

presence and prompting of the Spirit of God in the human Spirit.

Notes

1. John Oman, *The Natural and the Supernatural* (Freeport, New York: BFL Communications Books for Libraries, 1972), p. 109.

The Gifts of the Spirit in the Church

Peter Stephens

Had this Institute been held ten years ago it is unlikely that there would have been a paper on "The Gifts of the Spirit in the Church." It is the charismatic movement in the church that has brought this subject to the fore, and what I have to say will, I hope, lead into a discussion of that later. Nevertheless, my immediate concern is to focus attention on two or three critical chapters of the New Testament, chapters 12 and 14 (and to a lesser extent chapter 13) in the First Letter to the Corinthians. I want us to see them at first in their own light, rather than in the light of questions which you and I want to put to them.

I. Paul

Paul appears to face a situation in which some people have certain spiritual gifts (*pneumatika*), and moreover set a very high value on those gifts. It is in response to this situation in which he sees perils for the Corinthian church that Paul engages in his only sustained discussion of spiritual gifts. However, such gifts are not limited to Corinth, nor indeed to churches founded by Paul, nor to letters written by him. They exist in the church at Rome, which he did not found. (Romans 12) They are referred to in 1 Peter 4:10, which (I think we may still hold) he did not write.

It is important to note the words which Paul uses to describe these spiritual gifts. He begins by referring to *pneumatika*, which is probably the word used by the Corinthians. But he very quickly uses other words, in particular *charisma* (grace gift) and *diakonia* (service). Paul seems to be the one who introduces the word *charisma* into theology;¹ it shows at once the way he understands spiritual gifts. An instructive use of this same word is seen in Romans 6:23, where he says: "The wages of sin is death, but the *charisma* of God is

eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord." It is in the context of this *charisma* of God that we can understand the *charismatic* (grace gifts) of God. Moreover, the *charismata* are at once referred to as services or ministries, that is, ways in which people are served. Paul's change of word, however, must not be exaggerated. He does not abandon the word spiritual (*pneumatika*), but in 14:1 returns to use it.

Before we examine Paul's critical assessment of these gifts, we ought to consider some of the affirmations he makes about them. First, there is the assumption that all Christians, without exception, share in the Spirit. "For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body . . . and all were made to drink of one Spirit." (12:13) That all share in the Spirit is a fundamental difference between the old covenant and the new. Indeed, not to share in the Spirit is not to be a Christian at all. It is almost impossible to overestimate the importance of this assumption that all Christians share in the Spirit.

Second, Christians do not share only in the Spirit, but they share also in the gifts of the Spirit. These gifts are not the privilege of the few, whether ordained or lay, but of all Christians. Only in Ephesians 4:7 ("grace was given to each of us") do we have the absolutely explicit statement that everyone has a gift. It is, however, implied in 1 Corinthians 12 and 14 by the use of "all" and "each," for example, "but all of them, in all men, are the work of the same God." (12:6; cf. 12:7, 14:26, 1 Peter 4:10) Each person, therefore, is expected to exercise his or her gift. Indeed, it is assumed that when they meet for worship "each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation." (14:26) The problem is not whether there are any gifts—they are superabundant—but how they can best be used for the good of all.

Third, not only do they all have some gift or gifts, but they should all desire gifts of the Spirit. That im-

plies gifts they do not already have. The desire should be especially for prophecy: "earnestly desire the spiritual gifts, especially that you may prophesy." (14:1) But Paul can equally say, "Now I want you all to speak in tongues," even if he does add, "but even more to prophesy." (14:5) He is not concerned to limit the gifts of the Spirit, except in a very particular sense. He is concerned, rather, to increase the openness of Christians to the immense variety of gifts that the Spirit wills to give. Thus, he beseeches the Thessalonians, "Do not quench the Spirit." (1 Thessalonians 5:19)

Fourth, the earnest desire for particular gifts in no way places them at the Christian's disposal. They are always gifts given by God in his sovereign freedom. The Spirit "apportions to each one individually as he wills." (12:11)

Fifth, the context in which Paul sees the gifts, however, is not an individual one—which is the context in which we tend to view the gifts. They are given individually, but they are given in the church. Thus Paul prefaces his list of the gifts with the words, "God has appointed in the church." (12:28) Not only are they given to the church, but they are also given in such a way that they complement each other, thus binding each member to the others. Here Paul uses the analogy of the body, the body which is the body of Christ and which consists of many members. Each part of the body needs the rest, so that "the eye cannot say to the hand, 'I have no need of you.'" (12:21) Moreover, the absence of a particular gift in a particular member does not make it any less a member of the body. "And if the ear should say, 'Because I am not an eye, I do not belong to the body,' that would not make it any less a part of the body." (12:16) One practical way in which one person or gift needs or complements another may be seen in the way Paul could write, "I

planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth." (1 Corinthians 3:5-6)

Sixth, the gifts of which Paul speaks are immensely varied. The variety does not mean that some are of the Spirit and some not. No, "there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit." (12:4) Now let me say at once that Paul does not at first indicate the extent of the variety. The first examples he gives in 12:8-10 are all what we may loosely call supernatural gifts, gifts like miracles, tongues, prophecy. Not until later does he place alongside these a couple of natural gifts—helping and administration. (12:28) Here, however, he almost certainly went far beyond the way the Corinthians saw the gifts of the Spirit. They seemed to regard the sensational, the obviously supernatural, as an expression of the Spirit. Paul does not reject that, but he regards the unsensational and ordinary as equally being gifts of the Spirit. In other words, the term "Spirit" does not necessarily refer to either the sensational or the supernatural.

Seventh, within this variety there seems to be a certain order or hierarchy. Apostles, prophets, and teachers are put in the first three places. (12:28) This appears to be an accepted order at least for apostles and prophets. (cf. Ephesians 2:20) The other gifts seem to be put in particular order. The various gifts fall into three main groups: those concerned with preaching (these seem to be primary), those concerned with service, and those concerned with leadership. In Ephesians, however, only the first group is represented. Nevertheless, an order or hierarchy of gifts does not mean that some in the church are superior and some inferior in status. Such an idea is alien to Paul. Rather, "God has so adjusted the body, giving the greater honor to the inferior part, that there may be no discord in the body . . ." (12:24-25)

Now let us turn to the criteria as well as to the

safeguards and limitations that Paul offers in these chapters. Recall first that he is dealing with those who appear to set great store by the gift of tongues, perhaps because its obvious abnormality made it appear a particularly spiritual gift. It could even be that they preferred it to a gift like prophecy, which Paul especially affirms, because tongues, without interpretation, could boost one's pride, whereas prophecy would disclose the secrets of one's heart and one would be convicted. (14:24-25) Whatever may have been in the mind of the Corinthians, Paul offers certain criteria by which gifts may be judged. He suggests certain safeguards or limitations in their use.

