

**Part I: Exegesis of I Corinthians 14:1-5 and Isogical study of
14:6-25
and
Part II: Counseling With Charismatics As Pastors As We Deal With
Glossolalia**

By Harry Wiedmann

[Presented at Central Conference October 16, 1984]

I Corinthians 14

Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύτε.

**ITS LOVE YOU SHOULD STRIVE FOR, BE EAGER TO HAVE THE GIFTS OF THE
SPIRIT, ESPECIALLY THAT YOU MAY PROPHECY**

Paul's interest does not lie in a theologically concise and precise treatise on glossolalia, which would make my assignment easier, but in addressing a problem in Corinth pastorally. So already here we have a clue how we should approach the same issue. We need to be conscientious, loving, and faithful shepherds of souls. The present tenses indicate Paul is speaking for today also. The first clause is a summary of chapter thirteen, which is no strange digression, but, vital in making love the essence in this matter. Love is the normative principle. For ardor without love as practiced by the Corinthians, serves as an example of this fault, and of being CARNAL (I Cor. 13:1) *σαρκικός* the very antithesis of *πνευματικός*. So we might ask, does speaking in "tongues" meet the test of love? At Corinth it did not!! "In their practical use of them they applied the wrong standards and did not let themselves be guided by the one supreme gift of love,"¹ But that just points out our need for the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the sine qua non of Christianity. Love imparted by the Holy Spirit seeks above all to profit others. It is like God's love for us, which so wonderfully has sought our eternal welfare. This essential point, the benefit of others, is the point of this chapter 14. **SEEK THAT YOU MAY EXCEL FOR THE UPBUILDING OF THE CHURCH** (v. 12) or **THAT THE CHURCH MAY RECEIVE UPBUILDING** (v. 5) that UPBUILDING is normative for Paul in making the necessary assessment. Hence they will **ESPECIALLY SEEK THAT THEY MAY PROPHECY**, which seems to have the implication that the "tongues gift" should not be sought. When Paul said **SEEK** these gifts, that does not mean "cultivate" somehow, which concept is excluded by the term GIFT. By the way prayer is nowhere listed as a *χάρισμα*.

Paul introduced the fact that he himself did speak "IN TONGUES" (v. 14&18) yet although Paul could and did speak by the Spirit, he never did so publicly and apparently, for otherwise there would have been no need for him to tell the Corinthians that he could, they would have heard him themselves. This indicates, by the way, that "tongues" were not given for the purpose of evangelism, the very point Paul makes in verses 21ff. "A SIGN FOR BELIEVERS? NO UNBELIEVERS!! (v. 22) "Charismatics reverse that."² **I THANK GOD THAT MORE THAN YOU ALL I SPEAK IN TONGUES** is not "to encourage use, but to curb misuse."³ Even so "tongues" are a sign not for believers just like the unintelligible Assyrian language of their conquerors was a sign of judgment upon the unbelieving Jews who **EVEN SO WOULD NOT HEAR THE LORD**(v21). So it appears Pentecost in Paul's eyes had the same purpose for the unbelieving Jews. "Tongues" heard by the unbelieving just confirm them in unbelief, for they conclude the congregation is composed of people who are

MAD (v. 23), or intoxicated (Acts 2:13). Precisely why prophecy is a greater gift! (v. 24 & 25) The proclamation of Law and Gospel will result in conviction of sin and repentance, resulting in heartfelt confession of faith.

“Since the prophet is a man of Word, the fruits must be sought in the sphere of the Word; the doctrine is the important consideration. This shall be tried whether it be of God” (Matt 7:15, Acts 17:10ff).⁴ So when Paul urges the Corinthians not to be CHILDREN IN MIND (v. 20—note the loving "BRETHREN") is he not tactfully saying their striving for the "tongues gift" was childish?

A definition of prophecy is important because Charismatics once again use the term with a different definition. "The Charismatic experience...can't just be preaching the Word!"⁵ Actually, they feel "prophecy differs from tongues only in that it is spoken in understandable speech."⁶ Paul does use another Word. in I Cor.

