

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY



Volume 82:1-2

January/April 2018

Table of Contents

Is Law Intrinsic to God's Essence? David P. Scaer	3
Johann Gerhard, the Socinians, and Modern Rejections of Substitutionary Atonement Jack D. Kilcrease	19
Luther on Vocation and Baptism: A Correction to Charismatic and Situational Ways of Discerning God's Call Benjamin T. G. Mayes	45
Paradise Regained: Placing Nicholas Hopman's <i>Lex Aeterna</i> Back in Luther's Frame Nathan Rinne	65
The Theology of the Cross and the Lutheran Confessions Andrew J. Preus	83
The Catholic Paul: Allegory and Perspicuity in Irenaeus's Reading of Scripture James G. Bushur	105
God Is My Strength and My Song: History and Practice of Old Testament Canticles Andrew Gerike	127

Research Notes	139
Misquoting Gieschen	
Theological Observer	143
Billy Graham	
Sermon for Easter Tuesday	
Book Reviews	149
Books Received	159

**Luther on Vocation and Baptism:
A Correction to Charismatic and Situational Ways
of Discerning God’s Call**
Benjamin T. G. Mayes

I. Introduction

The English word *vocation* is ambiguous. Many think of it as a career. We have “vocational schools” that prepare people for a trade or career. Christians remember that the word “vocation” is from the Latin *vocatio* and means a “calling.” Now, if God is doing the calling, then it is a divine calling, a divine vocation. This is what Christians mean when they speak of the doctrine of vocation. But even in this Christian sense, there is an array of ideas loaded on the term. For Roman Catholics, vocation is normally a call to the priesthood or monastic life. For Lutherans, vocation often means that God calls us to the ordinary duties of human life in which we find ourselves, and these ordinary duties are where God calls us to serve.¹ Sometimes, however, this divine vocation is extended to every permissible area of human activity, whether or not God in Scripture has commanded it or called anyone to do it. People speak as though vocation means the same thing as the duty to serve God and neighbor in every area of life. But what really is a divine vocation or calling?

What passes as the Lutheran doctrine of vocation these days has two fundamental errors. One error is to overspecify vocation at the expense of Christian freedom. The other error is when vocation is used as a replacement for the moral law of God² and thus tends toward libertinism. Both of these errors appeal to Luther

¹ Gene Edward Veith, Jr., *Working for Our Neighbor: A Lutheran Primer on Vocation, Economics, and Ordinary Life* (Grand Rapids: Christian’s Library Press, 2016), xv.

² The moral law of God is distinct from the Old Testament ceremonial and civil laws. “For in order to put human nature to the utmost shame, he not only gives laws like the Ten Commandments that speak of natural and true sins, but he also makes sins of things that are in their nature not sins. Moses thus forces and presses sins upon them in heaps. For unbelief and evil desire are in their nature sins, and worthy of death. But to eat leavened bread at the Passover [Exodus 12–13] and to eat an unclean animal [Leviticus 11, Deuteronomy 14] or make a mark on the body [Lev. 19:28, Deut. 14:1], and all those things that the Levitical priesthood deals with as sin—these are not in their nature sinful and evil. Rather they became sins only because they are forbidden by the law. This law can be done away. The Ten Commandments, however, cannot be done away, for here there really is sin, even if there were no commandments, or if they were not

for support. But a closer examination of Luther, particularly his baptismal sermons, shows that God's call leaves room for career choice, while the doctrine of vocation operates only within the parameters of the moral law, which is revealed in Holy Scripture.

II. The Problem with Charismatic Views of Vocation

There are two questions that have remained unanswered in most Lutheran accounts of the doctrine of vocation or in studies of Luther on vocation: (1) How do you know to what stations in life God has called you? And (2) Is it permissible to change vocations?

Career Choice as Vocation?

The most influential study of Luther's doctrine of vocation in North America is undoubtedly Gustaf Wingren's book *Luther on Vocation*.³ Wingren's book presents views related to vocation from many stages of Luther's life. But his book also raises further questions. For example, does Luther have anything to say about how one *enters* into a vocation? Wingren says a vocation is always "given by God." How does this happen, practically speaking? Can one ever give up or change vocations? For example, can a cobbler become a farmer, or is he in duty bound to remain in his calling? The duty to remain in one's calling seems to apply to vocations like marriage but not to vocations that are not specifically instituted in God's word. Related to this is the question of how the three estates (church, civil government, family) relate to other career-vocations, such as butcher, baker, and candlestick-maker. Are the latter subsumed under family/domestic estate/*oeconomia*, or do they *add* to the three estates? The question here is: What is a vocation? Can one have a divine vocation to be a computer programmer, for example? If so, where would you look to substantiate such a claim, since Scripture says nothing about that particular vocation?

Sometimes Luther's doctrine of vocation is seen as something in which there is no freedom to move from one occupation to another or from a lower social class to a higher. When viewed this way, people react negatively to it. According to some,

known—just as the unbelief of the heathen is sin, even though they do not know or think that it is sin" (Martin Luther, *Preface to the Old Testament* [1523], vol. 35, pp. 243–244, in *Luther's Works, American Edition*, vols. 1–30, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955–1976]; vols. 31–55, ed. Helmut Lehmann [Philadelphia/Minneapolis: Muhlenberg/Fortress, 1957–1986]; vols. 56–82, ed. Christopher Boyd Brown and Benjamin T. G. Mayes [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2009–], hereafter AE).