The first criterion is the most important, though some would doubt if it is meant as a criterion. It is, "no one speaking by the Spirit of God ever says 'Jesus be cursed!' and no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit." (12:3) This is regarded by some interpreters simply as an example of the operation of the Holy Spirit rather than as a criterion. But, in effect, it seems reasonable to take it as a criterion. If we do, we have the contrast between mere spirit possession, which can be pagan, and possession by the Holy Spirit. Satan indeed can produce signs and wonders (see, for example, 2 Thessalonians 2:9; Mark 13:22), so that miracles or tongues are not in themselves necessarily actions of God. When they were pagans, the Corinthians might have been spirit-possessed, but then, to quote Paul, they "would be led astray and carried away to the dumb idols." (12:2) A sure indication that possession is by the Holy Spirit and not by some other spirit is shown when the person who is possessed says, "Jesus is Lord," because such a confession is possible only by the Holy Spirit.

It could be that the reference to "Jesus be cursed" is explained as by C. K. Barrett, who suggests (in this he follows Allo) that Paul is referring to the cries of

Christian ecstasies who were resisting the trance or ecstasy they felt coming upon them "in the manner of the Sibyl who foamed as she resisted the inspiration that was taking possession of her, or of Cassandra who curses Apollo in Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*."

The statement, "Jesus is Lord," is an affirmation about Jesus (one might say the historical Jesus) and about God. It is not, however, simply a correct theological statement. It is a statement of discipleship, an affirmation of the lordship of Jesus over oneself. A sense of this can be seen in the way Augustine contrasts 1 Corinthians 12:3 with Matthew 7:21, in his *De Trinitate*.⁸ The importance of discipleship in this kind of context can be seen in Acts where Jewish exorcists tried to use the name of Jesus to cast out demons. (Acts 19:13-17) They used his name but they did not accept his lordship. They were not disciples. (Compare Simon Magus in Acts 8:18-19.)

If "Jesus is Lord" is Paul's first criterion, then it fits in with the Johannine tradition which sees the Spirit primarily as one who bears witness to Christ. It also shows the very close link in Paul's thinking between Christ and the Spirit, so that the Spirit is not thought of as going beyond Christ in some way. This is in keeping with the parallel drawn between the Spirit and Christ in verses 4 and 5: "varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit . . . varieties of service, but the same Lord."

The second criterion is the serving or building up of the church. Gifts are given, not for the sake of the individual, but "for the common good." (12:7) They are to build up the congregation, a statement that runs right through chapter 14. (See verses 3-5, 12, 17, and 26.) Here again the Spirit is seen in a distinctively Christian way. The work of the Spirit is to create unity in Christ, indeed "by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and all were made to drink of one Spirit." (12:13) The gifts

of the Spirit are likewise concerned with the building up of this body and not merely with the building up of one member of it. This notion of the gifts of the Spirit is seen equally in the Letter to the Romans where Paul writes, "I want to bring you some spiritual gift to make you strong." (1:11)

It is concern for the congregation that leads Paul to stress the need for intelligibility. Unless what is said can be understood by those who hear it, there is no building up of the congregation. The person who hears can make no response with his or her mind and, therefore, cannot say "Amen." (14:16) One can, in other words, not make a response with the whole of one's being. What applies to the worshipper applies in a not dissimilar way to the outsider who happens to come in. Tongues, unless interpreted, would be unintelligible to such a person. The visitor would simply feel that the speakers were mad, presumably in the sense of possessed. (14:23) If, however, someone prophesies, then the visitor will be convicted and brought to worship God, (14:24f) and so be built into the body of Christ. There is thus a missionary concern here as well. The gifts of the Spirit can therefore build people into the body of Christ as well as build up the body of Christ.

To ensure that they do in fact build up the congregation, Paul mentions safeguards or limitations in the use of gifts, particularly the gift of tongues. When people speak in tongues there are to be two or three at most. They are to speak in turn, and there is to be interpretation. (14:27) If there is no one to interpret, they are to keep silence in church, although they may use the gift privately. (14:28) Thus, the purpose for which the gift is given determines the use to which the gift is put. In this way the variety of gifts can be a variety of service or ministry. (12:5) What is said about tongues and prophecy in this context implies that they can be controlled to some extent.

A third criterion, linked to that of building up the church, is the criterion of love. This is expressed in a variety of ways. It must underlie every gift. Without love, none of the gifts is truly spiritual. A gift such as knowledge might puff up, whereas love builds up. (8:1) It is love, moreover, which makes the gift the possession not of one, but of all. Without love the gift of tongues, or prophecy, or liberality is nothing. (13:1-3) The Corinthians are to aim at love and this is more important than spiritual gifts, though it does not displace them. (12:31, 14:1) It is not an accident that the theme of love in Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 13 is so closely linked with the discussion of the gifts of the Spirit.

Along with these criteria are important comments on who is to do the testing of the gifts. The testing is by the Spirit through the congregation or certain members of it. The Spirit gives to some "the ability to distinguish between spirits." (12:10) However, at one point Paul suggests that either the whole congregation or everyone who is a prophet is to do this work of distinguishing between what is from the Holy Spirit and what is from other spirits. "Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said." (14:29) If it is the congregation, then that is in keeping with what is said in 1 John where it is assumed that the whole congregation will test the spirits, (1 John 4:1) and in the Didache. (11:2-7) The congregation does not, without reason, accept something as from the Holy Spirit. It must be able to say, "Amen," and that involves giving assent to it as well as understanding it. As discernment is the control exercised over prophecy, so in a somewhat different way interpretation is the control exercised over tongues. Interpretation, like discernment, is a specific gift of the Spirit.