14:31 *αποαλύπτω*. When used in their sense an opponent says "it is contrary to the Word of God to claim prophetic gifts in the postapostolic era."⁷ Charismatics contend God's revelation is still incomplete. Neo-pentecostals are all agreed that the Holy Spirit works apart from the Scripture designated meaning. "I would suggest we are getting at the roots of this movement when we consider its non-acceptance of the doctrine of the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures...at issue is not God's power, but His will. The question is not, can God give extra-biblical revelations? But does God wish to add to revelation given in the Holy Scriptures."⁸

"Danger that the divine authorization of the Apostle be replaced by ecstatic experience with its exaltation of the individual, and veneration of the pneumatic, or pretended pneumatic."⁹ Another critic says: "I have heard hundreds of 'messages in tongues' and 'interpretations'. Not one added anything of value to the meetings."¹⁰ Do remember Paul speaks of ALL MAY PROPHECY in 14:31.

ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσση οὐκ ἄνθρωποις λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ θεῷ οὐδεις γὰρ ἀκούει, πνεύματι δε λαλεῖ μυστήρια

FOR WHEN ONE SPEAKS IN ANOTHER LANGUAGE (TONGUE), HE DOES NOT SPEAK TO MEN BUT TO GOD, FOR NO ONE UNDERSTANDS, FOR HIS SPIRIT IS SPEAKING MYSTERIES.

Paul wanted to prove the use of *μᾶλλον* in the first verse by comparing glossolalia with prophecy. Note the connecting *γάρ*. How, should we define *λαλῶν γλώσση*? Acts uses a fuller expression (Acts 2:4) adding *ἑτέραις*, here "an ellipsis of adjective."¹¹ One ought not leave the *ἑτέραις* untranslated. In Acts it means VARIOUS languages which were different from the mother tongue of the speaker. They were even listed. Mark 16:17 adds *καιναῖς* (new—unusual). In I Corinthians 14:21 *ἑτερογλώσσοις* was a foreign language Assyrian. In Acts 2:6 each one hears *τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ* which refers to the speaker's own "dialect". The King James unfortunately adds UNKNOWN to TONGUES. There is not even a variant for the false or misleading UNKNOWN. "Paul does not qualify the tongues as being UNKNOWN."¹² "Lamentable proof of the above (i.e. not *ἀγνώσκῃ*) to which latter interpretation rendering can be perverted in the hands of ignorant or insidious enthusiasm, by assuming the term to mean 'a tongue unknown to mankind' and from thence, by an impious inference, supernatural and divine instead of relatively, 'unknown to another people.'"¹³ Some charismatics, there is no agreement among them, will say that "speaking in tongues is a language."¹⁴ "Here again., the term is being subjected to a new definition. They would also insist that "tongues" is the expression of the 'groaning which cannot be uttered' of Romans 8:26."¹⁵ It does not seem to bother them that "it cannot be uttered." One must also wonder how they go from Romans to Corinthians following normal exegetical rules!! They also make use of v.14 FOR IF I PRAY IN TONGUES, MY SPIRIT PRAYS (hence by the way *πνεύματι* in verse 2 is not the Holy Spirit) BUT MY MIND IS NOT INVOLVED. So 'tongues' is a language used for speaking with God in worship in contrast to a language in speaking to men, for HE DOES NOT SPEAK TO MEN BUT TO GOD (v. 2). Generally charismatics insist such SPEAKING TO GOD requires glossolalia to be understood as ecstatic

utterance. Not necessarily. It is simply a matter of God understanding, but the hearers do not. "Paul's statement that speaking with tongues was meant for God and not men, hardly applies to the use of a foreign language among men who are not familiar with that language."¹⁶ It is unintelligible, a mystery then, but made so by the mode of expression, rather than content. But we hear: "most likely by the word γλώσση has here the sense of language—a miraculous language which is used in heaven between God and angels."¹⁷ Why not read Corinthians and this term in the light of Acts? There the term is defined clearly! Finally, we might look at v. 11 τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς (force of sound)—‘meaning of the language’.

The Corinthians would bring their understanding of what they had known (cf. Delphic Oracle—There is more "glossolalia among mystics and cults"¹⁸ of strange origins with "muttering sounds" and words with no meaning connection, outside the church than inside). They practiced this (I Cor. 12:2) YE KNOW THAT YE WERE GENTILES CARRIED AWAY UNTO THESE DUMB IDOLS, EVEN AS YE WERE LED. Notice, despite their hopes and expectations idols are DUMB. No message from God! They had heard ecstatic speech. But it certainly was not SPIRITUAL. "Ecstatic does not prove spirituality."¹⁹ Charismatics laud tongues as 'prayer language' as a special blessing. "It is distinct from praying with understanding", for it "bypasses the limitations of intellect."²⁰ Yet, when Paul wrote (v. 5) I WOULD THAT ALL SPOKE IN TONGUES, we must note that he adds he would rather they could prophesy on a five to ten thousand ratio!!! And ten thousand. was the largest number the Greeks had!! "If they have quoted him aright, then the apostle was a man who contradicted himself in a most astonishing way."²¹ Schlatter in his commentary of first Corinthians "assess this speaking to be ecstatic expression of strong emotion that so filled the heart of the speaker that he could not find the words to express himself and sounded forth his feeling of joy and praise in whatever sounds bubbled forth out of his heart. This was also Kowalke's opinion. Balge was uncertain. And Gerlach thought nothing proves that it can't mean languages.

ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν.

HE WHO PROPHESES, SPEAKS TO MEN FOR UPBUILDING, ENCOURAGEMENT, AND COMFORT.

These are the wonderful results of prophecy which makes it a gift to be desired, surely, beyond 'tongues'. These are the gifts and the tasks of the true prophet. Prophecy is for UPBUILDING (3,4,5,12,17,26). The true God is the Source (chapter 12). Love is the manner (chapter 13). Up building is the goal (chapter 14). So all the gifts receive their value in accordance with the power to edify (v. 4,5,6). This thought is amplified by the trumpet and flute comparison (v. 6-10). Some instructions are given (v. 12-20). And finally, its place in worship and in evangelism is noted (v. 21-25).

Charismatics reverse the apostolic teaching by deprecating prophecy and the teaching of the Word. "We will not heal divisions...through correct belief about Christ...We can hardly attribute divisiveness to a gift from God the Holy Ghost."²² "It comes from sinfulness, ignorance, or Satan."²³

"For the papacy, also is nothing but sheer enthusiasm, by which the Pope boasts that all thoughts exist in the shrine of his heart, and whatever he decides and commands within the church is spirit and right, even though it is above and contrary to Scriptures and the spoken Word."²⁴

"The older Pentecostal denominations reject prophecy as the foretelling of the future and permit it only as edification....Whenever the Pentecostal movement has taken organizational form, spontaneous prophecy, which goes beyond exhortation for edification has necessarily been rejected as 'Satan deceiving and misdirecting simply souls.'"²⁵ Some charismatics evade the problem of prophetic errors by insisting "we see through a glass darkly now" and so one must expect some error! This is hardly very reassuring!!

ὁ λαλῶν γλώσση ἑαυτὸν οἰκοδομεῖ· ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομεῖ.

HE WHO SPEAKS ANOTHER LANGUAGE (TONGUES) BUILDS HIMSELF UP, BUT HE WHO PROPHESES BUILDS UP A CONGREGATION (CHURCH).

So there was a gift of "tongues". Paul did not despise it. He himself had that gift. Yet, he did not urge it, nor instruct others to seek this gift, although 'tongues', could be useful. Diplomatically Paul substituted alternate goals and gifts, which are better. We might observe in passing, however, that public speaking in 'tongues', which is the matter discussed here, ought to follow Paul's injunction of v. 34: LEI' YOUR WOMEN KEEP SILENT IN THE CHURCHES: FOR IT IS NOT PERMITTED UNTO THEM TO SPEAK (This means that speaking was optional and controllable by the speaker). It is advice that simply is not heard or observed among charismatics. Yet the person speaking in 'tongues' "really does feel in himself the edifying influence of what he utters, yet not so that he could communicate it to others."²⁶

"Therefore, we ought and must constantly maintain this point, that God does not wish to deal with us otherwise than through the spoken word and sacraments. It is the devil himself whatever is extolled as Spirit without the word and the sacraments."²⁷

Θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε· μείζων δὲ ὁ προφητεύων ἢ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσαις ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύη, ἵνα ἡ ἐκκλησία, ἵνα ἡ ἐκκλησία οἰκοδομῆν λάβῃ.

I WANT EVERY ONE OF YOU TO SPEAK LANGUAGES (TONGUES), BUT EVEN MORE THAT YOU MAY PROPHESEY, FOR GREATER IS HE WHO PROPHESES THAN HE WHO SPEAKS OTHER LANGUAGES (TONGUES), UNLESS HE TRANSLATES (INTERPETS) SO THAT THE CONGREGATION RECEIVES UPBUILDING.

