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Among non-Pentecostals, much of the recent discussion of glossolalia, speaking in tongues, focuses on the strangeness of the phenomenon. But it is precisely this “strangeness” that may have blinded interpreters to a fundamental functional similarity between speaking in tongues and two other widespread and generally accepted religious practices, namely, Quaker silent worship and the liturgical worship of Catholic and Episcopal churches. Each of these three practices, I believe, permits the analytical mind, the focused, objectifying dimension of human intellect, to rest, thus freeing other dimensions of the person, what we might loosely refer to as spirit, for a deeper openness to divine reality.

Significantly, this goal is not achieved by a deliberate concentration on emotions as over against intellect. In fact, neither the silent worship of the Quakers, the practice of glossolalia, nor the liturgical worship of the Catholic or Episcopal church seeks to stimulate the emotions as such — in the manner of some revival meetings or some of the more contrived celebrations in certain avant-garde Protestant and Catholic congregations. Rather, the intent is to free us in the depths of our spirit to respond to the immediate reality of the living God.

Contrary to uninformed speculation and opinion, speaking in tongues is not a form of religious hysteria or Spirit possession. Nor is it, except occasionally and quite incidentally, uncontrolled expression of emotion. Not only are glossolalia, speaking in tongues, a form of religious freedom, a form of the spiritual freedom which the Bible teaches the Christian to enjoy in his indwelling Holy Spirit. The beauty of perfect holiness. In the Johannine narrative the Spirit of the deity was a quickening force in the life of Jesus and later of the apostles. When Jesus grew tired among the multitudes, he was seen going up into the mountains and deserts away from the people to receive the ministrations of the Father through prayer in the Holy Spirit. The infilling of the Spirit constantly restored the weary Jesus and quickened the indwelling Word, enabling the bearer to proclaim it and the receiver to appropriate it to himself. When the apostles grasped the import of one of Jesus’ teachings, it is recorded that “he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit” (Lk. 10:21 RSV).

In the synoptic Gospels one realizes the importance of the Holy Spirit in the messiahship of Jesus. As in the creation of the first Adam (Adam in Hebrew simply means man) so in the creation of the second Adam (the perfected spiritual man, the express image of the Godhead) the Holy Spirit is the generative principle or agent. The first Adam was created a living soul with the breath-Spirit of God in a divine rational conscious image. The second Adam, the prototype of the perfected man, was uniquely conceived by the power of the Holy Spirit.

The incarnation is in one respect like the in-breakings found in Hebraic faith-history. The incarnation is a radical event — a miraculous surprise. Mary, according to Luke, was troubled at the angelic greeting, “Hail, O favored one, the Lord is with you!” (Lk. 1:28 RSV). She was doubtful and skeptical about the message given in the angelic visitation or vision: “How can this be?” (Lk. 1:34 RSV). Through her freely willed consent she became an obedient instrumentality of the Holy Spirit. And because she was filled with the Holy Spirit in total submission, the child she would bear would be holy, the son of man and, in a unique fashion, the son of God. At the visitation of Mary with Elizabeth it is recorded that when Mary spoke to Elizabeth, “the babe leaped in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit” (Lk. 1:41 RSV). Jesus from his conception radiated the dynamis, the infilling

the church affirm that there was a natural ethical law implanted in the nature of things, which if rightly perceived and followed would call men to righteousness even in an uncovenanted dispensation. This realization of the universality of spiritual laws is a major insight of the Hellenistic period in Judeo-Christian tradition. With the emphasis on the particularity of God's historic revelation of himself in a specific time and place goes a complementary realization that this does not preclude the possibility of the Spirit's imparting the Word of Truth in other contexts. To postulate a limitation upon the freedom of the deity's will in revelatory action is tantamount to denying the sovereignty of God.

In the Johannine literature of the New Testament the thought-forms of Hellenistic Judaism are employed in narratives of Jesus' divine ministry and in outlining the uniqueness of his persona. In the Gospel of John, Jesus is perceived as being totally identified with the logos-principle—the all-creating, loving wisdom proceeding from and eternally living in God. In the Christ-dispensation the Word of God is uniquely incarnated in the flesh, the persona of Jesus. In the Old Testament the Word of Truth is either directly revealed to prophets such as Moses or is mediated by the Spirit to visionary prophets such as Isaiah in dreams, trances, or contemplative in-breakings. There is a radicality in the manifestation of the Spirit in the New Testament that is at variance with traditional Hebrew experience. Incarnationalism, familiar in other Semitic and oriental religions, is alien to Jewish thought. In this regard Judaism is a religion of abstract spirituality, whereas Christianity is a religion of incarnational revelation in which there is a total divinization of humanity in the person of Jesus, God-made-flesh. The continuing theological motifs that unify the Hebrew covenant literature with the Christic-covenant literature are the conceptions of Word and Spirit.