Before we look at other ways in which the gifts of the Spirit were experienced and assessed in the early

church, we need to consider how far the gifts in Paul's writings were what may loosely be called natural or supernatural. The Corinthians seemed to think of them as supernatural, regarding such an apparently supernatural gift as tongues as a spiritual endowment. Paul seems to qualify this in a number of ways in light of his understanding of the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ. He does not regard extraordinariness as a sign that something is a gift of the Spirit. It is not a gift of the Spirit unless it bears witness to Christ and builds up the body of Christ. Moreover, quite ordinary activities such as helping and administering, which to the pagan mind do not suggest any possession of the Spirit, can be described as gifts of God. Now there are non-Christian equivalents of administration, as there are non-Christian equivalents of miracles. They may, however, be seen as gifts of the Spirit by a number of tests, such as whether they build up the body of Christ.

But the question may still be asked whether they are seen by Paul as natural qualities which we have and which we put to good use, or whether they are specific gifts of the Spirit. I find the second more likely.

In this, a lot depends on how we understand 1 Corinthians, chapter seven. Some read this chapter, especially verses 7 and 17, as though being married or unmarried, enslaved or free, circumcised or uncircumcised, is a gift of God—at least if you accept it as such. I am not persuaded that this is what Paul means. In verse 7, Paul clearly accepts the idea that God gives some, but not others, a gift of celibacy. But this is not the same as saying that the state of celibacy or marriage is, in itself, a gift from God, or becomes so if we accept it as such. Certainly it does not follow without more ado that verse 7 controls the exegesis of verse 17, and that whatever state one is in is a gift of the Spirit (as Paul uses the term in chapter 12 and 14) as long as in that state one leads the life to which God has called one.

Paul appears to use the idea of the gifts of the Spirit for specific gifts to members of the church. They may be ordinary gifts that coincide with their natural qualities, or they may be extraordinary gifts that do not coincide with their natural qualities. The critical matter is not their ordinariness or their extraordinariness, but their being gifts of the Spirit. Being gifts of the Spirit stresses the fact that behind them lies the initiative of God, rather than human initiative. I should add that a very different view of 1 Corinthians, chapter seven, can be found in many writings.⁴

II. The Church After Paul

Let us now look briefly at the experience of the gifts of the Spirit in the early church and, in particular, at some of the criteria it applied for testing whether something was of the Spirit or not. Rightly or wrongly, all we shall do is focus on certain important points of comparison or contrast with what we find in Paul.

We turn first to 1 and 2 Timothy where there is an important contrast with 1 Corinthians. This lies in the understanding of the church and the ministry. Corinthians sets the gifts in the context of the body and its various members. There is a rich variety of gifts in which all share in different ways. There is no opposition between the ordained and the non-ordained; indeed, there is none who, in the normal sense of the term, is ordained. In the Pastorals, however, the word *charisma* is used twice only, and on both occasions of what can be called ordination. First, "Do not neglect the gift you have, which was given you by prophetic utterance when the elders laid their hands upon you." (1 Timothy 4:14) Second, "Hence I remind you to rekindle the gift of God that is within you through the laying on of my hands." (2 Timothy 1:6)

This linking of gifts with the ordained ministry finds further expression through the centuries in different

ways, either in the insistence that those with the gifts should be ordained, or in the view that those who are ordained thereby receive a gift of the Spirit.

In 1 John, the Didache, and the Shepherd of Hermas, we find various criteria suggested or applied for testing the spirits. The criteria are to some extent determined by the situation for which they were written. Thus, in the situation in which 1 John was written, there were clearly prophets who had once been within the church. They spoke by inspiration, but the writer regards the inspiration as coming from antichrist, not from God. They are people who deny the Incarnation and who lack love, whatever else they may possess. In the face of such people who had been within the church and who were still regarded as being inspired, the writer offers a twofold test, a doctrinal one and a moral one. The doctrinal test is explicit. "Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are of God; for many false prophets have gone out into the world. By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God." (1 John 4:1-3) The moral test, which is the test of love, is not explicit in the same way, but it runs through the whole letter. We should note, as well, that the author expects the whole congregation to be able to test the spirits.

In the Didache the concern is once more with prophets. They are now held in much greater awe than in Paul, perhaps because there are fewer of them. Thus we read: "Do not test or examine any prophet who speaks in a spirit, 'for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven.'" (11:7) It is recognized, however, that there are false prophets, and the quotation continues: "But not everyone who speaks in a spirit is a prophet, except he have the behaviour of the Lord. From his behaviour, then, the false prophet and

the true prophet shall be known." (11:8) Examples of such behavior are given: "And no prophet who orders a meal in a spirit shall eat of it: otherwise he is a false prophet. And every prophet who teaches the truth, if he do not what he teaches, is a false prophet." (11:9-10) The test of the prophets is essentially one of character. As in Matthew 7:16, they are to be known by their fruits. The inadequacy of a mere moral test is evident, but the important thing is that it may well have been an adequate test in that situation.

The way in which the moral argument has constantly been used in the church can be seen in our own day in the Soviet Union in the division in the Baptist Church between the Council of Churches and the All-Union Council. Listen now to an extract from the "Message to the Whole Brotherhood of Evangelical Christians and Baptists in the USSR from Former Pastors of the Council of Churches" which declares: "For all those in doubt about the activity of the AUCECB (All-Union Council), we declare that the work of God is being carried on in the power of the Holy Spirit; this is testified to by the good fruits of the Spirit in the life and ministry of the united brotherhood."

It is interesting to note that the Didache assumes that the congregation has the ability to test the spirits. "Let everyone who 'comes in the name of the Lord' be received; but when you have tested him you shall know him, for you shall have understanding of true and false" (literally, "right and left understanding"). (12:1)

Hermas equally assumes that the congregation can discern true prophets from false ones. The people are told, "Test, then, from his life and deeds, the man who says he is inspired." (Commandment XI:16) The criterion again is essentially moral. It is seen that even the false prophet "also speaks some true words, for the devil fills him with his spirit, to see if he can break any

of the righteous." (XI:3) The true prophet is "meek and gentle, and lowly-minded, and refrains from all wickedness and evil desire of this world, and makes himself poorer than all men, and gives no answers to anyone when he is consulted, nor does he speak by himself (for the Holy Spirit does not speak when a man wishes to speak), but he speaks at that time when God wishes him to speak." (XI:8) The false prophet "exalts himself and wishes to have the first place, and he is instantly impudent and shameless and talkative, and lives in great luxury and in many other deceits, and accepts rewards for his prophecy, and if he does not receive them he does not prophesy." (XI:12)

The primary test is moral, but there are two other elements worth noting. There is a test that has to do with the nature of prophecy—that is, the true prophet cannot speak in response to human requests, but only in response to the Spirit's initiative. There is also a test that has to do with the church itself.

