

The Holy Spirit and the Charismatic Renewal

By Joel C. Gerlach

[Convention Essay, Southeastern Wisconsin District, Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, Wisconsin Lutheran High School, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, June 11-13, 1974]

Introductory: The half-known God. A new period in church history Pneumatology (study of the Spirit and his work) versus Christology. Pentecostalism, Neo-Pentecostalism, Charismatic Renewal—all part of the same theological school. The study of this subject is necessitated by the rapid spread of the Charismatic movement.

I. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit as Presented in Scripture

A. Who He is—3rd person of the Godhead

1. a person
2. True God
3. The progressive revelation theory of the Holy Spirit

B. What He does—Sanctification (He glorifies Christ in and through Christians)

1. Call us by the gospel
 - a. How faith originates—“the hearing of faith”
 - b. The message demands AND creates faith
 - c. Conversion and Regeneration
2. Enlightens us with gifts to serve
3. Sanctifies us
4. Keeps us “by the power of God”
5. The Holy Christian Church

C. How He does it—the means of grace

1. The Word and sacraments
2. ONLY the Word and sacraments

II. The Holy Spirit as Represented by the Charismatic Movement

A. Historical background from the time of Christ to the present

1. Its modern beginnings
 - a. Los Angeles, Melodyland Christian Center The Wilkersons
 - b. Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship International
 - c. Reasons for its phenomenal growth—irrelevant institutionalism of the churches.
2. Its antecedents
 - a. Montanism
 - b. Methodism and John Wesley - two experiences of grace
 - c. Pentecostalism, Charles Finney, R. A. Torrey, W.J. Seymour

B. Distinctive doctrines of the Charismatic Movement

1. Baptism in the Holy Spirit:

	<u>New Birth</u>	<u>Spirit Baptism</u>
Agent:	The Holy Spirit	Christ
Means:	Atoning Blood	the Spirit
Result:	New Birth	Power to Serve

2. Doctrine of the initial evidence of the Holy Spirit—tongues

- a. The Scriptural basis

- b. The need for it—inner assurance
- 3. Doctrine of the conditions for-receiving Spirit baptism
 - a. Conversion, obedience, prayer and “faith” (*fides ultima*)
 - b. Law/gospel confusion
- C. The gifts of the Spirit 1 Co 12-14
- D. Observations, evaluations, conclusions

The Holy Spirit And The Charismatic Renewal

The Apostle Paul began his memorable sermon to the learned men of the Areopagus in Athens with a reference to the words inscribed on one of their altars, “to the unknown God.” He then proceeded to make known to them the God they did not know, the God of the Scriptures, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Some years ago a Lutheran author, Lorenz Wunderlich, wrote a book giving it a title which employs a play on words suggested by the inscription on that ancient Athenian altar. He titled it, “*The Half-Known God*.” The subject of that book is the Holy Spirit. The point of the title is the generalization that within Christendom God is only a half-known God because of what is unknown about the Holy Spirit. “The theology of the Holy Spirit,” says Dr. Wunderlich, “is a neglected one among many Christians.”ⁱ

Those words were written a decade ago. They are probably somewhat less true now than they were then. For the Holy Spirit is gaining in popularity within Christendom. In fact we may well be in the process of going from one extreme to the other, from one of serious neglect to one of misguided overemphasis on the theology of the Holy Spirit. We may even be entering a new period of Church History, one in which Pneumatology (a study of the Spirit and his work) replaces Christology (the study of Christ and his work) as the centerstage doctrine of the faith. The Pneumatic movement is principally a reactionary one. It involves people who are overreacting in predictable fashion to the lack of vitality, or lack of spirituality, as they see it, in the established churches. Their purpose is to unloose the power of the Holy Spirit again in the church in the manner in which that power was apparent and operative in the church in the apostolic age.

Pentecostalism is the familiar name for this particular brand of Spirit theology. Today the movement embraces a growing number of people outside Pentecostal churches who are members of the old-line Christian denominations including Lutherans and Roman Catholics. This extension of Pentecostal interest across and beyond denominational lines is frequently referred to as Neo-Pentecostalism. Another name for it is the charismatic movement. Neo-Pentecostals are advocates of a charismatic renewal in our times. Charismatic is a word which derives from the Greek word *χαρίσματα*, a word St. Paul uses to refer to the special spiritual gifts with which the Holy Spirit graces the lives of God’s people, such as love, wisdom, knowledge, and various other capabilities for service. Modern charismatics place particular emphasis on speaking in tongues, healing and prophecy as evidences of a special charismatic working of the Holy Spirit in their lives.

The rise of Neo-Pentecostalism is unquestionably a phenomenon that demands our attention and analysis on the basis of God’s Word. That is the reason for the assignment of this essay at this convention. Consider the fact that Pentecostalism has grown from nothing to more than 10 million adherents from 1900 to 1970. There is perhaps no way of knowing how many hundreds of thousands more outside of the Pentecostal churches have been caught up in the charismatic movement, —one ALC student of the movement estimates 35 million throughout the world. Here in Wisconsin a Green Bay pastor was ousted from his Missouri Synod congregation because of his advocacy of the movement. Last summer the 7th Annual International Conference of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal Conference brought 22,000 people to the campus of Notre Dame, including bishops and archbishops. While our Synod was in convention in New Ulm in August, 18,000 convened at the Minneapolis Auditorium for the 2nd International Lutheran Conference on the Holy Spirit, twice as many as had attended the first such conference. In March of this year Jerusalem hosted 4000 participants in the Logos-sponsored World Conference on the Holy Spirit. Thirty-five nations sent representatives. The largest ever such assembly is slated for Anaheim, California in 1976. A reported 1000 Lutheran clergymen have

received the baptism in the Holy Spirit, 400 each from the LCA and ALC, over 200 from the LCM. Probably all of them would insist that the charismatic movement is a thing of the Holy Spirit. Is it, or is it not? That is a question to which we wish to address ourselves in our study of *The Holy Spirit and the Charismatic Renewal*. We shall first of all briefly review the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as he himself presents it to us in Holy Scripture, and then we shall summarize and examine the teachings about the Holy Spirit and his work as represented by the charismatic movement.

I. The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit as Presented in Scripture

Because of our special interest in the charismatic movement, our review of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in Scripture will emphasize especially the means by which the Holy Spirit accomplishes his saving work and the evidences of his saving work in the lives of God's people. Traditionally when we present the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in confirmation classes, we show from Scripture (1.) who he is, (2.) what he does, (3.) and how he does it. We propose to follow that same procedure now.

In answer to the question, "Who is the Holy Ghost?" our catechism replies, "The Holy Ghost is the third *person* of the Triune God, true *God* with the Father and the Son." Thus He is designated as a person, a rational individual, to which we usually add the thought that he is of the same essence with the Father and the Son. Neither the word person nor the word essence is found in Scripture with reference to the Trinity. They are terms employed by the early church to define the Trinity and to safeguard the truth about our God from the many subtle errors advanced in opposition to the truth. The church, however, read its own meaning into the terms with our assuming that words like person, nature and essence adequately described the mystery of the Trinity. Thus also the first article of the Augsburg Confession entitled "Of God" defines the word "person" when it says, "The word 'person' is to be understood as the Fathers employed the term in this connection, not as a part or a property of another but as that which exists of itself."