³ Gustaf Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, trans. Carl C. Rasmussen (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1982).

the reformers saw any attempt to change one's station in life as sinful. Such people claim that Luther and other reformers did not consider the terrible consequences of injustice in the economy and workplace. People were stuck in unjust working situations.⁴

In Missouri Synod circles, perhaps the most popular presentation of the doctrine of vocation is Gene Edward Veith's *The Spirituality of the Cross*. Veith argues that every lawful career is or can be a divine vocation. While the vocations of spouse, parent, and citizen are "perhaps more important" than career-vocations,⁵ every career, such as musician or electrician, is a divine calling. Because Veith does not distinguish between the vocations instituted in Scripture and all particular career-vocations, he suggests it may be sinful to tinker in an area in which one is not skilled. "Again," he writes, "consider the spectacle of me trying to repair electrical appliances. When we work outside of our vocation—that is, without regard to our God-given abilities, inclinations, and station in life—we usually fail miserably or, more seriously, violate the moral law."⁶ If this were true, however, it would border on sinful to try to do anything oneself or to learn a new skill by trying it. Instead of identifying every permissible career as a divine vocation, one should distinguish adiaphorous career-vocations from the divinely established vocations that are revealed in Scripture.⁷

It is significant that studies of Luther's doctrine of vocation do not address how one knows what vocation one has, nor how or whether one may change careers.⁸ This indicates that perhaps Luther himself does not address those questions. What we find in Luther's writings instead is that God does not command people to enter careers; his callings are limited to the stations of life that are established in Scripture.⁹

⁴ Sandra Beardsall, "A Funny Thing Happened . . . 'Vocation' in the Reformation Era," *Touchstone* 34, no. 2 (2016): 11.

⁵ Gene Edward Veith, Jr., *The Spirituality of the Cross: The Way of the First Evangelicals*, rev. ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2010), 91.

⁶ Veith, *The Spirituality of the Cross*, 107.

⁷ Jane Strohl notes that career-vocations were adiaphora for Luther. If this is so, how can they be considered vocations, duties to which God calls individuals? (Jane E. Strohl, "The Framework for Christian Living: Luther on the Christian's Callings," in *The Oxford Handbook of Martin Luther's Theology*, ed. Robert Kolb, Irene Dingel, and L'ubomír Batka [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014], 365–369).

⁸ Robert Kolb, "Called to Milk Cows and Govern Kingdoms: Martin Luther's Teaching on the Christian's Vocations," *Concordia Journal* 39, no. 2 (2013): 133–141; Paul Althaus, *The Ethics of Martin Luther*, trans. Robert C. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 36–42; Douglas James Schuurman, "Vocation," in *Dictionary of Luther and the Lutheran Traditions*, ed. Timothy J. Wengert (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017).

⁹ Commenting on Galatians 2:5 in 1519, Luther suggests that entering what I have called a career-vocation is a matter of free choice, not a specific command of God (*Galatians* [1519], AE

Commenting on 1 Corinthians 7:18–19 in 1523, Luther emphasizes that not only is circumcision free; (not commanded) but that marriage is also. Even marriage is optional. Not everyone has to enter it.¹⁰ Of course, once you are in it, there are certain divinely established duties that attend to it. In other places where Luther speaks of a divine calling in career-vocations, he does not say that God commands us to enter a specific career but that God commands us to fulfill our duties.¹¹ Again, on 1 Corinthians 7, Luther says, “In all these matters service, loyalty, and duty are to be maintained, regardless of whether the one party is Christian or non-Christian, good or bad, so long as they do not hinder faith and justice and allow you to live your Christian life. For all such estates are free and no impediment to the Christian faith.”¹²

Thus, if one wants support for speaking of a divine call to be a plumber or computer technician, he will have to look someplace other than Luther. Christians who are plumbers or computer technicians or who hold any other lawful career are indeed called by God to various duties, and they should also fulfill the duties that they have voluntarily accepted. But if the plumber decides he does not want to be a plumber anymore, God will not be upset. This is a matter of freedom.

Enthusiasm: Discernment of God’s Call

How do we know our vocation? How do we know what God is calling us to do? Popular Lutheran accounts of vocation emphasize that you must discern God’s call from your situation, your gifts, and your inclinations (what you like). For example, Veith’s view of vocation directs people to examine their situation in order to discern their vocation:

A vocation is not something we choose for ourselves. Rather, it is given by God, who “calls” us to a particular work or station. God gives each individual unique talents, skills, and inclinations. He also puts each individual in a unique set of external circumstances, which are understood as having been providentially arranged by God. Since vocation is not self-chosen, it can be known also through the actions of others. *Getting offered a job, being elected to an office, and finding someone who wants to marry you are all clues to vocation.*

27:204). Commenting on Genesis 44:17 toward the end of his life, Luther does not say that anything your hand finds to do is your vocation, but that for believers who attend to their calling, anything else their hand finds to do is pleasing to God (*Genesis* [1535–1545/1544–1554], AE 7:366–367).

¹⁰ Luther, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 7 (1523), AE 28:40–42.

¹¹ See, for example, Luther, *Notes on Ecclesiastes* (1526/1532), AE 15:151, on Ecclesiastes 9:10.

¹² Luther, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* 7 (1523), AE 28:43.

Essentially, your vocation is to be found in the place you occupy in the present.¹³

While this strong emphasis on situational discernment of vocation has the potential for abuse, Veith is by no means a moral relativist. There are concrete moral norms. Some careers are always impermissible, such as robber, prostitute, and hitman.¹⁴ For Veith, the situationality only functions within the boundaries set by the moral law. So, for example, God will never give you a vocation that calls you to violate the sixth commandment. But in all the areas left free and permissible by the moral law, Veith seems to regard vocation as adding extra divine commands to individuals.

This way of thinking goes especially wrong in the American neo-evangelical context. A typical example of the neo-evangelical *Schwärmerei* that Lutheran pastors often face can be found in Gordon T. Smith, *Spiritual Direction: A Guide to Giving and Receiving Direction*.¹⁵ Smith is a good example of how many people, even in our congregations, think about religion and religious experience. For Smith, emotions are the primary place of God's communication to mankind. For him, there is divine revelation apart from Scripture. How God commands a certain individual outside of Scripture can be radically different from how he commands or leads someone else, in a way reminiscent of situation ethics. For neo-evangelicals like Smith, "spiritual direction" is mainly about encountering the Holy Spirit in one's emotions. The joys and sorrows of individuals are, for him, the "primary data" to become aware of the Spirit's presence.¹⁶ The neo-evangelicals also approach vocation this way. According to them, one must discern God's call from one's situation and from the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit.

