

We Preach Christ Crucified: Rejecting the Prosperity Gospel and Responding to Feminist Criticism Using Luther's Second Theology of the Cross

By Daniel J. Peterson

Abstract: This article affirms that Luther's theology of the cross should serve as a counterpoint to ideologies like the prosperity gospel that encourage adherents to amass personal wealth while remaining indifferent to the suffering of others. To employ Luther's theology of the cross responsibly, however, one must take into consideration the feminist critique that it potentially encourages passive suffering and abuse, especially on the part of women in abusive situations who are told to 'bear their cross' and simply endure what they suffer. A second theology of the cross implicit in Luther's writings, one that portrays God not as the cause of suffering but as the healing power that brings life out of suffering and death that already exists, provides the basis for a rejection of the prosperity gospel while meeting (at least partially) the concern of feminist critics.

Key Terms: prosperity gospel, Joel Osteen, hidden God, feminist theology, Kazoh Kitamori

The Gospel According to Osteen

Nowhere in America today is the power—and profit—of positive thinking more evident than at Joel Osteen's Lakewood Community Church in Houston, Texas. On any given Sunday, Osteen preaches to thousands in his congregation and millions of television viewers across the country. His message is simple: "God wants to increase you financially, by giving you promotions, fresh ideas and creativity."¹ If you are stuck in a rut, says Osteen,

"God has more in store." If your small business is floundering, "God has more in store." If your house is too small, your possessions too modest, or your income too meager, "God has more in store." These promises of 'more in store' are the gospel according to Osteen. The good life, a life rich in material wealth and prosperity, comes to believers as a sign of divine favor and blessing.

How, then, does one obtain the material wealth and prosperity that God ostensibly offers? Osteen advises his audiences to adjust the way they think and then to trust God. "If you expect defeat, failure, or mediocrity," he writes in his most popular

Daniel Peterson is currently teaching as a visiting assistant professor of religion at Pacific Lutheran University in Tacoma, Washington. This updated and expanded essay was originally delivered as the Pacific Lutheran University Department of Religion University Lecture on March 12, 2007.

book, *Your Best Life Now*, “your subconscious mind will make sure that you lose, fail or sabotage every attempt to push above average.”² By contrast, “if you obey God and are willing to trust Him, you will have the best this life has to offer—and more.”³ Such a claim, the critical reader will observe, is hardly new. As Jason Byassee points out, “*Your Best Life Now* is [merely] another entry in the long list of American contributions to the prosperity gospel: just improve your attitude, keep your chin up, and God’s blessings will rain down on you. Russell Conwell said it a century ago, Norman Vincent Peale said it 50 years ago and Bruce Wilkinson said it with *The Prayer of Jabez* a few years back.”⁴

Of course, whether the Apostle Paul said it 2000 years ago remains another question. Few biblical scholars or theologians would say he does. In fact, when Paul expresses what could be the heart of the Christian message in his first letter to the Corinthians, he speaks of anything but success, prosperity, or ‘the best this life has to offer.’ Instead, he focuses upon the ‘scandal’ or ‘stumbling block’ of the crucifixion, noting the apparent folly of a messiah whose life ends shamefully with a cry of God-abandonment and defeat on a cross (I Cor 1:1-25; see also Mk 15:34, Mt 27:46).

Centuries later, Martin Luther would recover the apostle’s theology of the cross as a response to the methods of medieval scholastic theology. For Luther, a theologian of the cross should not expect to find God where God ‘ought’ to be—at the summit of human intellectual, moral, or spiritual aspiration. Rather, a theologian of the cross should take as her point of departure the “humility and shame of the cross,”⁵ which is the place where God comes to us or ‘condescends’ to human limitation, as Karl Barth says. By insisting upon the cross as the starting point for thinking about God, Luther would turn theological method on its head. As Timothy Lull remarks: “If God is present in Jesus at the moment of defeat and rejection, then most of our guesses about who God is and where God is to be found (in glory, power, and success) are wrong.”⁶

Cross as Counterpoint

The contrast, then, between a theology of the cross and the gospel of prosperity is obvious. God is not primarily present in the midst of what Osteen terms increase, abundance, and ‘more in store’—places we expect God to be. Instead, as the crucifixion silently suggests, God resides *preferentially* among those in society who have ‘less than’—that is, the marginalized, the suffering, the weak, the powerless, the widow, the orphan, and the poor. The theology of the cross accordingly marks one of the few substantive antidotes one has against a message like Osteen’s that, in the words of Douglas John Hall, “provides its adherents, especially among the more affluent peoples of Earth, with a panoply of well-being that effectively insulates them against the suffering of many creatures, human and extra-human” alike.⁷ Luther’s theology of the cross, in short, carries with it enormous critical and prophetic power as a counterpoint to the gospel of wealth and prosperity.