In 14:5-20a Paul shows that speaking other languages could be useful far more when supplemented with the gift of translation (interpretation is the word to use if 'tongues' were ecstatic language, the language of heaven perchance, for then it would be an explanation of that phenomenon.) "It seems strange that if this was the heavenly language, it could sometimes be interpreted and sometimes not." Yet, "It seems strange that Paul did not mention these foreign languages if the speakers were using them."^{28,29} So the benefit of the heaters is the point Paul drives home. Acts 9:36 Ταβιθά, ἡ διερμηνευομένη λέγεται Δορκάς surely means TRANSLATED. Again, in Genesis 42:43 Joseph's brothers did not realize Joseph could understand them since he was using an interpreter, that is, some one who translated what he was saying in Egyptian (LXX). But Paul did not choose further to define the term for us. "Granting even the complete sincerity in practioners of tongues-speaking, they still come under Paul's rebuke."³⁰

Verse 13 enjoins the one speaking in 'tongues' to pray that he may be able to interpret, or translate. "Glossolaly is meaningless to anyone but God and is fruitless so far as the congregation is concerned."³¹

In this connection we want to ask: Who are those who say they "prophecy", whom Jesus renounces, saying: "I NEVER KNEW YOU?" (Matthew 7:23) How can we judge? This is especially so, since Satan, also, knows all about 'signs'. II Thessalonians 2:9ff indicates his lying signs and wonders are intended to move people to follow his falsehoods. Surely, not all words reported as being taught by God actually are such. We know Jeremiah complained (14:13-15) about those who WAG THEIR TONGUES. We also meet discerning of spirits in the encounter with Anannias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1ff). Paul Qualben "demonstrated from tape recordings that although charismatics who claim the gift of interpretation were consistently willing to 'interpret' his tapes of 'utterances in tongues by other charismatics, no two 'interpretations' of the same utterance agreed" (lecture at Concordia).

A sample: Prou pray praddy; Pa palassate pa pau pee pe. In this sample one is struck by its alliteration. It almost sounds like Latin conjugations. One hears other have also noticed "a most peculiarly restricted set of consonant sounds."³²

Part II

Counseling with Charismatics as Pastors as We Deal with Glossolalia

1. Possibility of existence
 - It is cited in three places in the Bible
 - Fellowship should not be broken over “Open Questions”
2. Possibility of fraud
 - “Where certain prominent tongues speakers had visited, whole groups of glossolalists would speak in his style.”³³
 - Realize the possibility of ‘demon tongues’, or ‘self-hypnosis’, and so the gift does not necessarily prove spirituality.
 - Avoid surrendering control of the mind, for that invites demons to enter.
 - Ask the historical question why there were no glossolalists for 1700 years?
 - Experts insist “contrary to common belief, it has never been scientifically demonstrated that xenoglossia occur among Pentecostals.”³⁴
 - Pentecostals or charismatics (essentially the same) insist we should have this experience. People have it!!! “Try the Spirits, don't condemn them on blind prejudice.”³⁵ This begs the question and seeks to silence opposition by argumentum ad hominem.
 - “Several years ago a man who understood the Chinese language took part in a ‘tongues’ prayer-meeting. Later he reported that some of the congregation had actually spoken in the Chinese lingo; but in place of praising God, they had unknowingly committed the worst kind of blasphemy.”³⁶
 - Many individuals “suffering from demon possession who spoke in foreign languages.”³⁷
3. Is Glossolalia normative for all time?
 - Only historic events are given in the Bible, 21 cases where the Holy Spirit was given but glossolalia is not mentioned. The Epistles say nothing about seeking the gift. “The writers of the Epistles assumed that everyone had experienced glossolalia.” “Are we to assume doctrines?”³⁸
 - Why were they so AMAZED in Acts 10, if glossolalia was the expected gift?
4. Adherents lives as proof (evidence of sanctification)
 - The church has faults (always has had!!!)
 - We also hear the complaint “How hard it is to live with a ‘holy’ person”³⁹ (Obedience is a condition, which charismatics teach).
5. Use of Gifts
 - Divisive history!
 - “A common fault among charismatics is judging.”⁴⁰
6. Be Grateful for all gifts
7. The entire church should profit
8. Assurance of faith from Word and Sacraments
 - “They always want to teach, not how the Spirit comes to you (i.e. in word and sacraments) but how you came to the Spirit.”⁴¹