The church is the place where the Spirit dwells and, therefore, when prophets are in its midst they are either inspired by the Spirit if true, or deserted by their evil spirit if false. "Therefore, when the man who has the Divine Spirit comes into a meeting of righteous men who have the faith of the Divine Spirit, and intercession is made to God from the assembly of those men, then the angel of the prophetic spirit rests on him and fills the man, and the man, being filled with the Holy Spirit, speaks to the congregation as the Lord wills." (XI:9) By contrast, a false prophet "does not come near to an assembly of righteous men, but shuns them." (XI:13) If he does come near, "the earthly spirit flees from him in fear, and that man is made dumb and is altogether broken up, being able to say nothing." (XI:14)

The second century sees the effective disappearance of many of the varied gifts of the Spirit, the rejection of Montanism being a kind of posthumous death blow.

In Montanism there was an outbreak of prophecy. Montanus and two companions, Priscilla and Maximilla, claimed they were inspired by the Spirit. They announced the coming of the Lord not far from the city of Philadelphia.

Eusebius refers to certain moral and doctrinal objections that were made against Montanism. Indeed, one quotation he makes has an almost contemporary ring in it when he writes: "But it is necessary to test all the fruits of a prophet. . . . Tell me, does a prophet dye his hair? Does he pencil his eyelids?" Yet the attack was not altogether—some would say not at all—against its orthodoxy or its morality, for it was orthodox and intensely moral, but against the ecstatic nature of its prophecy. Listen to two quotations. "He began to be ecstatic and to speak and to talk strangely, prophesying contrary to the custom which belongs to the tradition and succession of the church from the beginning."⁷ "But the false prophet speaks in ecstasy But they cannot show that any prophet, either of those in the Old Testament or of those in the New, was inspired in this way" Thus, the ecstasy which Montanists regarded as evidence of the Spirit, as possibly the Corinthians did, is regarded as evidence the other way.

From this point, one could almost say that charismatic ministries were forced out of the church, at least out of its congregational life. Montanism displays a conflict between the charismatic ministries and the ordained hierarchical ministries which at many points had existed happily alongside each other, rather than in opposition to each other.

III. The Reformers

A summary glance at the reformers may take us a stage further in considering the gift of the Spirit and gifts of the Spirit. With the reformers the doctrine of the Spirit gains new prominence. There are many ways

in which their understanding differs from that of the Roman Church. For the reformers, it is the Spirit who is the source of new life. The church does not possess the Spirit or have him at its disposal; rather does the Spirit possess and give life to the church. Nor is it only some in the church who are spiritual, such as priests and monks, but all Christians are spiritual, because they all have the Spirit. Moreover, because all Christians have the Spirit, they understand the things of the Spirit. Like the New Testament church, they are capable of judging what is true from what is false. Thus doctrinal disputations did not need to be referred to the pope or to the universities for their adjudication. This is particularly true of Zwingli in Zürich. For him it was sufficient to have an assembly of Christians before whom the Scriptures were opened.

All Christians may, in principle, engage in the ministry of the church, though in fact some hold office and some do not. In an emergency any Christian may properly minister to others. In Luther's words, "all Christians are truly of the spiritual estate, there is no difference among them, save of office alone."⁸

It is possible for the reformers to see that the gifts of the Spirit belong to the whole church and not just to those ordained. Thus Bucer, stating that the purpose of reading the Bible is edification, affirms, "Those who adhere to this purpose will appoint to interpret the Scriptures in the Church the person on whom the gift of interpretation has been bestowed, irrespective in the end of the position he occupies. This was still the practice in the days of Origen."¹⁰

The place at which the reformers differed among themselves was in how one received the Spirit. In this the sharpest contrast is seen between Luther and the so-called enthusiasts, although there were immense differences among those who are loosely classed enthusiasts. They range from the fundamentalism of the

anabaptist, Grebel, who is shocked to find that Thomas Müntzer has the singing of hymns in his German mass, to the sublime freedom towards Scripture of Sebastian Franck. Thus Grebel's reaction to Müntzer's hymns was: "Whatever we are not taught by clear passages or examples (of Scripture) must be regarded as forbidden, just as if it were written: 'This do not, sing not.'"¹¹ Franck's response to Grebel would have been even stronger than his words about Luther when he wrote, "... thou shouldst not believe and accept something (merely) reported by Scripture—and feel that the God in thy heart must yield to Scripture."¹²

Consider with me for a moment how the reformers viewed the relation of Spirit and Word. For Luther, the Spirit was given in, with, and under the Word, both the audible word of proclamation and the visible words of the sacraments. This is central in his thinking, tied in with his whole theology of the cross—that is, that God makes himself known to us in a hidden way, in Christ. He opposed this to a theology of glory in which we seek to meet and see God as he is in himself. For Luther that belongs to the future, not to the present where we walk by faith and not by sight. Just as God used the flesh of Christ to meet us in the past, so now in the present he uses word and sacrament to come to us. There was not for Luther, as there was for the spiritualists, an opposition between the Spirit and what is physical or material. They belong together. Indeed, the Spirit does not come to us apart from what is outward. Luther can therefore speak of the word as "the door and window of the Holy Spirit. Windows are in the house, so that light may enter. If you wish to close them, God will not give you the proper Spirit. But he will use this door which is the word whether written or spoken"¹³ For Luther, the devil misleads the enthusiasts. He uses the words Spirit, Spirit, Spirit to destroy the very bridge by which

the Holy Spirit comes to the human spirit, that is word and sacrament, and teaches them not how the Spirit comes to them but how they come to the Spirit.¹⁴

At the opposite pole from Luther's view is that of a spiritualist like Sebastian Franck. For him, everything (word, sacraments, church) is like a doll that God gave the church in its infancy and has now taken away. What matters is the inward teaching of the Spirit, and that knows no bounds. Listen to what he says: "Consider as thy brothers all Turks and heathen, wherever they be, who fear God and work righteousness, instructed by God and inwardly drawn by him, even though they have never heard of baptism, indeed, of Christ himself, neither of his story or Scripture, but only of his power through the inner Word perceived within and made fruitful And therefore I hold that just as there are many Adams who do not know there was one Adam, so also there are many Christians who have never heard Christ's name."¹⁵ Some may feel that the new theology of Geneva sounds uncommonly like the old theology of Sebastian Franck.