A Feminist Critique

Prophetic and critical power notwithstanding, the theology of the cross also has its detractors, especially among feminist theologians like Rebecca Parker and Joanne Carlson Brown.⁸ According to Parker and Brown, theologies of the cross encourage victims of abuse and oppression to endure their suffering passively. Imagine, they might say, the way Luther’s advice to Christians in the sixteenth century could sound to a woman facing domestic assault today: “[S]he who is a Christian must also bear a cross. And the more you are wronged, the better it is for you. Therefore, you must accept such a cross willingly from God and thank Him. This is true suffering that is pleasing to God.”⁹ Far from speaking prophetic truth to privilege or power, the argument goes, Luther’s theology of the cross “support[s] systems of oppression by demanding

self-sacrifice and suffering from the weak while at the same time justifying oppression and abuse by the powerful.”¹⁰ By contrast, Christians should encourage resistance to suffering and not reinforce it with appeals to the cross.

Two Theologies of the Cross

Here we are obliged to return to Luther and place his theology under scrutiny, particularly if we wish to retain his understanding of the cross as a viable critique of a prosperity gospel that endorses amassing personal wealth and power while typically remaining indifferent to the world’s poor and disenfranchised. We ask: does Luther’s theology of the cross necessarily encourage victims of poverty and abuse to endure their predicament as “true suffering that is pleasing to God?” Or can Luther’s theology of the cross remain a tool for affirming God’s hidden presence among the maltreated and marginalized in a way that challenges the cycle of abuse and systems of oppression on a local or even global scale? I submit it can, but only after we go beyond more recent feminist retrievals of Luther by acknowledging a fundamental ambiguity that exists *within the Reformer’s writings themselves*: namely, that implicit especially in the early writings of Luther we find not one, but two theologies of the cross.

To tease out the existence of two theologies of the cross in Luther’s early writings, we begin by looking briefly at the work of the Japanese Lutheran theologian, Kazoh Kitamori. According to Kitamori, God’s wrath is the cause of pain and suffering in the world because of human sin. This view is one that Kitamori lifts from Luther’s *Lectures on Romans* as well as *The Bondage of the Will*. It represents what will be identified as Luther’s first theology of the cross, a theology that names God as the cause of death and suffering. The second theology of the cross, evident in Luther’s early sermons and in his *Lectures on Hebrews*, specifies not that God causes suffering, but that God uses the suffering that already exists in the world to create “life [out of] the antitheses of suffering and death.”¹¹ The aim here will be to reject Luther’s first theology of the cross

as a way to incorporate the rightful concerns raised by feminist theologians like Parker and Brown, and then to resurrect Luther’s second theology of the cross as a way of renewing the prophetic protest against the gospel of prosperity and its disregard for the marginalized and the poor of contemporary American society, if not the world.

Luther’s First Theology of the Cross

The conviction that death and suffering are somehow the will of God is widespread among people today. One need only attend a funeral service to hear clichés like ‘It was her time’ or ‘The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.’ In Lutheran theology, the idea that God wills death appears in the work of Kazoh Kitamori, the Japanese theologian noted above whose *Theology of the Pain of God* was originally published in 1946. For Kitamori, God the Father intends wrath and destruction upon all human beings because of their sin. God the Son, however, intercedes on humanity’s behalf in the name of grace, mercy, forgiveness and love. The will of the Father and the will of the Son collide in the process, the result of which is the pain of God. As Kitamori explains, “God who must sentence sinners to death fought with God who wishes to love them. The fact that this fighting God is not different gods but the same God causes his pain.”¹² The essence of divine being is thus love rooted in divine pain, a pain that gives purpose to human suffering insofar as such suffering testifies to the pain of God.