Another example of charismatic vocation is Rick Warren's bestselling *The Purpose Driven Life*.¹⁷ The premise of the book is that it takes about forty days to discern what God is calling you to do. Warren says, "Let God transform you into a new person by changing the way you think. Then you will know what God wants you to do."¹⁸ Yet, Warren does not just leave people to search their hearts for God's call. He has five "purposes," the first three of which could be summarized as living in fellowship with God. The fourth purpose is "You Were Shaped for Serv-

¹³ Veith, *The Spirituality of the Cross*, 103, emphasis added.

¹⁴ Veith, *The Spirituality of the Cross*, 101n.

¹⁵ Gordon T. Smith, *Spiritual Direction: A Guide to Giving and Receiving Direction* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2014).

¹⁶ Smith, *Spiritual Direction*, 40. We see this also in his view of prayer. For him, prayer is not mainly intercessory. Instead, he speaks of prayer as communion with Christ and especially as listening to Christ during prayer time (53–54).

¹⁷ Rick Warren, *The Purpose Driven Life: What on Earth Am I Here For?* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002).

¹⁸ Warren, *The Purpose Driven Life*, 10, supposedly quoting Romans 12:2.

ing God.” Here we can see the charismatic view of vocational discernment clearly. On the basis of one’s spiritual gifts, heart, abilities, personality, and experience, one will discover “God’s will for your ministry.”¹⁹

The questions raised by the need to discern one’s vocation are many. If God’s gifts to me are clues to my vocation, then what is the relationship between gifts and offices? Is God’s calling based on the gifts I notice in myself? If one thinks that God is calling him to something if he has the gifts for it, this, too, leads to problems. There are always possibilities of self-deception. What if I think God is calling me to be the mayor of my city but other people do not recognize this? Are they resisting God’s will? What if I am good at *several* things but do not have time to do them all? Should I think that God is calling me to do all of those activities? What role do my preferences play? Maybe I am good at playing piano, but I do not like it. Is it sinful not to use the gifts that God has given? What about people who think they have the gift of marriage, and then later think that they do not, and so seek divorce? If God’s vocation, his call, is located in his gifts—or if the gifts I notice in myself are clues to God’s call—then the stations or offices that God has established (pastoral ministry, marriage, civil government) are merely instrumental, a means toward exercising God’s gifts and calling. Then one will have to ask a question like: Is this station configured in such a way that I can use my gifts? If not, then the station may need to be changed. This way of thinking may not be a problem if it is applied to stations in life that have been created by human beings, but it is disastrous when applied to divinely instituted stations such as those in the church, marriage, and family.

Gilbert Meilaender is one of the few who have noticed this problem with what passes as the doctrine of vocation. He has noticed, on the one hand, that it is a problem to identify God’s vocation with the drudgery of one’s present career; then there is no escape. And on the other hand, there is a problem in identifying our own desires with God’s call. This collapses the first love commandment into the second. Loving one’s neighbor becomes the same thing as loving God. And the danger of being self-deceived in such cases is very present. As Meilaender characterized that view, “Whatever work we want to do—we’ll just call that our vocation.”²⁰ These concerns should be heeded. First, some see a specificity of God’s call where God has not revealed it in Scripture nor given a duty through his institutions of family, church, and civil government. Second, some look for God’s call in their own hearts and desires. Third, some overlook the fact that God’s main call is to belong to him and be united with him.

¹⁹ Warren, *The Purpose Driven Life*, 237.

²⁰ Gilbert Meilaender, “Divine Summons: Working in the Horizon of God’s Call,” *The Christian Century* 117, no. 30 (2000): 1115.

Now, what does Luther have to say about discerning one's vocation? Luther does not have a fully detailed presentation of vocation that would answer the questions modern people might put to it. Luther seems not to have been worried by the question of how you know what God is calling you to do. And in the published English translations of Luther, he simply does not address how to "discern" one's vocation. What he does, instead, is this: he constantly points his readers and hearers to the scriptural word of God. Preaching on Baptism on January 6, 1539, Luther said, "A Christian should not think of basing his faith on his own judgment and opinion, nor on the revelation even of angels or saints, but on the sure Word of God, which comes from God."²¹

Luther also does not develop any unified description of how you enter the stations. How do you enter the vocation of husband or wife? Luther says it happens through mutual, public consent, with the consent of parents.²² Human choice is a factor in entering marriage. God does not command you to marry this person as opposed to that person. But things are different when it comes to how you become a son or daughter, or even a citizen. You are simply born into these stations. Your choice plays no role whatsoever. So, already it should be clear that we cannot take the call to one station and apply it across the board to all the stations. The ways to enter the various stations or vocations are all different. For the divinely established station-vocations, we must look to how each station is established individually and described in Scripture. We must not apply a general theory of "vocation" to them. That is, we must be inductive, not deductive.

There are, of course, passages where Luther emphasizes that everyone has his *own* calling from God. In these passages, Luther does three things. First, he does not speak of discerning God's call to you. Instead, he assumes that your call is your station in life and is very obvious. Second, he does not address whether you can change careers. Instead, he emphasizes that you may not shirk your duty in order to run away on a religious pilgrimage or to enter a monastery. Third, he says that the stations in life are consistently three: household, church, and civil government. These are the divinely established stations in life for Luther, not whether to be a miner or a lawyer.²³ Therefore, the charismatic view of vocation, so common in modern books on discerning God's call for your life, really cannot look to Luther for support.

²¹ Luther, Sermon of January 6, 1539, in Martin Luther, *Ungedruckte Predigten D. Martin Luthers aus den Jahren 1537–1540*, ed. Georg Buchwald (Leipzig: G. Strübing's Verlag, 1905), 501, trans. Matthew Carver.

²² Luther, *On Marriage Matters* (1530), AE 46:267–277; cf. Tr 78.

²³ See, for example, Luther, *Church Postil* (1525/1540), AE 75:352–357.