There are Monarchian sects today just as there were in the early days of the church which deny that the Holy Spirit is a person. They contend that the Holy Spirit of the Scriptures is nothing more than an abstract power or an influence emanating from God like team spirit or the spirit of '76. Unitarians, Christian Scientists, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormons and liberal theologians all deny the personality of the Holy Spirit. To them the Holy Spirit is an "it," not a "he." Significantly, however, in the Greek language the word for Spirit is *pneuma*, a neuter noun. When we use pronouns as substitutes for neuter nouns, we ordinarily say "it," not he or she. Yet in Scripture pronouns used with reference to the Spirit are masculine, suggesting a person. Jesus said, "When he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he shall glorify me," John 16:13,14. Obviously Jesus is speaking about a person, not a vague something or other.

As a person, the Spirit is coordinated with the person of the Father and the person of the Son. "In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," is the familiar baptismal formula Jesus gave us, Matthew 28:19. The pulpit vatum too reminds us of that coordination of persons. "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God (the Father), and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all," 2 Corinthians 13:14. The activities of a person are also ascribed to the Holy Spirit in Scripture. He *caused* Jesus to be *conceived* in Mary's womb. He *led* Jesus into the wilderness at the time of his temptation. He divides up spiritual gifts according to his will, 1 Corinthians 12:11. He can be blasphemed against, Matthew 12:31 and he can be lied to as Ananias and Sapphira sought to do, Acts 5.

The catechism's answer to the question, "Who is the Holy Ghost?" not only states that he is a person but also that he is true God. In that same Ananias episode, Peter specifically calls the Holy Ghost God, Acts 5:1-11. David too speaks of "The Spirit of the Lord... the God of Israel," 2 Samuel 23:2. In addition to those passages in Scripture that specifically call him God, there are numerous others that say things about the Spirit, which can only be said of God. He is omnipresent, Psalm 139:7; He is omniscient, 1 Corinthians 2:10,11; He is called the eternal Spirit, Hebrews 9:14; He was involved in the creation, for Moses says "The Spirit of God moved (brooded upon, brought forth life) upon the face of the waters (επεξεραμ;) Genesis 1:2; He consulted with

the other members of the Trinity about making man in their own image; and in a passage we will be studying at length later, we learn that He is presently involved in the affairs of the administration of his Church, 1 Corinthians 12:1-11. It is patently apparent from Scripture that the Holy Spirit is not to be regarded as a mere Junior Partner of the Trinity.

In support of the currently popular theory of progressive revelation, many scholars today contend that the Holy Spirit was unknown in Old Testament times, indeed even that the Trinitarian concept of God developed after the time of Christ. These theorizers read their theories into the Bible. They certainly do not derive their teachings from the Bible.

Revelation concerning the Spirit is not dependent on chronology as though earlier writers knew little or nothing about the Spirit, while later writers knew more, leaving it to the early Church to fully develop the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Wunderlich in *"The Half God"* provides some interesting statistical information regarding this point. He writes, "Of the more than a hundred references to the Holy Spirit scattered through twenty-two of the thirty-nine books in the Old Testament, fourteen are found in the Pentateuch, thirteen in Isaiah, and fifteen in Ezekiel... Nor are the completeness and variety of this revelation dependent on the comparative spirituality of an Old Testament book. For while it is true that the prophecies of Isaiah, and Ezekiel stand high in this category, it is equally true that the Psalter has only six references to the Spirit of God while the historical chronicle of Judges has seven."ⁱⁱⁱ The Holy Spirit was as active in the life of the Old Testament church as he is in the life of the New Testament Church. He was a saving Spirit to God's people of old, just as he was to the Pentecost Christians, and just as he is to us. And they all knew him just as we do.

Except for the sectarians and the modernists who we mentioned previously, there is no controversy about who the Holy Spirit is. Charismatics today believe as we do that the Holy Spirit is a person and that he is God. But when it comes to the question of what he does and how he does it we come to an obvious parting of the ways. How their beliefs differ from Scriptural doctrine we shall seek to make clear after we have reviewed what Scripture teaches us about the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit.

No one has ever improved upon Luther's classic summary statement of sanctification in the Small Catechism. "I believe that I cannot by my own reason strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, nor come to him; But the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, sanctified and kept me in the true faith; In like manner as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and keeps it with Jesus Christ the one, true faith; In which Christian Church he daily and richly forgives all sins to me and all believers; And will at the last day raise up me and all the dead, And give unto me and all believers in Christ eternal life. This is most certainly true."

St. Paul told the Thessalonian historians that the way of salvation is "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth," 2 Thessalonians 2:13. The Spirit's work is a saving work. He accomplishes it through sanctification. That work includes everything the Holy Spirit does for me to make me holy and thus transform me from sinner to saint. My sainthood is his work from start to finish.

When Jesus cried out with a loud voice from the cross and said triumphantly, "It is finished," He meant that his assignment as Savior was completed. In my place *servicing* as Substitute he had fulfilled every demand of the law down to the last iota. In my place *suffering* as my Substitute he endured the punishment of every sin of mine including those I have not yet committed. The "Amen" was added the "It is finished" three days later when our Father raised our Brother from the dead. "He was raised for our justification." By that one mighty act God put into effect a reconciliation between himself and all men. He declared every sin forgiven, every sinner not guilty, not only not guilty, but righteous for Jesus' sake. Every man, woman and child, those dead, those living and those not yet born, gets the credit of Christ's holy life while he gets the discredit of our unholy living. That is the good news to which the Spirit gives testimony, John 16:13. It packs power The Holy Spirit employs that life-giving, life-altering, life-preserving power to work the work of Christian sanctification.

Sanctification begins with "belief of the Truth." To believe or not believe the good news is not my choice to make. Not to believe it is, but to believe it is not. My mind is predisposed to disagree with God, Romans 8:7. He tells me things that are obviously wrong to my way of thinking. Why, it is absurd to think that

if I am at fault for disrupting our relationship, God should come to me with a peace offer instead of my going to Him in an effort to straighten matters out between us. So it is that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for these are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned," 1 Corinthians 1:14.

The task of dealing with recalcitrant, obstinate minds has been given by the Trinity to the Holy Spirit. If I am going to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, he is the one who must make a believer out of me. For "no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost," Corinthians 12:3. Still speaking of the "belief of the truth," Paul adds, "whereunto he called you by our Gospel." The spirit's *call* to a man is an offer of all the blessings of the new life in Christ. The Spirit's purpose is to get us to believe the truth.

But just how does one begin to believe? Because Neo-Pentecostals give an inadequate answer to this vital question, an answer which in effect turns the Gospel into a new law, We need to take a closer look at Scripture's answer. Pentecostals make much of receiving the Spirit. "Have you got the Spirit, brother" is their characteristic query. But to them receiving the Spirit means something quite, different from what it does to us. Scripturally speaking, to receive the Spirit means simply to say "yes" to his Gospel invitation; in other words it means to believe. To believe and to receive the Spirit are essentially one and the same thing as to reject the Spirit and to not believe are the same thing. For the Pentecostal, however, one follows the other. Before a person can receive the Spirit he must have faith. The basic error of their doctrine is the attempt to make faith a required accomplishment for obtaining the reward of the Spirit.