Standing between these two extremes of Luther and Franck we find the other reformers. Of them Zwingli stands farthest from Luther, but for reasons quite different from those of Franck. He is concerned above all to assert the sovereignty of God. This is a thread that runs through and holds together the whole of his theology. For him, to ascribe to the sacraments the power to convey the Spirit, as it were of their own accord, diminishes the sovereignty of God and puts the Spirit in some way at the individual's disposal. Zwingli uses a series of texts to sustain his case, texts such as, "It is the Spirit who gives life, the flesh is of no avail," to show that what is outward is not of itself effective; or texts like, "the Spirit blows where he wills," to demonstrate the sovereign freedom of the Spirit.

For Zwingli, Luther's position is too close to that of

the Roman Church which he believes leads to idolatry. He is opposed to putting confidence in what is created and not in the Creator—in the sacramental bread rather than in Christ, for example. This, for Zwingli, is a denial of the central doctrine of justification by faith.

In a sense it is Zwingli's reformation theology (his concern to affirm that salvation is God's gift in Christ) that leads him to a position other than Luther's, although a further factor is important. That factor is a somewhat negative and unbiblical way of looking at what is physical and material.

It is interesting to note that Bucer came to a position that held together the Lutheran insistence on the Word with the Zwinglian insistence on the sovereign freedom of the Spirit; the key to this was in his doctrine of election. The gift of the Spirit was tied closely to Christ. Thus God normally gives the Spirit and all his gifts *with* (but not *in*) the outward word and sacraments, although of course only the elect receive this gift; exceptionally God can act apart from the outward word. Indeed Bucer goes so far as to say that on the ground of their election there are among the pagans those who have received the Spirit, not simply the gifts of the Spirit which he believed the non-elect like Judas could receive, but also the Spirit of sonship. Bucer would regard the election of those pagans and the gift of the Spirit to them as being linked with Christ, but his position would here be unlike Luther's.¹⁶

Thus the characteristic theological understanding of each of the reformers, with their own particular theological stress, produced a striking diversity in their views of how and where the Spirit works, both in the world and in the church.

IV. The Church

The gifts of the Spirit are most naturally linked by us with a theology of the ordained ministry. Clearly in

Corinthians they are concerned not with the ministry of the few, but with the varied ministry of the whole people of God. The gifts of the Spirit show a church in which there is no division between the ordained and the non-ordained. There are no ordained ministers who are given a kind of unilateral or one-way ministry to the rest. Rather, within the body of Christ are multifarious ministries which enrich the common life and build up each other. Together all the members exercise ministry. It is noteworthy that Paul does not appeal to any leader, bishop or presbyter, to take a lead, for example, in improving the disorderly arrangements for the Lord's Supper or initiating the discipline of a member. Paul expects them together to make whatever decisions are to be made.

The Pauline picture of the church is seen most clearly when the church assembles for worship. There the Spirit who has bound the whole community together moves each person to share what he or she has been given with the rest of the congregation. Each one has a hymn, a prayer, a lesson, a revelation. The Corinthian Christian would certainly have a shock if he or she worshipped in almost any Christian congregation today, except among such as the Pentecostals, the center of whose worship is not in the priest or preacher, but in the people acting in response to the Spirit.

The chapters in Corinthians about the gifts of the Spirit are therefore a constant challenge to the church to ask whether it substitutes a doctrine of the ministry for a doctrine of the church.

Within the body the members have their varied gifts, gifts which are different rather than equal. To each is given a particular gift, which he or she is called to exercise. We are not called to do what others are doing, but only what we are given as a gift of the Spirit to do. The source of our action is in God's initiative in granting his gift and in addressing his call to us, not

in our own personal initiative. Our natural qualities are not the basis of our service within the church, but the gift and the calling of God are. Of course, our natural abilities may be used, although even then they are not the basis of our service.

The way people come to exercise their gifts may imply something much less dramatic and personal than our traditional Methodist sense of vocation. Not everyone goes along a Damascus road. Stephanas, for example, seems simply to have offered his services as one of the first converts in Corinth. (1 Corinthians 16) By contrast, in the Lukan tradition the deacons in Acts were chosen by others when an emergency situation arose, but they were chosen from those already full of the Spirit.

Although the Pauline pattern is not limited to Corinth or indeed to the Pauline churches, still it is not the only pattern in the New Testament period. A system in which presbyters or elders were appointed to a special ministry within the congregation existed from the start alongside the Pauline pattern and gradually replaced it in the Pauline churches themselves. It cannot be said with certainty why the Pauline pattern disappeared, although it was probably more dependent on the role of an apostle than its present-day admirers allow. After Paul's death the Pauline pattern was less able to cope with the turmoils (doctrinal and ecclesiastical) of the second century than was the pattern of elders and the system that evolved from it. Nevertheless, the presbyterial pattern is not necessarily in opposition to the charismatic pattern. For some decades they existed side by side in the same church. Hans von Campenhausen, writing of the second century, could say, "It is, therefore, not surprising that in addition to the office-holders the old free men of the Spirit continue to play their part; and the Church is proud that this should be so Not only do office-holders pos-

sess the Spirit, but the spirituals for their part, to the extent that they rightly belong to the Church, derive the power of their teaching from the traditional apostolic truth."¹⁷

There are even hints (if one-sided ones) of how these two patterns should exist today in our British ordination service, where the ordinands are asked: ". . . will you do all that in you lies to build up the Body of Christ, to persuade and encourage every member to exercise the gift of grace that is in him . . . ?" This question presupposes that each Christian has a gift of grace, but that without persuasion and encouragement they are not likely to exercise it. The question shows that the role of the minister as enabler is not new, but it also helps to explain why a charismatic movement has arisen inside and outside the historic churches.