God as the Cause of Death and Suffering: Kazoh Kitamori

Kitamori’s attempt to find meaning in the midst of suffering must have made sense to some of his contemporaries in Japan following the aftermath of the Second World War. Not only can those of faith who are in pain discover purpose by witnessing to the pain of God, they also may find consolation in

the conviction that God suffers as humanity suffers. What may be less comforting, however, is that Kitamori simultaneously identifies God as the *cause* of human pain, if not the author of death itself. “The Lord wants to heal our wounds which were caused by God’s wrath,” he writes. “[T]his Lord suffers wounds, himself receiving his wrath [on the cross].”¹³ Here the critical observer may pause to notice a troubling resemblance between God’s interaction with humanity and what psychologists today term the ‘repair and honeymooning’ phase of abusive relationships, one where the male perpetrator attempts “to quickly fix the relationship after an abusive episode so that he can feel good about himself and [regain] control again as fast as possible.”¹⁴ Such is one difficulty—indeed the major difficulty—with the theology of the pain of God.

The difficulty persists when we turn to Luther, Kitamori’s primary theological source. Luther’s hidden God and the pain of God, Kitamori maintains, are virtually indistinguishable. Indeed, Kitamori writes, “the God who sends man into hell and death in order to cleanse mankind is the ‘hidden God’” of Luther’s theology.¹⁵ This is the God, to cite Luther directly, who “hid his gracious will and his good purposes beneath his wrath and punishment.”¹⁶ Here Kitamori provides what looks like an important qualification of Luther’s perspective: “God sends man into hell and death, not to kill him, but to give him real life. God hides his love beneath his wrath.”¹⁷ Regardless of God’s final intentions, however, there can be little doubt that Luther himself poses the same problem evident in Kitamori: the notion that “the wrath of God is the *means* of revealing his love”¹⁸ carries with it the potential consequence of justifying the cycle of abuse in relationships. Here God is the author of suffering and death; and like an abusive parent, spouse or partner, God justifies punishing humanity *for its own good*.

Luther and God’s Agency

Luther claims that God is the cause of death and suffering at several points throughout his writings. In 1527, for example, as an epidemic sweeps

through the tiny town of Wittenberg, Luther writes that “we can be sure that God’s punishment has come upon us, not only to chastise us for our sins but also to test our faith [in God] and love for our neighbor.”¹⁹ And yet, Luther continues by blaming the spread of the plague not on God but on ‘evil spirits,’ the devil, and even human beings who tempt God by saying that “if [God] wants to protect [the dying] he can do so without medicines or our carefulness.”²⁰ This tension, one where Luther cites both God and other agents like the devil, evil spirits or human beings as the cause of death, has similarities with the Reformer’s theology of the cross, articulated almost a decade earlier.

Luther’s most famous treatment of the theology of the cross occurs in the *Heidelberg Disputation* of 1518. In this document he contends that God ‘punishes us’ and causes us to suffer for the purposes of redemption, reflecting what Jos Vercruysse identifies in Luther’s theology as the “twofold way by which God operates with man.”²¹ God uses a foreign or ‘alien work’ (i.e., a work foreign to God’s nature like death, sorrow, judgment, and wrath) to bring about God’s ‘proper work,’ which appears in “the resurrection of Christ, justification in the Spirit, and the vivification of the new man.”²² Herein lies the key that unlocks the basic meaning of Luther’s theology of the cross: God’s proper work or essential nature lies “hidden under its opposite” so that “our life is hidden under death . . . salvation under damnation . . . heaven under hell, wisdom under foolishness, righteousness under sin, [and] power under weakness.”²³ Far from finding God in the glory and majesty of creation or in human achievement and success—which reason easily grasps and expects—Luther insists that the true recognition of God begins where God has come to us in “the humility and shame of the cross.”²⁴

One may rightly praise Luther here for critically anticipating the gospel of prosperity described above, a ‘gospel’ that arguably extols self-sufficiency over trust in God and brushes aside what David Tracy calls the socio-economic ‘non-person’ in the interest of personal gain. The trouble with Luther’s theology of the cross, however, is that it sometimes makes God the *cause* of suffering and oppression,

implying rather abusively that God makes us suffer for our own good. While Luther often holds that God's alien work occurs through the preaching of the law, which convicts human beings of sin, there are points where God directly "operates his alien work to do his proper work."²⁵ Christ's death is one example. Luther writes, "When [God] wanted to glorify [Christ] and establish him in his Kingship, [God] made him die, he caused him to be confounded and to descend into hell."²⁶ God works likewise among the rest of us: God not only "makes a person a sinner so that he may make him righteous," as Luther says with regard to the preaching of the law; God also actively 'punishes us' and "humbles us thoroughly, making us despair, so that he may exalt us in his mercy, giving us hope."²⁷ So it is, Luther concludes in his *Lectures on Romans*, that "[i]f God should not test us by tribulation, it would not be possible for any man to be saved."²⁸