We usually answer the question about how faith originates with the familiar words of St. Paul: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," Romans 10:17. That says all that needs saying. There is another passage that gives the same answer. When Paul wrote to the Galatians he expressed concern about the possibility of their falling away from faith: "O foolish Galatians who hath bewitched you that ye should not obey the truth before whose eyes Jesus hath been evidently set forth crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?" Galatians 3:1,2. Someone was disturbing the Galatian Christians with a false teaching that made the receiving of the Spirit a result of law works rather than the result of a faith message. In the Greek text the significant words are ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως, literally the message of faith," or "by means of the message of faith." The means of the Holy Spirit are nothing else than the message of Jesus Christ on his cross for us. The important Greek word is ἀκοή. It can mean "message," "report" or "what is heard," but it may also mean simply "hearing." In other words it may mean the thing you hear, or the hearing you do. Paul might well have chosen the word because of its twofold meaning thus stressing both things, the objective message and the subjective hearing of the message.

Now what is significant about that? When Paul speaks about the "heard message of faith," in what sense does he mean "of faith?" In a double sense. The Gospel message is one that requires faith. But because of its uniqueness, because the power of the Spirit is in it, the Gospel message also gives what it requires. To put it another way, "The heard message of faith gives not only the message of Christ, it gives the hearing of faith to receive the message. The 'message of faith' is the 'message which brings faith.'"ⁱⁱⁱ The article on εὐαγγέλιον in the *Theological Dictionary the New Testament* says succinctly, "The message demands and creates πίστις (faith)."

This is what Luther means when he says, "the Holy Spirit has called me by the Gospel." He not only brings me the message, he makes a believer out of me. Why some who hear the message believe it while others do not is a question we do not attempt to answer because God has not given us any word on the basis of which to answer it. We realize the problem this creates, but the problem is one for God to resolve, not for us.

Scripture uses a variety of terms to express what happens when the Spirit makes a believer out of an unbeliever. Jesus told Nicodemus it was a matter of being born again. On another occasion he spoke of the necessity of being converted, Matthew 18:1-3. Paul used the word "regeneration," Titus 3. He told the Corinthians it was like having God shine his light into a person's heart "to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God."

When the Spirit enlightens a man's heart. He does not do it with an intermittent flashing light so that at times a person is left in the dark. His enlightening activity is a continuing process. Luther says, "He enlightens me with his gifts." Our catechism lists these gifts as knowledge that Jesus is my Savior, assurance that I am right with God, peace, hope, the witness that I am God's child, comfort, confidence to pray, and all the blessedness Jesus has obtained for me. The gifts of the Spirit are presented in various ways in Scripture. The classic list is presented by Paul in 1 Corinthians 12-14, a list that we shall consider (in some detail) later.

As I am enlightened I become a light. As I am loved of God, I become a lover of God and of all those whom God loves. I love them with the love with which God loves me. As the Holy Spirit gives me wisdom and knowledge, he expects me to use them, not just for my own sake, but according to God's will for the benefit of others. This is true of all the gifts the Holy Spirit gives including the gifts of tongues, healing and prophecy. They enable us to serve. They point us in the direction of our fellowman, and they point our fellowman in the direction of God. That emphasis is not always apparent in charismatic theology.

Luther has that life of service in mind when he says the Holy Ghost "sanctifies me." He equips me to do God's work for him and then prompts me to get on with it. He supplies the opportunity, the impulse, the power, so that when we do what we have been called to do, we cannot say proudly, "Look what I've done for God," but rather humbly and gratefully, "Look what God has used me to do for him." It is only by the grace of God that I am what I am. The good works I do are really his workmanship. This is a truth which charismatics would agree to in theory. But their teaching and practice deny what they affirm in theory.

Luther concludes his summary statement of the Spirit's work in the life of the individual Christian with the reminder that the Holy Ghost "keeps me in the true faith." I need him just as much to stay alive as I do to come alive in Christ. In God's family I always remain a dependent child. I grow and I mature, but I never get to the point that I can stand on my own two feet without help, or never to the point that I can strike out on my own. The person who thinks he can stand alone is due for a fall, Scripture warns. When the Spirit does not have me in constant tow, the devil, the world and my flesh do. That is why it is so tremendously important to know that "He which hath begun a good work in you will perform it unto, the day of Jesus Christ," Philippians 1:6. And again, the message is the means. For "ye are kept *by the power of God* through faith unto salvation." And the power of God, remember, is inherent in the Gospel.

Preservation in the faith is another truth that gets lost in the confusion of Neo-Pentecostal teaching.

To complete the picture of the work of the Holy Spirit, we need to remember that what he does for you, for me, he does for others also throughout the world. All together they comprise the Holy Christian Church, the communion of saints. The Spirit "calls, gathers, enlightens and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one, true faith." He works in it and through it uniting men equipping them for the work of the ministry. He is the power source for Christians. God's church gets God's work done as he motivates and energizes God's people. If there is a power failure in the church, it is because in some way or another are quenching and stifling the Spirit. If there is joy, warmth, zeal and power to do God's thing, he supplies it. The unity we enjoy is a unity of the Spirit, Ephesians 4:3, and the success with which our labors are blessed is success which he gives, Acts 2:47, 5:14.

We have already answered the question, "How does the Holy Spirit do his work?" Not because the Neo-Pentecostals are all agreed that the Spirit works apart from Scripture's designated means, we need to emphasize one answer once more. We are brought to faith and salvation by the power of God, and we are kept in faith by the power of God. According to Scripture there is but one place we have access to the power of God, and that is in his Gospel-Word, either the, heard-word of gospel preaching or the seen-word of sacrament administration. In one case the power of Spirit reaches the heart through the ears, in the other case through eyes and ears. But in both cases only in connection with the Word of God. The gospel Word is the power of God unto salvation, nothing more, nothing else. To paraphrase the familiar words of Paul, "Faith comes by means of the Gospel report, and the hearing of it with faith is made possible by the Word of God."

God could certainly unleash his power in the lives of men in some other way, if he chose to. He could knock men flat in their tracks with a light ray from heaven as he did with Paul. Or he could have men dip

themselves seven times in the waters of the Jordan. He could even do it on the golf course or in a fishing boat on Sunday morning, but contrary to what some people would like to believe, he simply has not chosen to do it that way. He has given us his Word, and through that Word he lets his power loose in the hearts and lives of men. As Luther said, “God wants to give the Holy Spirit through the Word, and without the Word he does not want to do it.”

Luther never tired of emphasizing the truth about the means of grace. In conclusion we offer this sample of what he taught.

We must hear the Word that comes to us from without (*das äusserliche Wort*) and not despise it, as some think. For God will not come to you in your private room (*Kämmerlein*) and talk with you. It is decreed that the external Word (*das äusserliche Wort*) must be preached and come first. Thereupon, after one has heard the Word and taken it to heart, the Holy Spirit comes, the proper Schoolmaster, and gives power to the Word, so that it strikes root . . . Therefore we must grant the Gospel this honor and concede to it this glory that it is a means and a way and, as it were, a pipe, through which the Holy Spirit flows and comes into our hearts. This is why St. Paul tells the Galatians that they have received the Holy Spirit, not through the works of the law but through the preaching of faith (3:2). And, writing to the Romans, he draws this conclusion (10-17): “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.”

From this it follows that they act foolishly, yea, against God’s order and institution, who despise and reject the external Word, thinking that the Holy Spirit and faith should come to them without means. It will indeed be a long time before that will happen.^{iv}

In brief then, the office and work of the Spirit is to reveal what great and glorious things God has done for us in Christ, John 16:13, and through the Gospel, to lead men everywhere to believe in Jesus and to live for Him.

II. The Holy Spirit as Represented by the Charismatic Movement

With that survey of the truth about the person and work of the Holy Spirit, we are ready to proceed to a consideration of the treatment of the doctrine of the Spirit within the charismatic movement. We shall begin with a historical sketch showing the connection between the Neo-Pentecostals, and the Pentecostals of the Apostolic and post-Apostolic times. Then we shall present some of the distinctive teachings of the charismatics together with an analysis to show their point of departure from Scripture.

