoozer further explains how the theologian of glory “relies on his own capabilities,” “succumbs to pride, the ultimate intellectual vice,” and is consequently “less likely to arrive at truth.”⁵⁴ Timothy Wengert, referring to the theologian of glory, adds “this make-believe theology turns everything upside down by refusing to connect suffering or the cross to God and God’s will.”⁵⁵

Luther’s theologian of glory relies on the theologian’s own abilities or genius, building theology on their expectations of God, rather than God’s revelation of himself on the cross. Luther is aligned with Paul in 1 Corinthians 1 who contrasts between the wisdom of humanity and the wisdom of God. Wengert asserts, “however often theologians agree that they are dealing with second-order discourse in theology, the temptation still lurks to make that discourse worth something before God.”⁵⁶ Wengert eloquently explains, “[i]n the theological enterprise, there is no greater temptation to sin than this. Evil lurks, not in that we think and speak about God, but, rather, in

that we imagine that our thoughts and words determine to some degree the outcome of our encounter with God.”⁵⁷ He continues “[o]ur temptation is always to have faith in theology or, even worse, faith in faith,” adding that “any claim that theology brings a blessing surely glitters with glory.”⁵⁸

In contrast to a theologian of glory, Luther explains how a theologian of the cross calls “the thing which it actually is,” referring to those who look to the cross for the revelation of Christ, and build their theology in light of God’s revelation of himself on the cross.⁵⁹ Thus, theologians of the cross exist as God intends, understanding life and righteousness in terms of the cross as revealed by Christ, and not by man’s image of God. Nevertheless, even though a theologian of the cross brings good news about God’s desire to save the suffering, the theologian usually does not offer solutions.⁶⁰ Wengert cautions that the “elitist” advice of theologians seeking to help at a practical level is often contextually misguided potentially causing greater harm.⁶¹

Helmut Thielicke illustrates a theologian operating within his own glory, and a kingdom of Satan ruled by sinful self-promotion exemplifying how a theologian should not help his neighbor. He imagines a young theologian answering questions of a shy layman using technical terms like “synoptic tradition,” “hermeneutical principle,” “realized eschatology,” and “presupposition,” which he describes as a form of shock therapy.⁶² As an alternative to shock therapy, Vanhoozer portrays theologians as doctors and farmers growing healthy disciples.⁶³ As doctors of the church, he compares doctrine to a health-giving tonic—in fact the “only reliable tonic to the toxins of worldliness, meaningless and hopelessness.”⁶⁴ “Doctors of the church,” declares Vanhoozer, “prescribe doctrine to awaken those who are sleepwalking their way through life to what is really going on.”⁶⁵ He compares the theologian or teacher of doctrine as the church’s primary care physician.⁶⁶ Vanhoozer argues that the prime constituency for the theologian is not the academy but the church.⁶⁷ As doctors of the church, he argues that theologians serve the church by helping pastors understand truth, and the goodness and beauty of Christ, and in turn, “the sermon is lifesaving surgery on the body of Christ.”⁶⁸ Thus, Vanhoozer’s metaphors illustrate how theologians might conceptualize the integration of faithful doctrine and good works addressed by both James and Luther. However, even the goal to help pastors faithfully integrate doctrine suggests that academic traditions are secondary at best. If the primary audience of theologians is not a member of the academic

community, what values lies in addressing fellow academics? Regardless of whether academics directly address pastors or laity, they serve the ultimate goal of integrating faithful doctrine through peer review and standards for evidence that contribute to scholarly debates, which as a body, shape doctrines taught by the church.