9. One baptism

10. Incidences of false doctrine

A. Minimizing of Christ's completed saving work.

- What about the Trinity? The dichotomy of Baptism into Christ and the baptism in the Holy Spirit? The second is superior? “Has the Holy Spirit something better to offer than the Lord Jesus Christ?”⁴²
- “Charismatics encourage people to be receptive to the special, personalized, Holy Spirit granted messages which are to help them deal with their day-to-day problems and needs.”⁴³
- “It’s dangerous to believe, as Neo-Pentecostal literature agrees, that the Holy Spirit baptism and speaking in ‘tongues’ are a ‘direct’ means for the Holy Spirit to accomplish in the heart what the Gospel of Christ was not able to do.”⁴⁴
- Is it not Christologically incorrect to use Jesus as an example of ‘emptying’ Himself of His divinity to receive the power of the Holy Spirit so that the Holy Spirit gave Christ powers he had not possessed previously? If Jesus was not God, we are yet in our sins, for “no mere man could satisfy the wrath of God.”⁴⁵ (cf. Col. 2:9)
- How does one explain that extreme liberals, deniers of Christ's divinity, virgin birth, and resurrection, are said to ‘receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit’ and exhibit power in their ministries?
- Yet note the claim: “Baptism of the Holy Spirit contributed to a strong Christ centered emphasis in church.”⁴⁶

B. Baptism

- “It is hardly new to speak of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. What is new is to connect it with the speaking of tongues. This connection is just 71 years old.”⁴⁷
- Baptism in the Holy Spirit as charismatics teach it is Scripturally unsupportable. It refers: 1) The historic event on Pentecost, or, 2) conversion.
- Is it biblically correct to equate ‘being filled with the Holy Spirit’ and ‘being full of the Holy Spirit’, or, which is the same to them, ‘being baptized in the Spirit’?
 - Only Acts connects ‘filled with the Holy Spirit’ and tongues.
 - Acts 6:3 refers to a type of person.
 - Acts 9:15-18 refers to being equipped for service.
- Acts 2:38 “Repent, be baptized, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost...does not contrast baptism and the gift of the Holy Ghost, Peter joins them!!
- “Baptism does not magically impart the Spirit...” But, it does impart!!!
- Is it not contrary to fact that Cornelius was a Christian before Peter preached, yet notice the Holy Spirit fell on them. V. 14 “All thy house SHALL BE SAVED” is a future.

C. Prayer

- The Bible does not teach conditions for receiving the Holy Spirit, which actually makes of faith a work, an accomplishment for obtaining the reward of the Spirit (So also conversion, prayer, and obedience). Is not every such condition legalism, even Arminianism!??
- “Those who pray, usually speak in tongues...” Is prayer a means of grace?

D. Conversion

- In receiving the Holy Spirit they speak of a "distinctive experience." From what?
- Where does the Bible teach us to ‘receive’ and to ‘fully receive’ the Holy Ghost? “In experience we can see it” is not an acceptable answer.

- In Acts WHEN THEY HAD COME...(no condition met, but a geographical note) ONE PLACE...(no moral accomplishment), SITTING... (Not seeking or yielding), ALL FILLED... (none partial, or none not at all).

E. Means of Grace

- No where do charismatics speak of this sign as ‘confirming the Word’, but use it to confirm the faith of the practitioner.
- “I would venture to say that 60%-70% of the personal prophecies which have come to me in my life have proved true.”⁴⁸
- “If I reject this I must reject all my Christian experiences.”⁴⁹
- The Word of God cannot be separated from the Bible, but it must be distinguished from the Scriptures.”⁵⁰
- “Emphasis on an experience must be judged by its faithfulness to the Word. The danger is that stressing what the Word must mean TO ME, at the expense of what it says on its own terms.”⁵¹

F. The objective character of the Gospel

- So it threatens the institutional church, should it be saved, if the opposite is a human life filled by power and presence of the Holy Spirit? Practically that means ‘holier than thou’, for once the charismatic becomes ‘obedient’ “sin does not exist in one so blessed.”⁵²
- Charismatics don't discern in a mechanical way, charismatics are learning to distinguish between spirits “with a kind, of on the scene confession.”⁵³
- “Are we obligated to explain the ‘claims’ or, is that the way our faith is tested.”⁵⁴
- “There must be a sign of some kind to guide the church and preserve her from deception.”⁵⁵
- “Really a despising of the objective Word.”⁵⁶
- “Neither application of an exegesis nor logic to the written word can infuse our conclusion with the self-validation of personal experience.”—“That consigns doctrine to a secondary role.”⁵⁷