The charismatic phenomenon is new, just over ten years old, but its antecedents go all the way back to the time of Christ. Its basic underlying idea was expressed already by the scribes and Pharisees who came to Jesus and said, “Master, we would see a sign from thee,” Matthew 12:38, and by the Corinthians who thought that speaking in tongues was superior to the proclamation of the word (prophecy), 1 Corinthians 14, as an evidence of the Spirit-filled life.

Neo-Pentecostalism originated like its twin sister, Pentecostalism in the Los Angeles area. In 1960 an Episcopal priest, the Rev. Dennis Bennett, rector of St. Mark’s Church in Van Nuys, resigned his pastorate because a controversy had arisen in his parish when he introduced speaking in tongues. About the same time an ALC pastor in San Pedro, Laurence Christenson, received the baptism in the Spirit and began to speak in tongues also. He was joined by a former neighbor of mine, Rev. Allan Hansen, pastor of St. Olaf Lutheran Church in Garden Grove. These two in turn received the support of the Rev. A. Herbert Mjorud, an former evangelism official of the American Lutheran Church. The ensuing controversy brought the new movement to the attention of the Christian world. From the Los Angeles area the movement has spread throughout the country, indeed, throughout the world. Its disciples are found within every major Protestant denomination as well as within the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Churches. An almost incredible 22,000 persons

attended the recent 7th International Conference on the Charismatic Renewal in the Catholic Church held on the campus of Notre Dame University in 1973. Participants included at least one bishop and two archbishops. We have already noted that while our convention was assembled, at New Ulm in 1973, 18,000 other Lutherans were participating in a similar charismatic conference in Minneapolis. In my judgment, the charismatic movement is the most significant as well as the most disturbing trend on the Christian scene today.

The unofficial headquarters of charismatic Christianity is the Melodyland Christian Center across the street from Disneyland in Anaheim, California, a multi-million dollar complex of assembly rooms, worship facilities, and offices headed by Ralph Wilkerson in periodic association with David Wilkerson of “Cross and Switchblade” fame. The center sponsors annual charismatic clinics that present name leaders of the movement as teachers and attract thousands of participants.

Originally the movement was known as Neo-Pentecostal because of its affinity for basic Pentecostal beliefs and practices. Adherents, however, prefer the term charismatic because “it is both Biblical and popular without bearing the stigma that has often in the past attached itself to the emotionalism and excesses of some Pentecostals.^v But whether it is called Pentecostal, Neo-Pentecostal or charismatic, “behind all these names stands the same central reality: the Pentecostal, or, if you will, the charismatic experience of the Holy Spirit in a life and speech-transforming event in the career of the Christian.”^{vi}

Mention must be made also of the organization that Fredrich Bruner in his valuable study of Neo-Pentecostalism asserts is the organ most efficient in the production of Neo-Pentecostalism. It is called The Full Gospel Business Men’s Fellowship International. It was founded in Los Angeles in 1953 and has since spread nationwide. It sponsors breakfasts and luncheons for Christian businessmen, originally of Pentecostal persuasion. In time others were invited as guests, especially pastors, including your essayist. It offers “Christian fellowship” in posh hotel dining rooms. Meetings begin innocently enough with testimonials that leave many unsuspecting Christians with the feeling that somehow their church has failed to turn them on. The end result for those who continue to involve themselves is the Pentecostal experience. In essence the charismatic theology of the Spirit is nothing other than a slightly refined, somewhat more sophisticated, form of Pentecostal theology.

What is the reason behind the spectacular growth of this new movement? Bruner’s answer, which is also cited by the Missouri Synod’s Commission on Theology and Church Relations states: “Protestant churches in particular and by definition and Roman Catholic Christians since the Second Vatican Council have exercised vigorous criticism of their own churches: their irrelevance, institutionalism, and spiritual deadness. Appealing especially to harried Protestant pastors and to spiritually malnourished Protestant and Catholic laity, the Neo-Pentecostal movement has promised a way out. Both Pentecostal and Neo-Pentecostal Christians claim that the power for the spiritual life in the individual and in the church is found in the long-neglected but now discovered and experienced baptism in the Holy Spirit with its charismatic manifestations.

“Charismatic Christianity promises the church and its members the source of renewal. As long as the church feels and experiences a renewal within its own resources (which, of course, the church will properly feel are not its own resources), the appeals of Neo-Pentecostalism will probably be minimal. But wherever a church or a Christian does not feel that present resources are adequate for present problems, Neo-Pentecostalism will appear on the scene with large advantages. Thus the future of Neo-Pentecostalism would appear to be as impressive as the surrounding churches resources are depleted. It will be interesting,” Dr. Bruner observes “to watch the future.”^{vii}

Students of church history will sense that all of this has a familiar ring to it. It may be neo, but it is not new. St. Paul encountered it already in Corinth, devoting three chapters of his first epistle (12-14) to the problem. The Montanists of the first century picked up the theme and developed it into a full blown heretical sect. The spiritualists of medieval times helped to perpetuate it, as did the Anabaptists and the Schwaermer of Luther’s day. Then came the Quakers, Pietism, revivalism in the frontier days of America, and then Methodism, the immediate predecessor and stage-setter for Pentecostalism.

Montanism has been described as “the classic example of a sect-type destined to reappear constantly in the history of the Church from that day to this.”^{viii} Professor Reinhold Seeberg, whom our Prof. Gawrisch regards as the father of the theological discipline which deals with the history of dogma, summarizes Montanism’s essential character in this fashion:

1. Montanists believed that the last period of revelation had opened. It is the day of spiritual gifts. Charism was a distinguishing trait of Montanism. (Montanus proclaimed himself to be the chosen instrument of the Paraclete promised by Christ. Members of Montanist congregations considered themselves to be more spiritual than members of ordinary congregations.)
2. The orthodoxy of Montanists is acknowledged in view of their acceptance of the rule of faith. Their Monarchical view of the Trinity was excused as due to their lack of theological culture.
3. The nearness of the end of the world was strongly emphasized.
4. Strict moral requirements were enjoined (fasts, no jewelry for women, entertainment a snare of Satan, etc.)^{ix}

Anyone even just vaguely familiar with Pentecostalism will recognize the parallels between these second century pneumatics and those of the twentieth century. This historical survey would be incomplete without a reference to John Wesley and Methodism, the precursor of Pentecostalism. A Jesuit student of Pentecostalism has observed that “The Pentecostal Movement is Methodism brought to its ultimate consequences. “ Indeed both in Europe and in South America Pentecostalism was introduced by Methodist ministers, W.C. Hoover in Chile, and T. B. Barratt in Norway.

John Wesley, it may be recalled, believed in “a second work of grace” after justification, something that had to be experienced before a sinner could be sure of salvation.” “We do not know of a single instance,” Wesley insisted, “in any place, of a person’s receiving in one and the same moment, remission of sins, the abiding witness of the Spirit, and a new clean heart.” In other words the receiving of the forgiveness of sins and the receiving of a new heart take place at two different times. One takes place when, a person is justified, the other when he is sanctified. So in Pentecostalism, the two experiences are likewise separated from one another. In both Methodism and Pentecostalism something more is necessary for salvation assurance than mere justification. In Methodism the theological focus is on salvation and the sanctification necessary to achieve it. In Pentecostalism, the theological focus is on salvation and the baptism of the Spirit necessary to assure it.