Luther's position that God actively causes death and despair to bring about new life and resurrection represents what I term his *first* theology of the cross. Here God directly wills human pain and suffering, even if through an 'alien work' that is otherwise foreign to God's true and essential nature. Feminist theologians like Parker and Brown are right to reject such a theology. Not only does it paint God as an abusive tyrant by insisting that God resorts to means totally inconsistent with God's revealed nature of love (Jn 4:8), it also bears horrendous practical implications for women who find themselves in situations of domestic abuse. On grounds both theological and pragmatic, therefore, Luther's first theology of the cross can and should be rejected.

Luther's Second Theology of the Cross

The good news, of course, is that another theology of the cross exists implicitly in Luther's writings, one that actually is more prevalent both in the Reformer's usage and in its appropriation by contemporary theologians. This version of the *theologia*

crucis denies that God actively causes death and suffering to bring about new life. Instead, God uses the suffering that already exists in fallen creation or what Tillich more technically calls the estrangement of nature from its divine ground to bring about, however fragmentarily, new life, new creation, and new being.

God Works through Suffering that already Exists

The move to affirm God's presence in suffering without attributing the suffering itself to God reflects a growing (though often implicit) tendency among theologians today. Kathryn Kleinhans serves as a helpful example. She writes, "While the cross is a scandal to non-believers, Christians confirm that God's saving power works through such weakness (I Cor 1:23-25, 2 Cor 12:9)."²⁹ Notice that Kleinhans does not say that God is the source of such weakness, much less the suffering through which God works. At least two tendencies in Luther's early writings support the existence of this second theology of the cross.

God Allows Suffering

The first tendency is the careful distinction Luther makes at points between God causing suffering and God 'allowing' or 'letting' suffering to happen. We find this distinction stated clearly in a sermon Luther preaches on the fourth Sunday after Epiphany in 1517, in which he interprets the story of the sleeping Jesus and his disciples at sea in the midst of a storm (Mt 8:23-27). The disciples, we recall, begin to fear the storm and, drawing near to Jesus, awake him and plead, "Our Lord, save us, we are perishing" (v. 25). Jesus silences the storm thereafter, though not without chiding the disciples for their lack of faith. For Luther, this story illustrates for all of those likewise "who find water breaking into their ship" that "while [Christ] abandons us he is upholding us and while he is allowing us to go through storms in terror he is bringing us forward."³⁰ One sees here the presence of Luther's

theology of the cross, only without the claim that God or Christ directly causes the turmoil in question; nor does Luther advise that a person should remain in the storm to please God.

Luther concludes the story of the storm by advising his hearers to distrust themselves and place their confidence in God, particularly in the midst of fear and anxiety. Again, he chooses language that avoids attributing the storm directly to God's will, implying that God *uses what is already the case* to achieve God's purposes of redemption. "Therefore," Luther declares, "sleep on, Lord Jesus, that thou mayest awake, and let us perish, that thou mayest save us."³¹ While the conviction that God 'allows' or 'lets' bad things to happen may not please all critics, Luther's move in this direction as a sixteenth century Christian is somewhat astounding. It pushes his theology at least partially beyond the critique of theologians like Parker and Brown, who rightly reject the assertion that God wills or wants abuse for humanity's own good. It even places Luther in proximity with the contemporary process theologian Catherine Keller who argues concerning Psalm 107 that "[t]he thundering divine waves" mentioned in the Psalm "do not describe the *cause* but rather the *condition* of suffering. The psalm almost blames God but—like Job in miniature—gets [in] mid-storm a different insight."³²

God Uses the Work of the Devil

The next tendency in Luther that supports the existence of a second theology of the cross surfaces in his comments on death in the 1517 *Lectures to the Hebrews*. Under the heading "Concerning the Contempt of Death," Luther says bluntly that "Scripture attributes death to the devil." He then cites texts ranging from The Wisdom of Solomon to Ezekiel, the Psalms, Revelation, John, and Galatians to arrive at the conclusion that God (at least in principle) has destroyed death, concluding that "if death were the work of God, He would not destroy it." The language of 'work' reintroduces a distinction we noted already between a 'proper' and 'alien' work of God. In his *Lectures on Hebrews*