The Johannine literature focuses upon Jesus as one who was constantly in touch with the Father, whose total life was immersed in prayer, and whose personality was radiant with lalics fully aware of what they are doing when they begin to speak in a tongue, but they also can stop at will. Although they may be moved by deep emotion, as indeed they often are in non-glossolalic experiences of prayer and worship, the act of speaking in tongues itself is not best characterized as emotional in contrast to intellectual. The actual speech can be only a quiet whisper or even sub-vocal, or, on the other hand, it can be loud and boisterous. At times glossolalics feel a singular lack of emotion while speaking in tongues.

For the most part, whether in private devotions or in public worship, glossolalics make use of tongues for praising God. But three other uses are also common, particularly in private devotions: (a) the expression of deep anguish or inner sorrow, (b) intercession, and (c) petition. In each instance there may be something deep inside the individual which simply cannot be expressed in words. For some people, and occasionally for almost everyone, silence seems appropriate at such moments. But others find that unpremeditated glossolalic speech best permits them to express their joy and sorrow. The use of tongues in such a case is similar to the fulfillment a person may find in spontaneous dancing, and, of course, the use of the dance for the expression of religious ecstasy is a well-known phenomenon. In petition and intercession one may not really know what to pray for. Even though there may be a deep sense of need or an acute awareness of distress, the one praying may possess little exact understanding of what is wrong, of what needs changing, or of what "solution" or healing would be appropriate. In such cases, praying in a tongue may well be the most satisfying religious response available (cf. Rom. 8:26-27 RSV, where Paul refers to the Spirit helping us in our weakness, interceding for us "with sighs too deep for words").

SILENT WORSHIP AND GLOSSOLALIA

Striking parallels exist between Quaker silent worship and the practice of glossolalia. At its best, Quaker silent worship involves a kind of letting go, a lack of strain or effortful attention, a willingness to "flow" with the leading of the Spirit and with the larger movement of the entire meeting. In the
course of the worship, Friends at worship may be led to speak to the gathered meeting but retain the freedom either to yield to this urge or to fight it. They are quite aware of what they are about and retain definite control over their speech.

However, it is not a strained or forced control but rather more like that of the skillful dancer or lover. What is said will, to be sure, have intellectual content, but not mainly this. One doesn’t plan ahead of time what to say, just as one doesn’t invent a tongue in which to speak. There is rather a sharing out of the depths of one’s self, or differently described, a speaking that is prompted by the leading of the Spirit. It is almost universally felt in Quaker circles that rational analysis and argument over what is spoken “out of the silence” is inappropriate. One is not to analyze or judge but rather to listen and obey.

As in the case of glossolalia, the process of speaking out of the silence and listening in the silence involves a resting of the analytical mind, a refusal to let deliberative, objective thinking dominate the meeting for worship. Rather, one tries to “center down” and become open to the “inner light” within, to “that of God in every person,” to the “leading of the Spirit.”

Silence is common among Quakers both in private devotions and in public worship. Although what is spoken out of the silence in the meeting for worship needs no interpretation as such, others as led by the Spirit may add to what has been said, often in a manner not dissimilar to the Mishnaic commentary of the rabbis on the Torah. There is a rough parallel here to what is common practice among Pentecostals. The use of tongues in one’s private devotions needs no interpretation. But in public worship one should not speak in a tongue unless there is present someone to interpret (1 Cor. 14:28). Significantly, the interpretation usually appears to be less a word for word translation of what has been said than a kind of paraphrase of the tongue with particular emphasis on reproducing its spiritual tone and general direction.

The phenomenon of quaking or shaking, which perhaps constitutes a religious and psychological parallel to glossolalia, consciousness. Whether human consciousness came about through spontaneous generation or evolutionary process is relatively unimportant. What is important is that rational consciousness — thought-processes capable of intuiting the nature of the universe — exists as a distinct entity in the cosmos. The Spirit of God is the dynamic energy-force that informs human consciousness but remains grounded in the essence, fullness, and mind of God. In post-biblical and Hellenistic philosophy the Spirit is identified with the divine Word or logos, the rational principle of all-creating wisdom and love at the core of the cosmos.

Judaism is a religion of historical process and revelation. Central to Judaism is the concept of direct communication between the deity and a chosen individual. The encounter is initiated by the deity; the revelation is not the result of philosophical reflection or desire for illumination. Revelations in the Bible are covenantal; in them God calls individuals and families to a relationship of trust, obedience, and righteousness and a communal peoplehood. Biblical revelations disclose very little about the abstract nature of divine truth, but stress the importance of a divine desire for moral perfection and holy fellowship and union with the Godhead through obedience and dependence upon the Spirit. Revelations in the Bible are spontaneous, miraculous in-breakings of the divine into the human order. Such covenant-creating and covenant-sustaining revelations are somewhat alien to Mediterranean thought-forms and peculiar to Judaism.