It would take us too long and too far afield to trace the steps from Methodism to revivalism in America and then to the Holiness Movement which spawned Pentecostalism. Suffice it to mention two significant names. The first is Charles Finney, the man who moved revivalism out of the tents, into the churches. He was the Billy Graham of pre-Civil War days, long time president of Oberlin College, and author of “*Lectures in Systematic Theology*,” the Pieper of Pentecostalism. Reprinted in 1968 by Baker Book House, it is the stock in trade item in any Pentecostal bookstore. Finney’s *Lectures* has probably done as much as any other text book to shape American Protestantism. Finney believed in and taught the importance of an experience subsequent to conversion that he called the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Because of his stature and influence as a teacher, we think a quote from his “*Memoirs*” is worthy of note. He is writing about the Rev. Mr. Gale, a Presbyterian minister who was his teacher.

There was another defect in brother Gale’s education, which I regarded as fundamental. If he had ever been converted to Christ, he had failed to receive that divine anointing of the Holy Ghost that would make him a power in the pulpit and in society for the conversion of souls. He had fallen short of receiving the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which is indispensable to ministerial success.”^x

(Finney's successor on the revival circuit was R. A. Torrey, influential president of the Moody Bible Institute in Chicago, and like Finney, a believer in Spirit baptism.)

The second key figure in Pentecostal history is W. J. Seymour, a colored holiness preacher in Los Angeles. A small group of Baptists invited him to speak in their home where on April, 9, 1906 (a date almost as significant to Pentecostals as Oct. 31, 1517 is to Lutherans) a Pentecostal happening occurred. Word spread, The curious were attracted, attendance grew, and to accommodate the crowds, a former Methodist Church on Azuza Street was purchased (the Castle Church of Pentecostalism). From Azuza Street Pentecostalism spread across the continent and around the world become in less than a generation a force to be reckoned with in Church history. Some even considered it to be Christianity's "third front." First there was Catholicism, then Protestantism, both of which, it is said, have lost their sense of mission urgency. And now, lately, there is the new Reformation, the charismatic movement.

What is distinctive about Pentecostalism, which gives the charismatic movement its peculiar theological character? Without question the one doctrine that distinguishes Pentecostal theology from all other theology is the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. Two other doctrines are corollaries to it, (1) the doctrine of the initial evidence of baptism in the Holy Spirit, (i.e., speaking in tongues) and 2) the doctrine of the conditions for baptism in the Holy Spirit (chiefly four such conditions: regeneration, absolute obedience, prayer and faith).

To understand how the doctrine of baptism in the Holy Spirit developed, it needs to be remembered that both the Pentecostal and the Neo-Pentecostal movements originated among people who were already active Christians, but who wanted something more than they were getting from their churches. They wanted something more than mere teaching, more than just religiously warmed-over moral exhortations and a social gospel decorated with a Christian vocabulary but without power to save. What was that something more and how could one acquire it? The story of Pentecost provided the answer, particularly the words, "They were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance," Acts 2:4. How could the experience of those first century disciples be experienced again by 20th century disciples? That question provided the impetus for the development of the entire Pentecostal system with its particular emphasis on Spirit theology. To a charismatic the doctrine of the Holy Spirit suggests nothing at all of the picture we tried to present in the first part of this essay. Rather, as Dr. Bruner points out, "The doctrine of the Holy Spirit according to Pentecostals is essentially the experience of the Holy Spirit, and the experience of the Holy Spirit in a special way: specifically, the post-conversion *filling* of the Holy Spirit."^{xi}

How does one get filled with the Holy Spirit? The answer is by being baptized in the Holy Spirit as Jesus' disciples were baptized in the Spirit on Pentecost day and as other Christians were subsequently. Pentecostals believe that the Holy Spirit is to be received twice, once in conversion and again in Spirit-baptism. In conversion a Christian merely receives the Spirit, in Spirit baptism he fully receives the Spirit and is empowered thereby for service in the church.

Because this idea is so crucial in the theology of the charismatic movement, it is necessary to define it more fully. Pentecostals believe in two baptisms, one water, the other a Spirit baptism. In water baptisms the spirit is the agent; in spirit Christ is the agent. Every Christian has been baptized by the Spirit into Christ (that is conversion) but not every Christian has been baptized by Christ into the Spirit. Thus this distinction is made between receiving the new birth and receiving Spirit baptism:

	New birth (by or of)	Spirit baptism (in or with)
The agent:	The Spirit	Christ
The means:	The atoning blood	The Holy Spirit
The result:	The new birth	Power for service

The book of Acts provides the proof passages for this erroneous teaching. First of all there is the Pentecost story itself. All will agree that Jesus' disciples received the Holy Spirit as believers before Pentecost. Their experience on Pentecost day constituted a subsequent reception of the Holy Spirit and established a

precedent for a similar experience for all Christians. Jesus had told his disciples to go back to Jerusalem and wait for the Spirit to come. One reason why Christians in other churches lack Spirit-power, charismatics contend, is because they do not wait for the Spirit as Pentecostals do in their “tarrying meetings” where they wait for the Spirit.

Further support for the baptism in the Spirit derives from Peter’s response to the multitude on Pentecost day: “Repent and be baptized everyone one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,” Acts 2:35. Peter enumerates three steps, repent, be baptized, and then receive the Spirit. Most Christians, charismatics point out, stop after step two, and thus never receive the Spirit fully because they do not seek him. We would say, in response, that the three things are not separate, but simultaneous actions in the Christian’s life.

The major passage which charismatics employ to support their doctrine is Acts 8:4-25. It relates how Philip worked with signal success in Samaria. Later, “When the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, then sent unto them Peter and John: who when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive Holy Ghost.” (For as yet he had fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost.” Supposedly this passage establishes beyond question that a person may come to faith and still not have received the Spirit. The Samaritan converts, like so many others, had stopped short.

Paul is also cited as an example of a person who had two encounters with the Spirit, first on the Damascus road, then three days later in the home of Judas on Straight Street where he met Ananias. Ananias told Paul that Jesus had sent him, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost,” Acts 9:17

Another passage frequently cited by charismatics in support of their view is Acts 19:1-7. At Ephesus Paul found a group of disciples and asked them, “Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John’s baptism.” After Paul had presented the full story about Jesus, “They were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spoke with tongues and prophesied.” This incident makes it clear to charismatics that first men become Christians, and subsequently they become Spirit-filled Christians. It is easy to see, I think, how uncaredful readers of the Bible can be easily misled by such a handling of the Scriptures.

The false interpretation which charismatics give to these passages becomes apparent when one recalls what Scripture teaches about the work of the Holy Spirit. He calls us by the Gospel, enlightens us with his gifts, sanctifies and keeps us in the faith. The Spirit’s work in the life of a Christian is an *ongoing* work. After initially receiving him when he calls us by the Gospel, we continually receive him as he enlightens, sanctifies and keeps us. Remember too that the gifts with which he enlightens us “differ according to the grace that is given to us,” Romans 12:6. Some receive gifts that are not given to others. So also in Apostolic times. When some received the Holy Spirit, they were given the gift of tongues, such as the apostles, Cornelius and the Ephesus disciples. When others were filled with the Holy Ghost, they did *not* receive that particular gift, notably the 3000 baptized on Pentecost day. But all received the gift of faith, faith to believe, to hope and to love.