Käsemann rightly poses the question "why . . . Protestantism itself . . . has never made a serious attempt to create a Church order which reflected the Pauline doctrine of *charisma*, but has left this to the sects."¹⁸

V. The Ordained Ministry

There are a number of ways in which the gifts of the Spirit are associated with an ordained ministry. There is in the Pastorals the idea that a gift of the Spirit is given in ordination itself. By contrast, there is the view that because one has the gift already, one should be ordained. Thus Origen held that "the one who is endowed with spiritual gifts should also be appointed to the corresponding position in the Church."¹⁹ In fact, both views have prevailed in the church, the accent lying in some traditions on the first, and in others on the second. It is interesting to note that there was a period in the early church when, for example, a person with the gift of healing who clearly already had a special gift of the Holy Spirit (such as is given in ordination) was admitted without ordination to the ranks of

the clergy. By the time of Cyprian this had changed, and such persons had to be ordained.

There are certain implications for an ordained ministry which can be drawn from the Pauline understanding of the gifts of the Spirit. The gifts of the Spirit are not at our disposal; they are always the gift of God. The church does not give, or command, or guarantee the equipment for a certain ministry, but prays God to grant it. The gift is God's, not the church's. This is precisely what is said in First and Second Timothy.

Moreover, people's claim to have a gift of the Spirit is not sufficient for their acceptance by the church. The church has to recognize whether it is a gift of God; moreover, it can recognize and test it only as it is used. According to the way one interprets the New Testament evidence, one will say either that natural qualities such as speech or leadership, if used in the service of God and in response to the Spirit, are the gifts of God, or that God's gift is something given more specifically and therefore may or may not coincide with natural qualities.

The traditional Methodist approach, with its emphasis on gifts and graces and the inward call of God, has stressed the second. Our more recent approach, with its stress on the dedication to God of natural qualities, has inclined to the first. The present emphasis, for example, on academic attainment by candidates for the ministry is always in danger of incurring Wesley's reproach to Dr. Lowth, the Bishop of London, when in 1780 he refused to ordain John Hoskins for America: "... your Lordship did see good to ordain and send into America other persons who knew something of Greek and Latin, but who knew no more of saving souls than of catching whales."²⁰ I do not raise the question as to whether we should ascribe the zeal for Latin and Greek in American seminaries today to the inspiration of Mr. Wesley or of Dr. Lowth.

Although Paul is not referring to what we would call ordained ministries, there is a further important implication for the ordained ministry in what he says about the gifts of the Spirit. It is that all the gifts are not given to one person. Our doctrine and practice have usually belied that in this country. We have often spoken of the minister as one in whom all the varied gifts of the Spirit (or at least the great majority of them) are focused. On that basis it could be said that the total ministry of the church is focused in the minister. I am not now concerned with whether the total ministry of the church is focused in the minister, only with the fact that this cannot be based on the assumption that he or she has received all the gifts of the Spirit. Rather, it is of fundamental importance to Paul's argument in First Corinthians that people have varied gifts and that each needs the other for this reason.

The true implication of this for the ministry (as Bucer saw in the sixteenth century) is that every minister is in some sense a specialist (with a gift of teaching or of pastoral care, for instance) and that he or she needs to be complemented by those with other gifts. Much of what is said about group or team ministry (perhaps especially when the team is made up of lay people as well as ordained ministers) has a solid basis in what Paul says about the gifts of the Spirit.

VI. Pentecostalism

We must be warned first against approaching Pentecostalism armed with a carefully prepared set of theological double standards. We accuse Pentecostalist Christians of divisiveness, individualism, irrationalism (as though Roman, radical, and reformed Christians had not their share of these qualities), or like the normally so perceptive Hans Küng, we lump them with spiritualists, Mormons, and Seventh Day Adventists (although he adds Congregationalists, Baptists, and

Quakers to the same happy band of enthusiasts).²¹ No movement should be judged by its extremists or by its abuses, although they will throw some light on it.

There is not space here to do the Pentecostal tradition justice. I only hope that in making three critical comments I shall not do them a great injustice. First, they speak of a second gift of the Spirit, following and distinct from what they call conversion. This is how one Pentecostalist puts it: "The New Testament appears to indicate as an unmistakable historical fact that after the first entry of the Spirit in regeneration there can be and should be also a special personal reception by believers of the Holy Spirit in his original and unique person. This experience is called the 'baptism in the Holy Spirit'; its purpose is not to impart life, but to impart power. Its characteristic accompaniments are not fruits, but gifts."²²

I do not want to comment on whether or not this is the way Pentecostalists experience this today. All I want to say is that this is not at all how Paul speaks of the gifts of the Spirit. He does not speak of some second reception of the Holy Spirit. Nor does the New Testament as a whole point in that direction. There is no such sharp distinction between receiving the fruit and receiving the gifts of the Spirit; no sense that there can anywhere be Christians who in fact have the fruit but do not have the gifts. Indeed the problem in the New Testament is rather that some claim the gifts but do not manifest the fruit. Moreover, the New Testament does not speak of the Spirit's coming in a distinctly different way, or in such a way that it is Christ who comes in conversion but the Spirit at this second point. Yet this is what R.M. Riggs affirms when he writes: "As the Spirit of Christ, He had come at conversion, imparting the Christ-life, revealing Christ, and making Him real. At the Baptism in the Spirit He Himself in His own person comes upon and fills the waiting

believer. This experience is as distinct from conversion as the Holy Spirit is distinct from Christ. His coming to the believer at the Baptism (in the Holy Spirit) is the coming of the Third Person of the Trinity, in addition to the coming of Christ, which takes place at conversion."²³

However, let me repeat that to say it is not true to the New Testament does not mean that it is not true to people's experience today.

Second, we turn to the gifts of the Spirit. It is held that the experience of the Spirit leads to "(1) the *indwelling* or infilling of the Spirit and hence, (2) *power* for service, with the equipment, usually, of (3) the *gifts* of the Spirit."²⁴ We shall in a moment consider the gift of tongues, but we need to see beforehand that Pentecostalists tend to the same emphasis as the Corinthians. Among the gifts, they stress the more sensational or supernatural. They ignore the more ordinary, more apparently natural gifts. They prefer 1 Corinthians 12:8-10 to Romans 12:6-8. They could, of course, legitimately reply that the rest of the church makes the opposite, and equally serious, mistake.