What makes the charismatic approach to vocation so appealing is that it provides an explanation for the experiences that many Christians have. For example, many of our new seminary students have come here because they *feel* that God wants them to be pastors. They *feel* called. This feeling that people have seems to be the source of the charismatic approach. Yet, the answer is not to tell our students that they have not had this feeling. Indeed, God may put desires into the hearts of Christians to pursue this or that career or another permissible choice. This is how it is with our new seminary students. God may be putting into their hearts the *desire* to offer themselves to the church for the work of the ministry, somewhat in accord with 1 Timothy 3:1: “If a man desires the position of a bishop, he desires a good work.”²⁴ (Likewise, in Ezra 7:27, God put the desire to rebuild the temple into the heart of Artaxerxes. Cf. Neh 2:12.) But this desire does not mean that God has called them yet. The desire is not a divine command. If God has not revealed His will in Scripture, then we should not feel guilty one way or the other in making a choice in an adiaphorous area.

When people are faced with a hard choice, and there is no clear word of the Lord on the issue, they must still decide. In these cases, people may suffer feelings of guilt. Even in a case where God neither commands nor forbids something, people can feel torn. They might wonder: Have I done the right thing? Is this false guilt, or something more? Perhaps this is an indication of our human predicament of being fallen people living in a fallen and broken world. In these situations, we can take comfort, and comfort others, in the freedom that God gives and in the sure gospel comfort that God works all things to the good of those who love Him (Rom 8:28).²⁵

III. The Problem with Situational Views of Vocation

When other authors speak of discerning God’s call, they generally deal not with direct enthusiastic revelation but with discerning one’s situation. The problem here is when situational/contextual discernment replaces the concrete parameters of biblical moral law.

Gustaf Wingren’s *Luther on Vocation* has been the standard work on Luther’s view of vocation for decades. Wingren has remained popular in part due to how he brings forth Luther’s emphasis on the holiness of everyday duties and work. As Wingren says, “Luther liked to think that the most commonplace matters in the world often contain just such invisible and hidden secrets, where man least expects it. God abides in the deep, and he makes his noblest jewels of ‘nothing,’ of that which

²⁴ Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture translations in this article are from *The Holy Bible: New King James Version* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982).

²⁵ I am indebted to Jason Lane for this observation.

is poor and rejected.”²⁶ Yet, Wingren’s description of vocation makes it appear as though the law is abolished, and in its place comes vocation, which is situationally unique for every individual. This is not Luther’s view. For Luther, Christian freedom does not mean that the law and command of God ceases to apply to Christians or is abolished.

According to Wingren, the new man acts as he is moved by the Holy Spirit. There are no rules for this.²⁷ Love rises above the law. Christians have freedom to do and to omit,²⁸ and Wingren does not specify but seems to mean this in an absolute sense. Wingren seems to think that for Luther, vocations are unique to individuals. He says “my” vocation is mine alone, and there can be no imitation of others in their vocations.²⁹ Vocation for him assumes that *everyone* has different works.³⁰ Wingren stresses that, for Luther, there is no standard outward form of life.³¹ “No particular form of conduct is fixed in advance as holy. A person has to wait and see what others need and do just that in a particular situation. Another time, something quite different may be necessary.”³² When asserting that vocation is unique in such a way that there can be no imitation, Wingren appeals to three writings of Luther, all of them before 1520. One of his references is in error. The others actually speak against the idea that people could be justified by imitating the works of the saints.³³ That is different from saying that all divine callings are unique.

Wingren is suggesting that Luther advocates a situation ethics. Wingren shows Luther’s stance against imitation³⁴ without, however, explaining how this view could be reconciled with writings such as Article XXI of the Augsburg Confession, which Luther approved. Article XXI of the Augsburg Confession links vocation and imitation together when it says that the commemoration of the saints should be set before the church “in order that we might *imitate* their faith and good works according to our *vocation*, as the emperor can imitate the example of David in waging war to fend off the Turks from our country. For both are kings.”³⁵ Vocations are not situationally unique. How, then, is Luther’s critique of “imitation”

²⁶ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 183.

²⁷ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 146.

²⁸ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 147–148.

²⁹ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 155–156, 171, 173, 180, 181, 184.

³⁰ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 172–173.

³¹ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 176–177.

³² Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 178.

³³ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 181n. Wingren refers to Luther’s *Treatise on the Sacrament of Baptism* (1519), AE 35:40; *Commentary on Romans* (1515–1516), AE 25:263–264; and *Commentary on Hebrews* (1517–1518) in Martin Luther, *Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe [Schriften]*, 65 vols. (Weimar: H. Böhlau, 1883–1993), 57:87 (hereafter WA). The Hebrews reference is in error.

³⁴ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 171, 173, 180, 181, 184.

³⁵ AC XXI 1, my translation and emphasis.

to be understood? Luther's critique has to do with imitation at a high level of specificity and for the purpose of meriting righteousness. In rejecting imitation, he rejects those who seek holiness by imitating the inconsequential details of another's life—for example, St. Bernard's white robe or St. Paul's missionary journeys. Instead, Luther points out that within one's vocation, the day-to-day requirements of how the neighbor is to be served may be quite variable. Although Luther stresses that love must serve the *variable* needs of the neighbor, he never loses sight of the fact that God has given *specific* commands to humankind. Insofar as vocation itself has *specific* duties, these duties would act as the boundaries *within which* the details may change. Luther's statements against particular outward forms of life seem to be applicable against a high level of *specificity*, not against all objective ethical standards. Wingren, unfortunately, does not make this explicit.

With vocation as radically unique to each individual, how does one know how he should behave in a given situation? According to Wingren, people will gain clarity from prayer. For proof, Wingren cites Luther's 1523 *Secular Authority*.³⁶ Yet, in that place, Luther does not say that God reveals his will in prayer but that a prince should pray for wisdom. Nevertheless, for Wingren, reason and prayer are the means for making moral decisions in one's vocation.³⁷

Wingren's book has not gone unchallenged. Kenneth Hagen gave a critique in 2002.³⁸ Before him, Holsten Fagerberg rightly pointed out that the Lutheran confessions do not "identify" vocation with the law; that is, they are not the exact same thing. Instead, vocation comes from the law (in Scripture and in creation). Fagerberg also said that one cannot deduce his duty from his situation, but only from the Decalogue.³⁹ That is to say, good works are defined by the Decalogue. But we often have additional duties (and thus opportunities for good works) from our additional vocations, such as "father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, or worker,"⁴⁰ ruler, subject, preacher, and hearer. The works of one's vocation and good works are not the exact same thing. "Good works" is the broader category. All the works of one's vocation (done in faith) are good works, but not all good works are the works of one's vocation.