According to Pentecostals, the necessity for the baptism in the Holy Spirit is threefold. It is necessary for the indwelling of the Spirit, necessary to obtain power for service, and necessary in order to obtain the gifts of the Spirit. All Christians have the Spirit, but not fully and permanently unless they are baptized in the Spirit. At the time of conversion the Spirit is only *on* or with the believer. After Spirit baptism he is in the believer. The charismatic emphasis on the inner working of the Spirit and on his equipping Christians for service is a good and a necessary one. But it is falsified by making the working and equipping the result of a second baptism.

Spirit baptism is necessary also in order to receive Spirit power for service in Christ’s kingdom. It is not necessary for salvation, only for power. When a person is born again, he becomes a child of God; when he

receives Spirit baptism, he becomes a soldier of Christ. He is not prepared for useful service until he *fully* receives the Spirit.

Spirit baptism is also a prerequisite for receiving the gifts of the Spirit, the charismatic gifts so important in the charismatic scheme of things. We will have a further word about those gifts later.

The first corollary to the doctrine of the baptism in the Holy Spirit is the doctrine of the initial evidence of this baptism. Charismatics agree that it is God's intention to provide a sign when the baptism in the Spirit occurs. That sign is speaking in tongues, or *glossolalia*. It is not the only sign, but it is the initial sign. The Rev. Laurence Christenson, a Lutheran charismatic says, "Scripture does not say that (speaking in tongues) is the only one. But in showing us the pattern, scripture gives us no consistent suggestion of any other."^{xii}

The pattern Christenson has reference to is, again, that which is presented by the book of Acts. On Pentecost day, speaking in tongues provided the evidence that the disciples had been filled with the Holy Ghost. That incident sets the pattern for every baptism in the Spirit. Charismatics argue that the Pentecost experience of the disciples is repeatable. If speaking in tongues was the evidence of the gift of the Spirit in the church's *first* major experience, why not also in the continuing experience of the church. The fact that the wind and the fire do not also recur is dismissed by as an artificial and arbitrary distinction between repeatable and unrepeatable phenomena.

The Cornelius episode (Acts 10:45-46) confirms for charismatics that the Pentecost occurrence was not intended as a one time only proposition. Cornelius and members of his household also spoke in tongues. The first gentiles to do so. The only other recorded instance of tongues-speaking in Acts occurred at Ephesus. After Paul had instructed the group of disciples he met there, he laid hands on them, and they too "spoke with tongues and prophesied," Acts 19:6. These experiences, they insist, of the apostles, of Cornelius and of the Ephesian disciples were a direct fulfillment of the Lord's prophecy concerning the "signs (which) shall follow them that believe." "They shall speak, with new tongues," He said just prior to his ascension, Mark 16:17.

Charismatics, therefore, see speaking in tongues as a must if a Christian is to have the assurance that the Holy Spirit has truly come to him. And therein lies a key to the understanding of the charismatics way of thinking. He must have a sign, an outward sign, or he cannot be sure. The sign is one that involves the believer personally. That means that his assurance is based upon something subjective, something personal and experiential within him, rather than something objective. Suffice it for now to point out that where the Scriptural teaching of objective justification is correctly understood and believed, no need exists for assurance based on something within. A Christian's assurance is based upon the pure promises of God, not upon the ambiguity of personal feeling or experience. The only sign a Christian really needs is the sign of the cross and of the empty tomb of Christ. You can always trust God. You cannot always trust your feelings or even your experiences.

The seventy disciples of Jesus once made this mistake, Luke 10:1-20. They had just returned from a special mission task. When they reported back to Jesus they told how they had cleansed lepers, healed the sick and cast out devils. Somewhat boastfully they said to him, "Even the devils are subject unto us through thy name." Jesus did not respond by saying, "Praise the Lord, Hallelujah!" Rather he cautioned them saying, "Notwithstanding in this rejoice not, that the spirits are subject unto you, but rather rejoice that your names are written in heaven." He saw clearly the danger. He did not want the attention of these disciples shifted from God's grace to their own experiences. Charismatics make that mistake. They shift the emphasis from what God does for sinners (objective) to what God does in sinners (subjective). That is the deadly error also of Roman Catholicism's infused grace.

The second corollary to the doctrine of baptism in the Holy Spirit is the doctrine of conditions for receiving the baptism. Charismatics believe that the Holy Spirit does not fill men automatically unless they meet certain conditions, and definitely seek to be filled. The list of conditions varies from one authority to another. But basically all are agreed on these four: conversion or regeneration, obedience, prayer, faith. It is in connection with these conditions that the characteristic absolutes of Pentecostalism enter the picture. The

candidate for Spirit baptism is asked, “Have you obeyed the Lord *fully*? Have you yielded to God at *every* point?” Total repentance and total yielding to God’s will are required.

Faith is also made a condition for Spirit baptism. Non-charismatics are frequently mystified by a charismatic’s insistence that salvation is by faith alone, and that faith is also a condition for receiving the baptism of the Spirit. He appears to be trying to say yes and no at the same time to the same question. Charismatics, however, operate with a dual concept of faith. First there is the faith that apprehends Christ. That is followed by faith that apprehends the Spirit. The one results in the new birth, the other in the baptism of the Spirit. The one procures salvation, the other procures power for consecrated Christian living. Pentecostals do not make clear why the first faith does not appropriate the Holy Spirit in all ways other than to say it is not aimed at the Spirit, but at Christ and that the Holy Spirit must be actively sought and applied for. They do make clear, however, that faith is not really faith unless it is joined with an experience, specifically the experience of *glossolalia*, an experience that involves conditions that must be met by the individual.

Bruner points out that in the Pentecostal view ordinary Christian faith is not really faith properly speaking because it is insufficiently total. Then he adds, “It is in this last category—totality—that we believe we have a major clue to the Pentecostal understanding of faith as a condition for baptism in the Holy Spirit. Faith, in the Pentecostal view, is not a mere trusting, it is absolute surrender. It is for this reason that Pentecostals can, seriously speak of ‘faith alone,’ for what they understand under faith is not what has been normally understood by this word.”^{xiii} (I can still recall how stymied I felt in one of my first encounters with a Pentecostal when I said, “We believe it’s all a matter of faith,” and she said, “So do we.”)

In a summary statement Bruner then concludes, “The definition of faith, then, provides the solution to the enigma of what Pentecostalism means by speaking of both the candidate’s faith alone *and* his costly sacrifice as a means to the gift of the Spirit. For until the glossolalia baptism occurs, the Christian’s faith must have been imperfect, and therefore, in the Pentecostal understanding, not really faith. When faith becomes as nearly absolute as it can—that is, practically speaking, when it becomes very intense—then it experiences and then it is really faith. In this intense sense, Pentecostals mean faith alone.”^{xiv}

Anyone who understands and appreciates the proper distinction between Law and Gospel has to be left squirming in his seat when confronted with the doctrine of the conditions for receiving Spirit baptism. It is difficult for me to conceive of any way in which one could do a more thorough job of confusing law and Gospel than the Pentecostals do with their distinctive pneumatology. Like the false teachers in Galatia, these people are preaching another gospel which is not another. It can properly be said of them, “There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ,” Galatians 1:7. And they are equally as deserving of Paul’s anathema. For they are bewitching many with their false notion that the Spirit of God is received by “works off the law” rather than by “the hearing of faith,” Galatians 3:2. What a tragedy it is that many evangelicals today seem reluctant to brand Pentecostal theology for what it is—“another gospel.”