Luther again speaks of death as an 'alien deed' that God uses to bring about God's 'proper work' of new life and salvation, but in this context he adds a profoundly important qualification. The passage merits full citation:

For in this way [that is, God's defeat of the devil through Christ and the saints] God promotes and completes His work by means of an alien deed, and by His wonderful wisdom He compels the devil to work through death nothing else than life, so that in this way, while he [the devil] acts most of all against the work of God, he acts for the work of God and against his own work with his own deed. For thus [the devil] worked death in Christ, but Christ completely swallowed up death in Himself through the immortality of His divinity and rose again in glory.³³

For Luther, in other words, God does not cause death, not even through an alien work or deed. Instead, God uses the devil who is the cause of death to achieve God's purposes of mercy and salvation. This removes the responsibility for death and suffering from God, and shows instead how God (quite ingeniously, actually) *uses what already exists*, namely, the reality of pain and suffering in the world that the devil symbolizes and personifies, to bring life out of death and suffering without causing the suffering itself. God is not to blame.

We have seen, then, two tendencies in Luther that suggest the existence of a second theology of the cross. The first is the distinction Luther makes between God causing human suffering and God 'allowing' or 'letting' suffering occur so as to bring about God's redemptive purposes. The second tendency appears in the suggestion that the devil, not God, commits the 'alien work' of death, pain, weakness, and despair. This attribution of suffering to a force other than God anticipates what Luther would say ten years later in his comments on the plague where, we recall, he ultimately blames the spread of disease on the devil, evil spirits, and human beings who tempt God by refusing to do anything about the sickness themselves. While Luther sometimes says more than we would like him to say regarding the first theology of the cross, a

second—sometimes hidden—theology of the cross emerges on the other side of criticism that bypasses some of the feminist critique, at least insofar as Luther cites other reasons for suffering instead of God. That suffering presumably remains as a precondition for redemption admittedly persists as a difficulty, but the depiction of God as abusive has been challenged.

Conclusion and Implications

Our discussion has shown that a fundamental ambiguity in Luther's early writings arguably gives rise to two theologies of the cross. By clarifying and then rejecting the first theology of the cross, I have tried to circumvent the criticism that Luther's theology lends itself to the cycle of abuse by valorizing suffering on the part of the weak while justifying abuse by the powerful. Along with my argument, there are other theological resources that attempt to recover Luther's theology of the cross in a way that benefits those in need. Marit Trelstad, for example, argues with respect to Luther's *Heidelberg Disputation* that a theology of the cross is really an epistemology of the cross, one that discloses how "one knows God and the world through the lens of suffering," even though it needs to be complemented (says Trelstad) by Luther's discussion of the experience of grace, his doctrine of justification, and the resurrection. The present article has tried to take the conversation a step further, highlighting the promise of Luther's perspective but adding (*pace* Trelstad) that there is a real stumbling block in his first theology of the cross that must be acknowledged as more than an epistemology, and thereafter rejected. Only then can we highlight and recover his second theology of the cross.

The second theology of the cross implies that God does not directly cause human suffering. Instead, God uses the suffering that already exists to bring life out of death, hope out of despair, and healing out of hurt. God acts as the healing power in nature and history, paradoxically present (according to the example of the cross) in moments of suffering, defeat, and despair. A theologian of the

cross can counter the prosperity gospel by insisting that the point of Christian faith is not to cast an indifferent eye to the suffering other while piling up personal wealth for oneself. The point of the Christian faith is to be there for the suffering other. A genuine theology of the cross makes this possible, reminding us that where we think God ought to be (in power, wealth, success, and glory) is not actually where God is (by faith). The antidote prophetic Christianity has against the prosperity gospel is thus a protest born of the splinters of a cross. That protest, I submit, becomes a real possibility once we uncover Luther's second theology of the cross and, to cite Luther's words from the *Heidelberg Disputation* directly, learn to call a thing like Osteen's prosperity gospel 'what it actually is.'³⁴

Endnotes

1. Joel Osteen, *Your Best Life Now: 7 Steps to Living at Your Full Potential* (New York: Warner Faith, 2004), 5.

2. *Ibid.*, 13.