³⁶ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 197–199. There he cites WA 11:272.

³⁷ Wingren, *Luther on Vocation*, 207.

³⁸ Kenneth George Hagen, "A Critique of Wingren on Luther on Vocation," *Lutheran Quarterly* 16, no. 3 (2002): 249–273. Most helpful is Hagen's explanation of Wingren's polemical goals against Anders Nygren and Einar Billing.

³⁹ Holsten Fagerberg, *A New Look at the Lutheran Confessions 1529–1537*, trans. Gene J. Lund (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1972), 286–288.

⁴⁰ SC, Confession. Quotations from the Small Catechism are from *Luther's Small Catechism with Explanation*, copyright © 1986, 1991 Concordia Publishing House. All rights reserved.

Wingren's situational approach has been followed recently by ELCA professor Mark Tranvik. In his recent book, *Martin Luther and the Called Life*, he gives an account of vocation that floats free of the moral precepts of Scripture. According to Tranvik, vocation is the role in life to which God calls all people, and it must be discerned by individuals in the context of their community. Luther's *life* is a model for finding one's own vocation.⁴¹ Yet, Tranvik would have done better to listen to how Luther actually *teaches* vocation, such as in the Small Catechism's Table of Duties, which roots vocation in specific moral precepts that are revealed in Scripture. Instead of looking to the written word of God for God's call, Tranvik points people to God's creation, by which he means everyone's situation in life.

All of these modern approaches to vocation have much in common with the view of morality set forth in 1966 by Joseph Fletcher in his *Situation Ethics: The New Morality*. The major, overriding situation put forth by Fletcher at the beginning of the book is abortion. If a psychopath rapist impregnates a girl, may the fetus be aborted? His answer is "YES."⁴² Here the subjective experience of the situation trumps all moral laws. One of Fletcher's problems is that he moves from something true, namely, that "circumstances alter cases" (which Thomas Aquinas and Lutheran moral theologians have always recognized), to the falsehood that "circumstances alter rules and principles."⁴³ Fletcher bases his view, ironically, on 2 Corinthians 3:6 and Galatians 5:14, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself."⁴⁴ Yet, here the law of love trumps the specific divine commands in the Scriptures. No longer is there any real moral order. Fletcher seems to have only the short-term end of love in mind, as if saying, "The girl has been raped. I seek the short-term (proximate) advantage for the girl. Therefore, it is loving to abort." But this is false. It assumes that individuals know best what the ultimate advantage of their neighbors is. It sets man on God's throne.

The list of theologians whom Fletcher invokes in support of his position is, nevertheless, impressive: Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Emil Brunner, H. Richard Niebuhr, James Gustafson, and several others.⁴⁵ For Fletcher and Karl Barth, in particular, situations are radically unique.⁴⁶ Karl Barth opposed

⁴¹ Mark D. Tranvik, *Martin Luther and the Called Life* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016).

⁴² Joseph F. Fletcher, *Situation Ethics: The New Morality* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 38.

⁴³ Fletcher, *Situation Ethics*, 29.

⁴⁴ Fletcher, *Situation Ethics*, 30.

⁴⁵ Fletcher, *Situation Ethics*, 34.

⁴⁶ Nigel Biggar, "Moral Reason in History: An Essay in Defence of Casuistry," in *Issues in Faith and History: Papers Presented at the Second Edinburgh Conference on Dogmatics, 1987*, ed. Nigel M. de S. Cameron (Edinburgh: Rutherford House, 1989), 24; see also pp. 24–25, 27; Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, ed. Thomas F. Torrance, trans. Geoffrey William Bromiley, vol. 3.4 (Edinburgh:

any special ethics or casuistic ethics in which universal laws are applied to cases, and thus in which cases of conscience are decided by a casuist in advance for others to follow. In such a casuistry, according to Barth, the casuist makes himself God, knowing good and evil; such a casuistry treats the command of God as a universal rule, which Barth strenuously opposes; and such a casuistry destroys Christian freedom, which is necessary for an action to be good. Barth's basic thrust is that situations and the human beings in those situations are radically unique, and, therefore, there can be no "ethics filled out with material content."⁴⁷ (Of course, even Barth's ethics and dogmas have a contour and state some things as wrong and others as right.⁴⁸)

Yet, if the law is replaced by situation ethics, then the result for many people will be the disaster of modern sexuality. Witness the ELCA statement "Human Sexuality: Gift and Trust," adopted by the Churchwide Assembly of the ELCA in August 2009. In this statement, "vocation" divorced from scriptural moral precepts is one of the arguments used to justify homosexual practice.

We recognize the complex and varied *situations* people have relative to human sexuality: being in relationships, being single, being a friend, living in a young or aging body, being male or female, being young or old, or having different sexual orientations and gender identities. In whatever the situation, all people are *called* to build trust in relationships and in the community.⁴⁹

Divorced from a concrete, real moral order, one's ethic will usually serve one's personal interests. In this case, as Paul says, for those who exchanged the truth of God for a lie, God gave them up to vile passions (Rom 1:26).

Of course, one's situation in life does play a role in one's vocation. As Luther puts it in the Small Catechism, "Are you a father, mother, son, daughter, husband, wife, or worker?"⁵⁰ Situation, if understood as station, really matters. A husband is not a wife. A father and his son are not equal. The problem comes when a situational or contextual theology separates God's call from the eternal moral law that is revealed in Scripture.

T. & T. Clark, 1961), 5–31. See also Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*, trans. Neville Horton Smith (New York: Macmillan, 1955), 85–86, 284–285.

⁴⁷ Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 3.4:8.

⁴⁸ Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, 3.4:6–31.