Before we offer our conclusions, we must still give consideration to 1 Corinthians 12:14, a portion of Scripture that occupies a special place of prominence in charismatic teaching. It is that section of Corinthians in which St. Paul discusses the subject, or perhaps one could say “problem,” of spiritual gifts. The fourteenth chapter concerns itself especially with the gifts of tongues and prophecy, and their proper, God-intended, use in the church. Charismatics use these chapters in support of their particular emphases. We on the other hand are convinced that there is no support in these chapters for the Pentecostal interpretation of prophecy or for its use of and emphasis upon speaking in tongues. In fact Paul is actually offering in these chapters a necessary corrective for the very kind of abuse of these gifts which had become apparent in Corinth and which characterizes the charismatic movement today.

Paul structures these three chapters in his usual orderly way. In the first chapter (12) he discusses the *work* of the Spirit in connection with *χαρίσματα* (the gifts of the Spirit). In the second chapter (13) he underscores the *manner* of the Spirit, *ἀγάπη*. And in the third chapter (14) he points out the *goal* of the Spirit, the *οικοδομή*, or the upbuilding of the church. So then, the work, the manner and the goal of the Spirit are the

subjects of Paul's concern, To know the interrelationship of these three chapters to each other is of utmost importance to a proper understanding of the tongues question in chapter 14.

Martin Franzmann in the *New Concordia Bible with Notes* summarizes that interrelationship this way: "The Holy Spirit puts men under the Lordship of Jesus, the Crucified; the gifts which the Holy Spirit bestows are therefore to be the expression of the Lord's self-giving will and are to be used in mutual ministration for the church, the body of Christ, where (as in the human body) no member can be solitary and self sufficient and all members are necessary." That is chapter 12, "The highest gift of the Spirit is the gift of that indispensable love which sets man free for ministry," chapter 13. "No gift of the Spirit is being used rightly when it is used to foster individualism in worship and creates a confusion which does not edify. The God who gave his Son to be the Peace of the world is a God of peace and not of confusion; He would have all things. . . done decently and in order." Paul begins the section by saying, "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant." The implication is that there was ignorance in Corinth concerning the proper use of the Spirit's gifts. Some apparently had the notion that those who could speak in tongues had been given a special measure of the Spirit, and therefore they were a kind of superior Christian in a special class. One can well imagine what such an attitude did to the tender relations between fellow Christians in the congregation.

Paul deepens our insight into the problem when he says in the second verse, "Ye know that ye were Gentiles, *carried away* unto these dumb idols, even as ye were led." Before they had become Christians, they had been a part of a heathen religious system in which they got "carried away" in their rituals in a frantic kind of ecstatic seizure. Such ecstasy was regarded as the ultimate means for establishing a connection with their gods. Some of the Corinthians, in a fashion so typical of the times, were transferring that heathen notion into the congregation and connecting it to such things as speaking in tongues. This, they then insisted, was really the highest of all spiritual gifts. It was this insistence, along with some other problems, which was under-mining the unity of the Spirit in the Corinthian congregation.

Paul corrects the spiritualists in Corinth by pointing out that the truly spiritual person is not characterized by being carried away in a frenzied, fanatical way. He follows that negative observation with a positive statement. "Wherefore, I give you to understand that no man speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed, and that no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by the Holy Ghost." Thus according to Paul, the simple intelligible confession that Jesus is Lord is the characteristic work of the Spirit. Any man who in humble faith confesses Jesus as Lord has experienced the work of the Spirit in his heart. The Holy Spirit has no higher gift to give than faith in Jesus as Lord.

That faith comes through the Word of God. That is why Paul heads his list of the gifts of the Spirit with the *word* of wisdom and the *word* of knowledge. The chief work of the Spirit, as we have emphasized previously, is to honor Jesus, particularly through speech. And for that purpose, "there are diversities of gifts," "diversities of *διακονία*" (ministries or services) and "diversities of operations."

It is over against that setting and background that the remainder of these chapters must be understood. In chapter 13 Paul connects all of these *charismata* with love showing how The gifts with which the Spirit graces our lives are to express themselves. It is interesting to note briefly how even this chapter argues against the Pentecostal enthusiast's understanding of these chapters. Paul's first definition of love is *makrothumēi* (μακροθυμεί)—long-suffering. Love is not super-emotional or passionate or fiery. It is rather the stretching out or the extension of passion or emotion, just the opposite of the ecstatic experience. Recall in this connection how Paul in the previous chapter had contrasted the Corinthians' fanaticism as heathen with their simple confession of faith as Christians.

Then Paul takes up the question of speaking in tongues. Paul begins the chapter by encouraging the Corinthians to use their enthusiasm to pursue the love life he has just described for them. The gift which they ought especially to seek is the gift of prophecy. "Desire spiritual gifts," he says, "but rather that ye may prophesy." We understand prophecy in its usual Scriptural sense of preaching, of communicating or sharing God's truth with one another, in understandable speech. In other, words, Paul is suggesting that the highest, noblest thing Christians can do is, not to get carried away in ecstasy or on emotional binges, but to engage in

helpful discussion and conversation of spiritual matters. That builds up the body of Christ. That strengthens and unites God's people. Mark with a red pencil in your Bible how often Paul speaks in this chapter of edification and edifying, that is of building up the body of Christ. That is the theme of this chapter.

When speaking in tongues does not serve the purpose of edifying, it has no place in the church. Then it does not unite, it divides. Then it is not a tool of the Spirit, but of Satan. Thus when it is taught that Spirit-baptism and its initial evidence, speaking in tongues, points to an "advanced" Christian status, then the members of the body of Christ are being divided into first and second class citizens of the Kingdom.

Bruner points out, "It was to avoid, not to introduce, such divisions that Paul wrote 1 Corinthians 12-13." In a footnote he adds a significant, insightful explanatory note. "Schism is, in fact, the historical result of the Pentecostal division of baptism into Christ for all Christians, baptism into the Spirit for especially dedicated Christians. A movement which begins by dividing the reception of deity culminates in dividing the fellowship of Christians."^{xv}

While a complete study of the tongues question is beyond the limited scope of this paper, we presume that the question will be asked later, so we will briefly answer it now: Does the Spirit still give the gift of tongues to individuals? Are there instances of its use today which are genuine? Actually these questions involve another much broader in scope. The basic question is: Has God promised to give his Spirit to the church today in the same way he gave his Spirit to the Church in the age of the Apostles? To the church? Yes! In the same way? No! No such specific promise is given anywhere in the Scriptures. The gift of the Spirit in Apostolic times included tongues, healing and the performance of miracles. Lutheran theologians of the past have generally agreed that these gifts were given for a special purpose at a special time in the church's history, and were therefore limited to that period of time. These special gifts were God's way of authenticating the message of the Apostles prior to the time of the formulation of the New Testament Scriptures. Once the authority of his Word was established, the authenticating miracles were no longer required.

The theologians of Lutheran orthodoxy distinguished between baptism with the Holy Spirit, a temporary gift, and baptism in Christ's name, a sacrament to be performed until his return. More recently, Dr. Theo. Engelder, in his "*Popular Symbolics*" identified Spirit baptism with a Christian's conversion.^{xvi} The late Prof. Adelbert Schaller, in an article in the "*Quartalschrift*" (Oct. 1944, pp. 230-245) entitled, "What is the Gift of the Holy Ghost According to Acts?" takes the position of the early orthodox dogmatists asserting that there is a bestowal of the Holy Spirit intended for all Christians, and another manifestation of the Spirit intended only for some Christians of the Apostolic age. I would agree that a natural reading of Acts compels one to that conviction.