Kelly Kopic, specifically addressing theologians, also integrates the spirit of both James and Luther by the term “anthroposensitive theology” meaning “a refusal to divorce theological considerations from practical human application, since theological reflections are always interwoven with anthropological concerns.”⁶⁹ Citing James 1:27, Kopic affirms, “theology must reflect God’s compassion and care for our neighbors” particularly “the most vulnerable and in need,”⁷⁰ warning “theology that lacks compassion and action is no theology at all.”⁷¹ He continues, “[s]uch compassion is not just an important civic virtue.”⁷² It “protects against a false worship” reflecting “divided hearts and divided minds” which concern both James and Luther.⁷³ Although theologians of the cross are preferable to theologians of glory, Wengert nevertheless cautions that the “cross has often functioned in theology as a sneaky way to excuse social structures that oppress the poor and weak.”⁷⁴ Kopic would agree, affirming, “neglect of love for our neighbor confines theology to a pursuit of personal peace, self-improvement and a detached spirituality” that “God equates with adultery (Is 1:21).”⁷⁵ Thus, whatever actions theologians chose for their vocation, taking care of the needy is still a responsibility in which everyone shares regardless of specific vocation.

CONCLUSION

Both James and Luther encourage believers to serve others. While Luther prefers the notion that one is not working for God, but rather for others as his instruments,⁷⁶ his concept of vocation offers theological scholars a unique perspective regarding good works also demanded by James. In effect, Luther’s doctrine of vocation assuages the guilt theological scholars might experience reading James, fearing their specific work fails to demonstrate a living faith (Jas 2:17). Under Luther’s doctrine, mundane and unique vocational tasks of believers qualify as good works, not necessarily for God’s sake, but more importantly, for the good of unique earthly neighbors providentially placed by God. In a sense, Luther’s doctrine clarifies the sanctification process at

a practical level for believers through the good works of unique vocational tasks regardless of how one interprets James's notion of works and faith. One is obliged to help their neighbor whether one interprets James 2 to mean works justify, or works sanctify; or whether one defines faith as mere creed, or active, justifying and saving. Accordingly, theological scholars, called by God, do good works by serving others through intellectual tasks defined by the academy which ideally reflect the spirit and actions of a faithful Christian life and imitate Christ.⁷⁷

-
- ¹ Douglas Moo, *The Letter of James* (PNTC; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 131.
 - ² Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "What are Theologians For? Why Doctors of the Church Should Prescribe Christian Doctrine," in *Pictures at a Theological Exhibition: Scenes of the Church's Worship, Witness, and Wisdom* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2016), 52.
 - ³ *Ibid.*
 - ⁴ *Ibid.*, 54.
 - ⁵ *Ibid.*
 - ⁶ Andrew Wilson, "Why Being a Pastor-Scholar is Nearly Impossible," *Christianity Today* [cited 25 September 2015]. Online: <http://www.christianitytoday.com/ct/2015/>.
 - ⁷ John Gunson, *God, Ethics, and the Secular Society: Does the Church Have a Future*, Australian Ebook Publisher, Appendix 3 "How We Missed the Bus: Contemporary Theology and the Question of God."
 - ⁸ Millard J. Erickson, *Christian Theology*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2013), 44n43.
 - ⁹ *Ibid.*, 44n42.
 - ¹⁰ A. J. Conyers, "Three Sources of the Secular Mind," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41, no. 2 (June 1998): 313.
 - ¹¹ *Ibid.*
 - ¹² *Ibid.*
 - ¹³ John F. Hart, "How to Energize Our Faith: Reconsidering the Meaning of James 2:14-26," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society*, no. 1 (Spring 1999), 65.
 - ¹⁴ R. Heiligenthal, "ἔργον," in *NIDNTT* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986), 50-51.
 - ¹⁵ Moo, *The Letter of James*, 36.
 - ¹⁶ Lorin I. Cranford, "An Exposition of James," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 29, no. 1 (1986): 19.
 - ¹⁷ Frank Thielman, *Theology of the New Testament: A Canonical and Synthetic Approach* (Grand Rapids, MI: 2005), 505.
 - ¹⁸ *Ibid.*
 - ¹⁹ *Ibid.*
 - ²⁰ William Varner, *James* (Evangelical Exegetical Commentary; Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012), 286.
 - ²¹ Hart, "How to Energize Our Faith," 65.
 - ²² *Ibid.*
 - ²³ *Ibid.*
 - ²⁴ Moo, *The Letter of James*, 127.
 - ²⁵ William D. Mounce, *Basis of Biblical Greek Grammar*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009), 295. See also G. K. Beale, Daniel J. Brendsel, and William A. Ross, *An Interpretive Lexicon of New Testament Greek: Analysis of Prepositions, Adverbs, Particles, Relative Pronouns and Conjunctions* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014), 67, 76.
 - ²⁶ Michael W. Holmes, *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition* (Lexham Press, Society of Biblical Literature, 2011-2013), Jas 2:14. See also Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan), 217.
 - ²⁷ Ralph P. Martin, *James* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Word, 1998), 80.