G. Fellowship

- The theme of the Thirteenth International Lutheran Conference (Aug. 15-19) was: “One...that the world may believe.” The antithesis is: “We cannot become one with anyone by our doctrinal deliberations and discussions.”⁵⁸
- Charismatics feel compelled to make many converts to ‘tongues’, but does the New Testament teach any other evangelism than: To seek and win the lost for Christ?
- “Fellowship is open for all baptized in the Holy Spirit” “Therefore closed to all who have not been.”⁵⁹

H. Confusing Law and Gospel

- “Total repentance, total yielding to God's will are required. Then you are able to speak in tongues...”⁶⁰ This totally mixes Law and Gospel. Actually, they are saying that the Spirit of God is fully received by “observing the Law” rather than by “believing what is heard” (Gal. 3:3).
- Is the gift of the Holy spirit an absolute gift or is it a conditional gift, dependent upon tarrying, praying, emptying oneself, faith, sanctification, help from the example of others, laying on of hands, and even careful and frequent coaching sessions?
- Every condition is rank legalism.

¹ E.E. Kowalke, *Speaking In Tongues In I Corinthians 14*.

² James Pope, *I Corinthians 14:1-25*.

³ *Charismatic Movement And Lutheran Theology*, LCMS Commission On Theology and Church Relations.

⁴ Ylvisaker.

-
- ⁵ Larry Christenson., *The Charismatic Renewal Among Lutherans*.
- ⁶ Frederick Bruner, *Theology Of The Holy Spirit*.
- ⁷ Douglas Judisch, *An Evaluation Of The Claim To Charismatic Gifts*.
- ⁸ Tom Pfothauer, *Gospel and Pretense*, Arthur Clement.
- ⁹ Kittel, *Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament*.
- ¹⁰ George Gardiner, *The Corinthian Catastrophe*.
- ¹¹ Blass-DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar*.
- ¹² *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, Joel Gerlach.
- ¹³ Grenville Penn.
- ¹⁴ Christenson.
- ¹⁵ Gerlach.
- ¹⁶ E.E. Kowalke.
- ¹⁷ Kittel.
- ¹⁸ Gerlach.
- ¹⁹ LCMS Commission.
- ²⁰ Christenson.
- ²¹ John A. Schep, *Baptism In The Holy Spirit*.
- ²² Christenson.
- ²³ *Ibid.*
- ²⁴ Luther, *Smalcald Articles*.
- ²⁵ Walter J. Hollenwegger, *Pentecostalism*.
- ²⁶ Gerlach.
- ²⁷ Luther.
- ²⁸ *Ibid.*
- ²⁹ *Ibid.*
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*
- ³¹ *Ibid.*
- ³² Wm. Welmes, *Tongues: To Speak Or Not To Speak*, Donald Burdick.
- ³³ Commission On Theology And Church Relations, LCMS, *Charismatic Movement and Lutheran Theology*.
- ³⁴ Arthur Clement, *Gospel Or Pretense*.
- ³⁵ Larry Christenson, *Church Renewal Among Lutherans*.
- ³⁶ C.B. McCaull, *Christian News*, Sept. 1984.
- ³⁷ S. Becker, *Wizards That Peep*.
- ³⁸ Herman D. Seyer, *Stewardship Of Spiritual Gifts*.
- ³⁹ Norbert Kauffeld.
- ⁴⁰ Larry Christenson.
- ⁴¹ Luther.
- ⁴² Appraisal of Pentecostalism, Present Truth.
- ⁴³ Tom Pfothauer.
- ⁴⁴ Arthur Clement.
- ⁴⁵ Herman Seyer.
- ⁴⁶ Larry Christenson.
- ⁴⁷ Richard Balge, *Neo-Pentecostalism: Antecedent, Attributes, Analysis*.
- ⁴⁸ Faith Or Presumption, Lutheran Charisiples.
- ⁴⁹ Larry Christenson.
- ⁵⁰ Ted Jungkuntz, *Church Renewal And Lutheran Theology*.
- ⁵¹ Robert Johnston, *Tidy Doctrine And Truncated Experience*, *Christianity Today*, Feb 1977.
- ⁵² Nobert Kauffeld.
- ⁵³ Ted Jungkuntz.
- ⁵⁴ *Meditations* 1984.
- ⁵⁵ F.D. Bruner, *Theology Of the Holy Spirit*.
- ⁵⁶ Richard Balge.
- ⁵⁷ R. Haan, *Charismatic Controversy*.
- ⁵⁸ International Luth. Renewal.
- ⁵⁹ Harold Lindsell.
- ⁶⁰ Charismatic Movement of H. S.