While I am convinced that this applies to the performance of miracles, such as the raising of the dead, I am not as convinced that it must also apply categorically to speaking in tongues. For one thing, there is a question as to whether the tongues in 1 Corinthians means foreign languages as it does in Acts 2, or some other kind of ecstatic utterance. Chrysostom insisted that it does mean languages, Tertullian (a Montanist) took the other position. For another thing, no conclusive substantiation can be cited from Scripture in support of the contention that the gift of tongues was to cease for all time with the passing of the Apostolic age and the acceptance of the canon of Scripture. As far as the charismatic movement is concerned, it is apparent from a testing of the spirits that it is not a phenomenon of the Spirit. It is a movement that distorts God's truth into another gospel. Therefore we cannot regard its tongues speaking as authentic. I would hesitate, however, to assert that every manifestation of tongues is likewise unauthentic. In summary we would say that the basic errors in the theology of the charismatic movement are these:

1. The insistence that the promise of the Spirit includes extraordinary, spiritual gifts which are to be actively sought by the Christian.
2. An emphasis on the Holy Spirit and His work which tends to de-emphasize the importance of Christ and his work for our salvation.

3. The claim that the baptism in the Holy Spirit involves a second grace-work of the Spirit in addition to conversion and sanctification for which a Christian must qualify on the basis of certain conditions.
4. A denial of the means of grace by making Spirit baptism a supplement to the means of grace, a supplement by which the Spirit equips Christians for service.
5. A confusion of evangelical truth that suggests that a Christian must seek the Spirit before the Spirit will fully come to the Christian.
6. The emphasis on experience as a basis of the assurance of God's favor. (This was the fundamental error of the Schwaermer in Luther's day.)
7. A disregard of the Scriptural principles of fellowship which makes the baptism in the Spirit a sufficient basis for fellowship with other Christians. (cf. ALC Pastor Morris Wogen's boast that he fellowships with priests and nuns who are charismatics; *Christian News*, July 24, 1972, p. 1)

In conclusion we would point out that the charismatic movement is apparently more than just a passing fad. It is a religious phenomenon that is here to stay. It has appeal. To many it seems to offer something genuine, something to turn Christians on in an age when churches have been notably successful in turning members off with their low view of Scripture and their substitution of a social gospel for the saving gospel. Charismatics have a warmth and a zeal for their cause, which though it is not according to knowledge, nonetheless gives us reason to ask how zealously we are employing the grace gifts the Spirit has distributed to us. If the charismatic movement is a reactionary one, for Jesus' sake let us be sure that we are not a part of what charismatics react against. Just to point our fingers at others while we sit comfortably at ease in Zion not using God's good gifts as the Spirit would have us to do is a sin no less reprehensible than the misuse charismatics make of those gifts.

Certainly we ought not to blind ourselves to the significance of the charismatic movement. We contend that the Holy Spirit is not its moving force, but he is nonetheless using it for his own purposes. Surely he expects a reaction from us. We could go to the opposite extreme. Or we could do the typically Lutheran thing and react in a truly evangelical fashion. We could do that by making sure that the Holy Spirit is not a half-known God in our churches. We could use the gifts of the word of wisdom and the word of knowledge to talk up the gifts of the Spirit among our people and to encourage a diligent, zealous and God-pleasing use of those gifts for the upbuilding, the οἰκοδομή, of the body of Christ. For this is the will of our God, even our sanctification.

One thing we will not want to do is to assume the posture of those who ask piously, "Who is to say for sure that the charismatic movement is not the Spirit's thing?" When Luther was faced with a similar phenomenon on the part of the Enthusiasts, he did not equivocate. He spoke out against Muentzer and his ilk in no uncertain terms insisting that the reason Muentzer was so full of the Spirit was because he had swallowed him, feathers and all.

If the charismatic movement is the wave of the future, and if it misrepresents the truth about Jesus and his Spirit, then we shall need to know its errors so that we can in ἀγάπη fashion, employ the Scripture, given by inspiration of God, for correction and instruction. We need to study this thing diligently, all of us, to discuss it among ourselves and with other Christians and to be able to give to any man who asks us a reason for the hope that is in us. And as we do so we ought also to combine our Spirit-given understanding of the truth with some of the joy, the warmth, the friendliness and the eagerness to share Christ so "characteristic of Pentecostals. There is room for, and need for more of that in our churches and people. Woe to us if our failure to be courteous and receptive to the stranger in our gates causes him to seek the warmer climate of a Pentecostal fellowship. Perhaps, pastors, we need to give more attention to that aspect of our work of equipping saints for their work of ministry. And perhaps I should begin by taking more seriously myself the exhortation of Paul to "rejoice in the Lord."

By the marvelous, amazing grace of God, we have been privileged to enter the 125th anniversary year of the establishment of our Synod. The discerning eye that surveys the record of those 125 years is aware of the fact that as a Synod we manifest certain strengths and certain weaknesses. We humbly thank God for the strengths, most especially for the gift of fidelity to the Word and for the unity of the Spirit he has given us these many years. It is a rare gift in short supply in our times. As we celebrate 125 years of grace, are we as aware of our weaknesses as we are of our strengths? Are we disturbed, for instance, about the fact that those whose theology we disallow are often more eager to share Christ than we are?

We need to recognize that Satan is clever enough to short circuit the powerline even of those who are orthodox, thus causing a power failure in the lives of individual Christians with the result that lights are dimmed and even extinguished. When that happens the warmth of ἀγάπη love cools, the joy of being a Christian is dissipated, stewardship and evangelism begin to falter. Our record in one area or another indicates that we could be putting the power of the Spirit to more effective uses. Where? That is a question each of us must answer for himself, each congregation for itself.

The church in our times needs a charismatic movement, no question about that. But it must be one patterned after the one that began on Pentecost day. You and I can be a part of that movement by praying for a charismatic renewal of our own, and then letting God use us so that our speech and our preaching is “in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.” 1 Co 2:4. Let us pray for the Spirit that he might come into our hearts and lives and make us effective instruments in his hand for the cause of the gospel and the glory of our Savior’s name. I can’t think of any better way to celebrate Grace 125.

Endnotes

ⁱ Lorenz Wunderlich, *The Half-Known God*, Concordia, 1961, p. 1.

ⁱⁱ Ibid. p. 78.

ⁱⁱⁱ Frederick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit*, Eerdmans, 1970. p. 245.

^{iv} E. Plass, *What Luther Says*. Vol. 2, Concordia, para. 2863.

^v *The Charismatic Movement and Lutheran Theology*, Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations, LC-MS, p. 4.

^{vi} Bruner, p. 53.

^{vii} Ibid. p. 54.

^{viii} J. S. Whale, *The Protestant Tradition: an Essay in Interpretation*, Cambridge, 1955. p. 209, Cited by Bruner.

^{ix} Cited in Bruner, p. 36.

^x Charles G. Finney, *Memoirs*, Fleming H. Revel Co. 1903, p. 85. Quoted by Bruner, p. 41.

^{xi} Bruner, p. 59.

^{xii} Laurence Christenson, *Speaking in Tongues*, Bethany Fellowship, Minneapolis, 1968, p. 54.

^{xiii} Bruner, p. 110.

^{xiv} Ibid. p. 111.

^{xv} Ibid. p. 293.

^{xvi} Theo. Engelder, *Popular Symbolics*, Concordia, 1934. pp. 69-70.