- ²⁸ Varner, *James*, 275-288.
- ²⁹ John F. Hart, "The Faith of Demons: James 2:19," *Journal of the Grace Evangelical Society* 8, no. 2 (Autumn, 1995): 42.
- ³⁰ Hart, "The Faith of Demons," 42 who quotes R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), 585; and James Montgomery Boice, *Christ's Call to Discipleship* (Chicago, IL: Moody, 1986), 17.
- ³¹ Moo, *The Letter of James*, 131.
- ³² C. L. Mitton, *The Epistle of James* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1966), 110, quoted in Moo, *The Letter of James*, 130.
- ³³ Moo, *The Letter of James*, 30-131.
- ³⁴ J. I. Packer, *Knowing God* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1973), 23.
- ³⁵ Gerald Hiestand, "Taxonomy of the Pastor-Theologian: Why Ph.D. Students Should Consider the Pastorate as the Context for Their Theological Scholarship." Modified version of paper presented at the Symposium of the Society for the Advancement of Ecclesial Theology, Chicago, IL, October 12, 2009.
- ³⁶ Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation* (trans. Carl C. Rasmussen; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1957), 180.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, 172, 178.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 19, 94.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*, 12.
- ⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 14.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 29, 31.
- ⁴² *Ibid.*, 32.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 50.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 177.
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 181.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 72.
- ⁴⁷ Gene Edward Veith, Jr., *God at Work: Your Christian Vocation in All of Life* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2002), 38.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁹ Hart, "How to Energize Our Faith," 65.
- ⁵⁰ Veith, *God at Work*, 135.
- ⁵¹ *Luther's Works* (ed., Helmut T. Lehman and Jaroslav Pelikan; St. Louis, MO: Concordia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1955-1986), 31:225-6. See also *LW* 31:129-30, 212.
- ⁵² *LW* 31:225-26.
- ⁵³ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 201. *LW* 31:225-6. See also Timothy J. Wengert, "Peace, Peace...Cross, Cross: Reflections on How Martin Luther Relates the Theology of the Cross to Suffering, *Theology Today*" 59:2 (July 2002), 201.
- ⁵⁴ Kevin J. Vanhoozer, "The Wisdom of Angels: Brokenness and Wholeness in the Academy and Church," *Pictures at a Theological Exhibition: Scenes of the Church's Worship, Witness and Wisdom* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2016), 291.
- ⁵⁵ Wengert, "Peace, Peace...Cross, Cross," 201.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 192.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁹ *LW* 31:129-30, 212, 227.
- ⁶⁰ Wengert, "Peace, Peace...Cross, Cross," 203.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁶² Helmut Thielicke, *A Little Exercise for Young Theologians* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1962), 13-14.
- ⁶³ Vanhoozer, "What are Theologians For?" 69-71.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 67.
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 68-69.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 69.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁹ Kopic, *A Little Book for New Theologians*, 47. See also Kelly M. Kopic, *Communication with God: The Divine and the Human in the Theology of John Owen* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 33-44, quoted in Kopic, *A Little Book for New Theologians*, 47.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁷¹ Ibid., 83-84.

⁷² Ibid., 86.

⁷³ Ibid., 86-87.

⁷⁴ Wengert, "Peace, Peace...Cross, Cross," 192.

⁷⁵ Kopic, *A Little Book for New Theologians*, 89.

⁷⁶ Veith, *God at Work*, 151.

⁷⁷ Special thanks to Myron Kauk, Thomas Breimaier, Gary Colledge, Ryan Heinsch, David Hudson, Isaac Johnson, and Carl Sanders for reviewing a draft of this article and making numerous suggestions.