⁴⁹ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, "A Social Statement on Human Sexuality: Gift and Trust." Presented at the ELCA Churchwide Assembly, Minneapolis, MN, August 19, 2009, http://download.elca.org/ELCA%20Resource%20Repository/SexualitySS.pdf?_ga=2.106406662.488279729.1532380714-786766238.1532380714, 8–9, emphasis added.

⁵⁰ SC, Confession.

IV. Luther on Baptismal Vocation

As a corrective to enthusiastic and situational views of vocation, let us learn from Martin Luther's Baptism sermons. In January and February, from 1528 to 1539, Luther sometimes interrupted the readings of the seasons of Epiphany, pre-Lent, and Lent to preach sermon series on Baptism.⁵¹ Luther's Baptism sermons provide rich instruction on vocation in two ways. First, the command-validity of vocation is parallel to the command-validity of Baptism. Second, the baptismal vocation is a life of good works that are defined by love and the moral law revealed in Scripture.

The Command-Validity of Vocation Is Parallel to the Command-Validity of Baptism

The first definitive place where Luther discusses his doctrine of stations in life is in the Small Catechism's (1529) Table of Duties, which has the title "The House-Table of Several Passages for All Manner of Holy Orders and Stations [*Stende*], Through Which They Are to Be Admonished Concerning Their Duty [*Ampts*] and Service, as Through Their Own Proper Lesson."⁵² Here the biblical commands for various stations are set forth. Second, in *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper* (1528), Luther lists three "holy orders and true religious institutes," which are "the office of priest, the estate of marriage, the civil government," with the helping offices that attend to these.⁵³ In addition, there is "the common order of Christian love, in which one serves not only the three orders, but also serves every needy person in general with all kinds of benevolent deeds."⁵⁴ Here, the connection with God's external, scriptural word is clear. Luther says, "For these three religious institutions or orders are found in God's Word and commandment; and whatever is contained in God's Word must be holy, for God's Word is holy and sanctifies everything connected with it and involved in it."⁵⁵ What needs to be emphasized here is that the word of God is what makes a station what it is or makes the station legitimate instead of sinful.

Examining Luther's Genesis lectures, Paul Gregory Alms finds that Luther discusses vocation in a sacramental framework. In both the sacraments and vocation, God's word is what makes ordinary creational objects divine and gives

⁵¹ See Martin Luther, *Martin Luther on Holy Baptism: Sermons to the People (1525–39)*, ed. Benjamin T. G. Mayes (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2018).

⁵² Irene Dingel, ed., *Die Bekenntnisschriften der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche: Vollständige Neuedition* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 894, my translation.

⁵³ Luther, *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper* (1528), AE 37:364.

⁵⁴ Luther, *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper* (1528), AE 37:365.

⁵⁵ Luther, *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper* (1528), AE 37:365.

certainty that this particular thing is pleasing to God.⁵⁶ Alms is correct, but more can be said. In our day and age, it needs to be stressed that we find God's word of command in Scripture alone. Without God's scriptural word of command establishing a station or giving a duty, there is no divine vocation.

In Luther's baptismal preaching, he gives many examples of the parallels between vocation and Baptism. The main thing that makes the water of Baptism a saving water and a sacrament is God's command. Luther points out in the Large Catechism that this is parallel to other commands that God gives. For example, in the Decalogue, God commands obedience to father and mother, and it is God's *command* that then actually makes this obedience into a good, God-pleasing work, as opposed to man-made, supposedly good works, like undertaking a pilgrimage to Rome or Santiago de Compostela.⁵⁷

In 1534, against the Anabaptists, who looked only at the physical element of water and decided it could not help the soul, Luther shows that the objective word of God is what gives Baptism its power, and as he does so, he points to the vocations of parents and princes as a parallel example. God's word of command is what gives the vocations of parents and civil government their authority, distinguishing them from other people.⁵⁸

Luther also draws a parallel from Baptism's validity by the word to the creation's objective existence. God's creation of the sun remains true whether or not someone can see the light.⁵⁹ Similarly, the command of God to baptize is parallel to the objective and eternal nature of the Ten Commandments and to vocations. As Luther says, God's work, "once done, lasts and avails forever."⁶⁰ The fact that the Israelites disobeyed the Ten Commandments does not invalidate or abrogate them. The fact that David fell into adultery and murder does not mean that new commandments must be made. God's command remains valid. The vocation of prince is likewise "not weakened when a prince has many disloyal and disobedient subjects in his principality."⁶¹ And the same is true of Baptism. God's command to baptize remains valid, regardless of whether people believe it. In all of these cases, the explicit command of God is what makes it what it is, regardless of how people regard it, regardless also of faith. Just as Baptism is valid regardless of how one regards it, so also the vocations that God has established continue to exist, regardless of how one *feels* about those vocations.

⁵⁶ Paul Gregory Alms, "The Sacraments and Vocation in Luther's *Lectures on Genesis*," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 80, nos. 1–2 (2016): 3–19.

⁵⁷ LC IV 14, 19–20.

⁵⁸ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:146.

⁵⁹ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:156–157.

⁶⁰ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:184.

⁶¹ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:184.

Four years later, in 1538, Luther again preached that Baptism's validity, based on the word of God, is parallel to the objective validity of the Ten Commandments and the vocations of father, mother, and prince. Here, he focused on the scriptural basis of both Baptism and the vocations. The fourth commandment established obedience to parents and princes. In the same way, Christ's word established Baptism. Both of them remain established and true, based on specific scriptural institution texts, regardless of how one feels about them.⁶²

Just as the word of God distinguishes plain water from Baptism, God's word distinguishes marriage from a life of fornication. Luther preaches:

But be sure yourself that it came from heaven, or it is nothing. For example, whores and rakes⁶³ live together, raise children, and collect property. This behavior and life is so similar to holy matrimony, it is beyond telling, and yet they are whores and rakes and in a sinful condition. Why? God's command is absent. However, if they are married, it is proper, for then it has the proper dress, God's Word. . . . And so it is not the same work any more than the cohabitation of married people and of whores and rakes are the same. And God says to married people: "You shall live together in holy matrimony," but He forbids whores and rakes to do so. They are not to lie together in unchastity. And this creates the distinction that holy matrimony is God's institution while God has forbidden fornication.⁶⁴

Luther also gives the example of the distinction between a judge and a robber, both of which kill—one with God's command (Rom 13:4) and one without.⁶⁵ What distinguishes the two kinds of killing is *God's scriptural command*, applied to the estate (station) of civil government.