Still, for the moment we are looking at them and not at the rest of the church. It is right to see that the typically Methodist *charismata* of making tea and showing people to their place with a warm handshake would find a more natural place in a Pauline than in a Pentecostal theology. Behind this may lie the danger of making the Spirit too spiritual, with the result that one has no sense of the variety of the Spirit's gifts.

Third, let us consider the gift of tongues. Cultured and educated middle-class Christians have an extraordinary horror of tongues, although it is more often our good taste that is offended than our good theology. Needless to say, we see to it that our good taste is armed with all the weaponry of wise theological sermons. Paul, who knew far more about tongues than we,

and who had the bad taste to speak in them, was fundamentally positive in what he said about them.

He urges the Thessalonians not to quench the Spirit. He tells the Corinthians not to forbid tongues. Indeed, he wants all the Corinthians to speak in tongues. He even seems to link tongues with prophecy, which for him is the supreme gift of the Spirit, as long as there is an accompanying interpretation. Certainly tongues do not build up the church if there is no one to interpret; in that situation Paul forbids tongues in church, but not in private. One may then speak to oneself (or it could be for oneself, that is, for one's own advantage) and to God. (1 Corinthians 14:28) It is needlessly subtle to suggest as some do⁸ that Paul does not explicitly tell the Corinthians to seek tongues because love does not seek its own and that to seek tongues if there is no one to interpret is to seek what is for one's own benefit, not the congregation's.

It is a piece of theological sophistry to suggest that Christians may not, in principle, seek that which is for their own benefit. It is manifestly contrary to Paul's encouragement of people to exercise the gift of tongues in private, which is a situation in which only the person can benefit. The fact that it does not build up the body is directly relevant as a criterion on those occasions when the congregation meets for worship. It is only indirectly relevant on other occasions. In any case there is no necessary reason why tongues should not, in an indirect way, benefit the body by directly benefiting one member.

Pentecostalists go beyond Paul in regarding tongues as initial evidence of baptism in the Spirit. There are situations where Acts appears to take this step. But Paul is much more cautious in his assessment of tongues. Far from being a necessary evidence of the Holy Spirit, tongues can be an expression of demon possession.

VII. Further Comments on Criteria

In Mark 16:17-18, we read: "These signs will accompany those who believe: . . . they will pick up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing it will not hurt them." Some Christians, even Christians in the most highly developed society in the world today, have taken this to be an objective test of a person's faith and of possession by the Spirit. Let me read to you an excerpt from *The Times* correspondent in New York, July 4, 1973: "Mr. Murl Bass belongs to a church in the mountains of Tennessee which demands that its members test themselves with snakes, fire and poison Hundreds of worshippers had gathered at the Holiness Church of God in Jesus' Name to chant, sing, clap their hands and test the strength of their faith by passing round snakes, including an Indian cobra. However, a diamondback rattlesnake was obviously not impressed and Mr. Bass, although praising the Lord for some time after the attack, collapsed The pastor, whose brother died in April after taking strychnine during a prayer meeting, claimed that the snakes are as safe as worms if the handler is anointed with the Spirit. In the case of the rattlesnake, he admitted: 'We had a contentious spirit today.'"

The signs mentioned in the Markan passage (besides picking up serpents and drinking poison, they are exorcism, tongues, and healing) may well be signs that accompany those who believe, but they are not necessarily criteria by which one can discern those who believe from those who do not, nor those possessed by the Holy Spirit from those possessed by demons. The New Testament is fully aware that unbelievers can do all these things, and the criteria it offers are criteria that reflect its belief that the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ.

The Spirit is one who witnesses to Christ. The Spirit unites people in Christ's body, and conforms them to the image of Christ. Therefore, where faith and love,

unity and mutual service are found, the Spirit of Christ is at work. Or perhaps one should say that where the Spirit of Christ is at work, there faith, love, unity, and mutual service are to be found—and one might add, prayer and praise, freedom and forgiveness, healing and reconciliation, and much else.

It is this basic criterion that the New Testament and the early church applied: whether the Spirit is the Spirit of Christ (this involved a test of faith in the fullest sense of the term—faith, for example, that “Jesus is Lord,” and “Jesus Christ has come in the flesh”); a test of character or love; and a test of mutual service and upbuilding. The tests were applied according to the situation. Thus, for prophecy the first test would most naturally be one of doctrine, although later the test of character would be as important. Whereas for tongues which, unlike prophecy, would not be intelligible, the first test would most naturally be the building up of the community.

When the more dramatic gifts (such as tongues, prophecy, and healing) became infrequent, another test intruded, as it does today. It involved the manner of the gift, rather than the matter. Thus, for example, with Montanism the objection was to the ecstatic *manner* of the prophecy; something like ecstatic inspiration was a feature of some biblical prophecy, however. Despite the church’s reaction to Montanism, and ours to Pentecostalism, it is doubtful whether there is any valid theological objection to ecstasy in itself. Even the argument that the Spirit does not suppress our freedom is a double-edged one. Moreover, however important the role of reason may be in the Christian faith, the gifts and insights of the Spirit do not all have to come that way, even if they need somehow to be tested by reason.

Although the New Testament may supply us with surprisingly adequate general criteria by which to judge

the gifts of the Spirit, it does not supply us with exhaustive lists of the gifts. It is interesting to note how often new interpretations may be given to the New Testament gifts, or new gifts added to them. Take for example the gift of power (*dunamis*). Bucer saw an example of this in the way Peter dealt with Ananias and Sapphira, and Paul with Elymas, the sorcerer. He can ask the question in his *Dialogi*: “The work of whose Spirit was it when St. Peter killed Ananias and his wife Sapphira . . . and Paul made Elymas the sorcerer blind?”²⁸ In his day Bucer saw this apostolic gift expressed in the church through the exercise of church discipline. We need not accept his exegesis to realize that the Spirit may achieve his work in various ways. The Holy Spirit is not static and his gifts may increase in variety according to the situation.

Now if the test of the gifts is whether the work of the Spirit of Christ is done, it is at least arguable (I will not say more) that the episcopal and petrine ministry that we see in the Roman Catholic Church (and I am not referring to its abuses) is a gift of the Spirit that we should consider “taking into our system.” I do not say that is what constitutes the church. It is the Spirit who constitutes the church, not some particular gift of his. For that reason we shall receive these gifts not in order to become one church, that is, as a necessary condition for being one, but in order to express within it a unity already given by the Spirit in the diversity of his gifts.