3. *Ibid.*, 306.

4. Jason Byassee, "The Health and Wealth Gospel: Be Happy," *Christian Century* (July 2005), 20.

5. Martin Luther, "The Heidelberg Disputation" in *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, 2nd edition, ed. Timothy Lull (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 57.

6. Timothy Lull, *Luther and Lutheranism*, ed. Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary Class of 2005 (Berkeley, CA: Three Trees Press, 2006), 57.

7. Douglas Hall, "Theology of the Cross: Challenge and Opportunity for the Post-Christendom Church" in *Cross Examinations: Readings on the Meanings of the Cross Today*, ed. Marit Trelstad (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 256. Hall's criticism is essentially pragmatic: ideologies like the prosperity gospel have the consequence of making their adherents indifferent to others as they seek to benefit themselves financially and materially. An equally powerful theological criticism warns us in the name of Paul Tillich's Protestant Principle that the prosperity gospel is tantamount to idolatry. As Nathaniel Holmes observes, "The focus of the prosperity gospel can easily turn from enhancing religious faith, enriching impoverished communities, and promoting healthy living to merely a grasp at wealth with theological justification. In other words, *mammon* has become [what Tillich would call] ultimate concern. If we are consumed with the pursuit of wealth and health, then we have abandoned faith in God and relating to others. In this form, the prosperity gospel demonstrates the state of human estrangement from the ground of being" ("Paul Tillich and the Gospel of Prosperity." Paper presented at the American Academy of Religion, Chicago, [November 2008], 11).

8. See Joanne Carlson Brown and Rebecca Parker, "For God So Loved the World?" in *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse*, eds. Joanne Carlson

Brown and Carole Bohn (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989), 1–31. For a general but brief overview of the various womanist and feminist theologians who have treated Luther's theology of the cross or, more broadly, the idea that suffering is somehow a precondition for redemption, see Marit Trelstad, "The Way of Salvation in Luther's Theology: A Feminist Evaluation" in *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 45:3 (Fall 2006), 236–245.

9. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, vol. 30, eds. J. Pelikan and W. Hansen (St. Louis: Concordia, 1967), 84. Luther makes it clear in this commentary and elsewhere, however, that such suffering should not be actively sought out.

10. Trelstad, *Cross Examinations*, 1.

11. Erich Seeberg quoted in Kazoh Kitamori, *Theology of the Pain of God* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005), 106.

12. *Ibid.*, 21.

13. *Ibid.*, 22.

14. Charles Donaldson, et al. *Stop Hurting the Woman You Love: Breaking the Cycle of Abusive Behavior* (Center City, MN: Hazelden, 2006), 82. See also Dawn Berry, *The Domestic Violence Sourcebook* (Los Angeles: Lowell House, 2000).

15. Kitamori, *Pain of God*, 107.

16. Martin Luther quoted in Kitamori, *Pain of God*, 105.

17. *Ibid.*, 108.

18. *Ibid.*

19. Luther, "Whether One May Flee from a Deadly Plague," in *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, 744.

20. *Ibid.*, 748.

21. Jos Vercruysse, "Luther's Theology of the Cross at the Time of the Heidelberg Disputation," *Gregorianum*, 57 no. 3 (1976), 530.

22. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, vol. 51, ed. and trans. J. Doberstein (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1959), 19.

23. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, vol. 25, eds. J.J. Pelikan, H.C. Oswald, and H.T. Lehman (St. Louis: Concordia, 1986), 383.

24. Luther, "Heidelberg Disputation," 44.

25. Vercruysse, "Luther's Theology," 544.

26. Luther quoted in Kitamori, *Pain of God*, 109.

27. Luther, "Heidelberg Disputation," 35.

28. Luther, *Luther's Works*, vol. 25, 291.

29. Kathryn Kleinhans, "Lutheranism 101: Culture or Confession?" in *The Lutheran* (June 2006), 14.

30. Luther, *Luther's Works*, vol. 51, 24.

31. *Ibid.*, 25.

32. Catherine Keller, *Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 215. (italics taken from original)

33. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works, vol. 29: Lectures on Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews*, ed. and trans. J. J. Pelikan, H. C. Oswald, and H. T. Lehmann (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 130.

34. Luther, "Heidelberg Disputation," 49.

Copyright of *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.