Again, in 1539, Luther contrasts honest labor with theft. Labor *in general*, he explains, has God's command. He preaches:

Likewise, thieves and robbers drink and dine together, and it tastes as good to them as it does to those who make a living by manual labor and eat and drink. Indeed, it tastes far better, for there is often house and home, money and goods. Yet in the case of the thieves and robbers, there is only the devil's word. But in the case of those who labor, there is God's Word and command, and you can

⁶² Sermon of January 27, 1538, in Luther, *Martin Luther on Holy Baptism*, 69–70.

⁶³ *Huren und Buben*. The word *Buben* has a range of meanings, from "scoundrel" to "philanderer," or in general, a dissolute, profligate person. By speaking of cohabiting unmarried people as "whores and rakes," Luther uses derogatory language to make such cohabiting shameful.

⁶⁴ Sermon of January 19, 1539, in Luther, *Martin Luther on Holy Baptism*, 107–108.

⁶⁵ Sermon of January 19, 1539, in Luther, *Martin Luther on Holy Baptism*, 108.

eat your bread with a good conscience and make use of what you have. In the first case, where it is similar, he says: "I do not want to you have this."⁶⁶

Here "labor" is a divine calling, but not the specifics of what that labor entails. Moreover, private property is authorized by divine command.

Over and over again, Luther emphasizes that vocational certainty must come from the Scriptures. "One should not say: 'I am a husband, but who knows whether that estate pleases God?' No, it must be certain. One must say: 'I am baptized. I have partaken of the Sacrament and have a wife and it is God's will that it be so.' No fornicator can say that."⁶⁷ What distinguishes a divine vocation from a different arrangement is the word of God, which specifies one and forbids the other—not an enthusiastic inner message from God, and not simply one's situation.

The Baptismal Vocation Is Forgiveness and a Life of Good Works That Are Defined by Love and the Moral Law Revealed in Scripture

Rather than being so concerned about discerning God's call in our lives, we must continuously emphasize that the universal call of God for all Christians is the *baptismal* vocation. Baptism itself is vocational. The baptismal vocation is forgiveness and a life of good works that are defined by love and the moral law revealed in Scripture.

The Large Catechism states that Baptism daily strengthens the new man and smothers the old man.⁶⁸ To use the language of the Small Catechism, "The Old Adam in us should by daily contrition and repentance be drowned and die with all sins and evil desires, and . . . a new man should daily emerge and arise to live before God in righteousness and purity forever."⁶⁹ This is what can be called the "sanctification aspect" of Baptism's ongoing benefits. Luther does not usually use the word "sanctification" to describe this; instead, he speaks of the fruits and consequences of Baptism: since people have died to sin and become new people in Baptism, now they must live a new life and honor their Baptism with good works. At other times, Luther describes this as the gradual putting to death of the old man, the growth of the new man, the growth of the fruits of faith, sweeping out sin, renewal, and so forth. Luther has many different ways of describing this gradual transformation.

In this ongoing effect of Baptism, Christians are not purely passive. Luther states in the Large Catechism, "We must do the work of which we are Christians."⁷⁰

⁶⁶ Sermon of January 19, 1539, in Luther, *Martin Luther on Holy Baptism*, 108.

⁶⁷ Sermon of January 19, 1539, in Luther, *Martin Luther on Holy Baptism*, 110–111.

⁶⁸ LC IV 83–84.

⁶⁹ SC, Baptism.

⁷⁰ LC IV 85, my translation.

That is to say, the power of Baptism works in us and *with* us. In that respect, its effect is cooperative with us.⁷¹ Sometimes Luther emphasizes the power that Baptism provides, but at other times, he stresses the responsibility of the *believer* to *do* good and *avoid* sin.⁷² In the 1534 sermons, he emphasizes the responsibility of believers. We must honor Baptism with good works. And so he preaches,

Although it was without our works and good life that we found grace to obtain Baptism correctly, we are still to devote ourselves to honoring and adorning it with words and works and our whole life from now on. Baptismal fonts, altars, and pulpits are there to remind us of this. Since they are to bear witness to the fact that we are baptized and Christians, we should also plan to honor the baptismal font and so live that we may view it with joy and that it may not bear witness against us.⁷³

Luther states that good works are necessary:

Being baptized and remaining in sin do not go together. It is given for the very purpose of taking sin away so that man would become just and increase in good works. If he was disobedient, angry, spiteful, unfaithful, and unchaste before, he is to depart from that, pray an Our Father instead, and from that point on take care and strive to be obedient, patient, and kind. If you do not do this, do not think that all is well with you nor boast about the grace of Christ a great deal in order to justify your sin.⁷⁴

But he also speaks of the new life and good works as being an effect of Baptism, an effect that you can actually perceive:

Likewise, if you had been an adulterer, fornicator, or coveter, then Baptism should teach you from that point on not to strike, commit adultery, covet, steal, and rob any longer. The former is forgiven and dead, and from that point on there is to be a different, just, righteous, beneficent, disciplined man. If you find such life and fruits in yourself for a length of time, it is a sign that Baptism has taken effect in you. If it should happen that you go amiss in one or two things, which would be called falling and stumbling, you may take comfort in grace and forgiveness; yet not in such a way that you would remain lying in it or continue and keep saying: "What can I do about it? I cannot get rid of it. Anyway, all is grace and forgiveness," etc.⁷⁵

⁷¹ The same is in FC Ep II 17; FC SD II 65–66.

⁷² Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:185–186.

⁷³ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:186–187.

⁷⁴ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:187.

⁷⁵ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:187–188.