A hint of such openness to the gifts of the Spirit in others is found in the Decree on Ecumenism of Vatican II: “Nor must we disregard the contribution to our own edification which can be made by the effects of the Holy Spirit’s grace in our separated brethren.” (4:9) We might surprise our separated Roman brethren, and even more our unseparated Methodist ones, by our zeal to affirm that there are diversities of gifts by the same Spirit, diversities of ministry but the same Lord.

We may or may not admit the value of the apostolic office, whether of apostle or bishop, in safeguarding the apostolic faith and the church's unity—above all, in the early centuries. But undoubtedly the church needs to discover the twentieth-century forms of the *charismata* of word, of service, and of leadership which were manifested in Corinth and Rome.

We need to be open to the gifts that are finding expression in many groups (traditional and radical) both inside, and in some measure alongside, the church. They will suggest to us a style of church life and a pattern of Christian community much less formal, much less hierarchical, much less inhibited, much less religious than we see displayed at present. In this we need to begin with the gifts that are given, and then test them, rather than begin with a fixed idea of what the gifts may be and so inhibit or limit the sovereign freedom of the Spirit.

VIII. A Postscript

The stress in Protestant theology has been excessively on the Word as over against the Spirit. Where this has happened there has been less concern for the fruit and the gifts of the Spirit.

Luther was himself aware of the danger and complained of certain preachers: "They may be fine Easter preachers, but they are very poor Pentecost preachers, for they do not preach . . . 'about the sanctification by the Holy Spirit,' but solely about the redemption of Jesus Christ, although Christ (whom they extoll so highly, and rightly so) is Christ, that is, he has purchased redemption from sin and death so that the Holy Spirit might transform us out of the old Adam into new men . . . Christ did not only earn *gratia*, 'grace,' for us, but also *donum*, 'the gift of the Holy Spirit,' so that we might have not only forgiveness of, but also cessation of, sin."²⁷

But Luther and his followers, for various reasons, did not preserve this balance and the result is that the charge Luther brings against others is the charge usually brought against him, and by people as different as Erasmus, Müntzer, and the anabaptists. It is perhaps significant that only Bucer of the reformers won back into the established church a large group of anabaptists. In his theology there was a particular stress on the Spirit as well as on the Word, on love as well as on faith.

Doctrine and life both go together and a stress on the doctrine of the Spirit goes with a stress on the life of love as the fruit of the Spirit, as our own Methodist heritage testifies.

What applies to the Spirit as sanctifier applies to the Spirit as the life-giver, whether we see this in the gift of faith or in the gifts of the Spirit. The natural Protestant emphasis on the Word focuses attention on the objective acts of God in Christ and has often led to a stress that is intellectual and verbal—intellectual in appeal and verbal in approach. The non-intellectual, the non-verbal is suspect. An appeal that touches our emotion and imagination is suspect just as is the appeal to what the Spirit has done in us as distinct from what was done in Christ. Yet for many these are the missing dimensions.

The appeal, for example, of music (and not only pop or folk music), with all its release of emotion, the appeal of Alcoholics Anonymous with its stress on personal testimony, the appeal of the occult and the mystical—all reflect some of the missing elements in contemporary Protestant Christianity. For all its imperfections, the charismatic tradition, inside the Pentecostal Church and outside it, makes this kind of appeal. It appeals to and releases the emotions; it expects changed lives and points to them; it believes in the supernatural and demonstrates it. It is one-sided, un-

balanced in its teaching and therefore in its life, but the one-sidedness may well be what the great church needs if it is to manifest fully in our day the fellowship of the Spirit.

As we look at the pentecostal or charismatic tradition, or at the catholic or orthodox traditions, and see the diverse gifts of the Spirit which they have received, we would do well to sing with Charles Wesley, "The gift which He on one bestows, we all delight to prove."

Notes

1. Ernst Käsemann, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: S.C.M., 1964), p. 64.
2. C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: A. and C. Black, 1968), p. 280.
3. *Augustine: Later Works, Library of Christian Classics*, Vol. VIII (London: S.C.M., 1955), p. 67.
4. Käsemann, *op. cit.*, pp. 65, 69.
5. *Religion in Communist Lands* (34 Lubbock Road, Chislehurst, Kent, England: Center for the Study of Religion and Communism), Vol. 1, No. 2, p. 16.
6. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Book V, xviii.
7. *Ibid.*, V, xvi.
8. *Ibid.*, V, xvii. Here Eusebius quotes Miltiades.
9. E. G. Rupp and Benjamin Drewery, *Martin Luther* (London: Edward Arnold, 1970), p. 43.
10. David F. Wright, *Common Places of Martin Bucer* (Abingdon: Sutton Courtenay, 1972), p. 223.
11. *Spiritual and Anabaptist Writers, Library of Christian Classics*, Vol. XXV (London: S.C.M., 1957), p. 75.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 159.
13. *W. A.*, 20.451.7-10.
14. *Ibid.*, 18.137.5-16.
15. *Library of Christian Classics*, Vol. XXV, p. 156.
16. For a detailed treatment of Bucer, see W. P. Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer* (London: C.U.P., 1970), especially pages 168-169 and 185-189.
17. Hans von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* (London: A. and C. Black, 1969), p. 178.
18. Käsemann, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
19. Campenhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 250.
20. *The Letters of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M.*, Vol. VII (London: Epworth, 1931), p. 31.
21. Hans Küng, *The Church* (London: Burns and Oates, 1968), p. 195.

22. For the translation of Donald M. Gee, *Die Früchte der Geistes*, p. 6, see Frederick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of the Holy Spirit* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), p. 75. The quotation is translated back into English from the German version given in an article by O. Eggenberger in *Theologische Zeitschrift*, II, 1955, p. 278. I have been unable to trace Gee's book.
23. Ralph M. Riggs, *The Spirit Himself* (Springfield, Mo.: Gospel Publishing House, 1949), pp. 79-80; cited in Bruner, *op. cit.*, p. 71. I have been unable to trace Riggs' book.
24. Frederick Dale Bruner, *A Theology of The Holy Spirit* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), p. 70.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 298.
26. Bucer, *Dialogi*, M.4.A.36-B.35.
27. *W.A.*, 50.599. The translation follows that of *Luther's Works*, Vol. 41, *Church and Ministry III* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), p. 114.