Over and over again, Luther emphasizes the theme he developed in the Large Catechism, that Baptism implants in us a power actually to become good. It does not work all at once, but it does happen, and it results in people who are renewed and equipped for good works.⁷⁶

But if Baptism includes both the Holy Spirit's renewing gifts and a call to holiness and good works, what are these good works? Here we are back at the question of whether we must discern God's call in our heart and situation or whether we should look to the scriptural moral law. Is the law instructive in good works or not? Holsten Fagerberg found that even though the parts of the Book of Concord written by Luther and Melancthon do not list a "third use of the law," an instructive use of the moral law is nevertheless present there.⁷⁷

In Luther's classic sermon on the thorough distinction of law and gospel, preached on Galatians 3:23–29 on January 1, 1532, he specifies that the "form" of the law, what makes it what it is, is not the function of condemnation or accusation but the *command* of what we should do, toward *God* and neighbor (not just toward the neighbor). The law also needs to be distinguished and applied rightly according to one's vocation. For example, scriptural commands to kings do not apply to Luther. They have different vocations, but the duties of those vocations are taught from the scriptural moral law.⁷⁸

But if Baptism and the gospel send us back to do good works that are defined by the moral law, is not Christian freedom being denied? Are we not freed from the law? Even as early as 1522, in what would later be called the *Church Postil*, Luther explained that freedom from the law does not mean that the law loses its power of obligation. The law is not changed by Christ. We are changed. So in the *Church Postil*, he writes,

21. So, if a lord had you confined in prison, and you were exceedingly unwilling to remain there, someone could free you from it in two ways. First, bodily, so that he would smash the prison, set you free bodily, and let you go wherever you wanted. Second, he could do you much good in prison—make it pleasing, light, spacious, and richly ornamented for you, so that no royal chamber and kingdom was so costly—and could break and change your attitude so that you would not leave the prison for all the property in the world, but would pray that the prison would remain and you could stay in it, which had become for you no longer a prison but rather a paradise.

⁷⁶ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:188.

⁷⁷ Fagerberg, *A New Look*, 85–86.

⁷⁸ Luther, *On Holy Baptism* (Jan.–Feb. 1534/1535), AE 57:64–76.

Tell me, which release would be the best? Is it not true that the spiritual is the best? In the first release, you remain a poor beggar, as before; but here you have a free spirit and everything you want.

22. So Christ has redeemed us from the Law spiritually. He did not smash and abolish the Law, but rather so changed our heart, which before was unwillingly under the Law, did so much good to it, and made the Law so delightful that [our heart] has no greater delight or joy than in the Law, and would not willingly lose even a dot from it [Matt 5:18]. Just as the prisoner makes his prison narrow and oppressive for himself by his loathing, so also we are hostile to the Law, and it is disagreeable to us because we loathe being locked away from evil and being compelled to good.⁷⁹

Luther was not always as clear as this. Preaching on 1 Timothy 1:5 in 1525, Luther frequently speaks of the abolition of human laws and even of the law of God. Human rulers can abolish human laws, but only Christ could abolish God's law, or, as Luther alternatively expresses it, "Therefore we must have Him over whom it has no power, who satisfied it for us."⁸⁰ Yet, when Luther argues that the law is abolished, he means *not* that it ceases to exist, ceases to be preached, or ceases to be God's will, but that, instead, "the Law remains in place," and the righteous person, having the Holy Spirit and a pure heart, acts in *accordance* with the law.⁸¹

In two sermons on Jeremiah 23:5–8 in November 1526, Luther explains that all sins have been forgiven by Christ, "provided that I believe in Him," and yet there are sins remaining, from which believers are in the process of being cleansed.⁸² The freedom that Christians have from the law is not absolute. They are free in the conscience and the soul, but it would be wrong to apply this freedom to the body, "as the peasants did last year" (in the German Peasants' War, 1524–1525).⁸³ Therefore, according to Luther (not just late but also early), Christian freedom does not mean that the law is abrogated. Rather, the Christian is forgiven and saved

⁷⁹ Luther, *Church Postil* (1522/1540), Epistle for New Year's Day, AE 76:9. Again, in his 1528 lectures on Isaiah, Luther makes clear that Christian freedom happens not by the abolition of the law, but by the change of man's relationship to the law: "Natural man would prefer that there be no law, because he is not able to perform what it demands. The sin that has been committed is the second tyrant, and it brings forth the third, namely, death and damnation. Who could be happy when he is answerable to these three? But now they have been vanquished, the Law is fulfilled by Christ and then also by us who have been endowed by the Holy Spirit. He adds the courage so that we may glory even in our sufferings (Rom. 5:3), and thus the Law is no longer outrageous in its dictates but an agreeable companion. The Law itself indeed is not changed, but we are. Obviously this is Christian liberty, when the Law is voluntarily fulfilled, so that it cannot accuse, demand, and render guilty" (Luther, *Lectures on Isaiah* [1528/1914], AE 16:98–99).

⁸⁰ WA 17/1:117 (AE 56).

⁸¹ WA 17/1:130, 114 (AE 56).

⁸² WA 20:573–574 (AE 56).

⁸³ WA 20:579 (AE 56).

despite the fact that he has not kept the law perfectly, and then his attitude toward the law is changed. “The Law itself indeed is not changed, but we are.”

What do we find from this? Good works are defined by the moral law of God. Vocation is defined by the divine institution of each specific station of life: marriage, family, civil society, church, and ministry. Where God’s word in the Bible does not speak, there is vocational freedom. Where God’s word *does* speak about these vocations, that is what they are. These things are not determined by the hearts of individuals; they are not to be divorced from God’s scriptural word.

V. Conclusion

When I helped start Christ Academy while a student worker at CTSFW in 1999, we used a trick question on the application form: “How does the Holy Spirit work in your life?” If a young man had been taught well, he would say something about being forgiven through word and sacraments and maybe being instructed in holy living through the word of God. If he had not been taught well, he would say something about how the Holy Spirit made him feel or about messages that he received from the Holy Spirit outside of Scripture. The doctrine of vocation seems to have fallen into the same error. People seem to have forgotten about Christian freedom on one hand and about the eternal⁸⁴ moral law of God on the other. Luther’s baptismal sermons can help us with this, if we are willing to hear him.

⁸⁴ FC SD II 50.