In post-biblical Judaism, particular, revealed truth is harmonized with truth perceived through philosophic speculation and observations of the natural law. Philo of Alexandria, a rabbinic scholar influenced by Platonism, notes the similarity between the Hebrew concept of Spirit and the Greek principle of logos. The Hellenistic rabbis are persuaded that, just as there were in-breakings of God’s Spirit in their Hebrew faith-history, so there had been different in-breakings in other cultures where a matured capacity for heightened intellectual and spiritual insight was present. Many rabbis and later fathers of
Spirit and Life: A Charismatic Theology
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In the Hymn of Creation, the prologue of the book of Genesis, we first encounter the word Spirit, derived from the Hebrew expression for a zephyr or a breath. In Genesis this word denotes an aspect of the divine nature—that elemental force which proceeds from God, partakes of his essence, and creates, sustains, and orders life. In Hellenistic thought the essence of life is equated with breath, pneuma. The expression anima in Latin refers to the life-force in matter which gives breath and vitality to all that lives. In both Hebrew and Hellenistic Christian theology the Spirit is a creating and animating force through which the sentient order is sustained and evolved and directed toward perfection.

The Genesis creation hymn clarifies both the difference and the relationship between man and God. God is unknowable to man except in his self-disclosures through the operation of the Spirit. In Hebrew thought God is one absolute, self-sustained Being beyond the time-space-matter continuum in which he expresses himself and in which he is participating. Man is composed of the dust; his flesh is matter, yet that which gives him life and identity is immaterial, the breath of God. Of all living things that have existed, apparently man alone has the capacity for self-contemplation and the faculties of thought and reason, capable of participating in the life of God: “Then God said, ‘Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.’ ... So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him” (Gen. 1:26-27 RSV).

The Spirit is that persona or manifestation of divine Being which participated in the dialogue of creation that brought the material order into existence and indelibly impressed the image of the divine nature upon matter in the form of human con-

is virtually unknown among Friends today. But there are other stylized physical manifestations which typically accompany speaking out of the silence. For example, one often speaks with a slightly lowered head and with little or no direct eye contact with fellow worshipers. Frequently the tone of voice has a decidedly subdued quality, reflecting what is probably the deep inner conviction among Friends that one does not try to persuade or convince others by human logic, emotion, or eloquence of the truth of what is said. Rather, one speaks out of the depth of silence by the leading of the inner light, the divine Spirit. It is only this divine Spirit that can bring true conviction and response on the part of the hearer. In other words, the truth of the communication or revelation is immediately self-authenticating. It is a word spoken not primarily in order to change the ideas of the worshipers or to rouse their emotions but rather to confront them in the inner depths of their spirit. It is noteworthy by comparison that in public Pentecostal-type worship what is spoken in a tongue, although usually more animated than the word spoken by Quakers out of the silence, nonetheless possesses something of the same quality. The speaker does not try to convince, persuade, or rouse people to action, perhaps in part because glossolalics are not rationally aware of the content of their speech. Also there frequently is a marked degree of inwardness on the part of the speaker, often reflected in the avoidance of direct eye contact, or in closed eyes, and in a tone of voice different from what would be employed in ordinary affairs.

LITURGY AND GLOSSOLALIA

Similarities between glossolalia and the classical liturgical worship of the church are less obvious than those we have noted in relation to Quaker silent worship. But they are also significant. Just as glossolalia and Quaker silent worship may at first be puzzling, frustrating, even irritating to the non-initiate, to many outsiders the practice of liturgical worship sometimes appears to be little more than a mechanical exercise in futility. What good can possibly come of the repetition week after week of the same prayer of confession, word of abso-
lution, intercessions, and petitions? And how can we even focus on what is being said when most of our attention is directed to turning pages and deciding whether to stand or to kneel? Even though we remember the advice, “When in doubt kneel,” the non-initiate is so preoccupied with physical motions and the proper sequence and enunciation of prayers and other responses that it is almost beside the point to talk of the resting of the analytical mind and an encounter with God in the depths of the human spirit.

But all of this is not really surprising and is not unlike the experience of the person first learning to dance. At this point, even walking seems far more graceful than these awkward, contrived motions. But when one has mastered the dance steps, a kind of “wisdom of the body” takes over which indeed permits the analytical mind, the focused attention, to rest. One begins to “flow” with the beat of the music, the rhythm of the dance.

So with the liturgy. The very repetition Sunday after Sunday of the same prayers, responses, and creeds frees the worshipers from needing to focus consciously on what is being said. To be sure, our mind and heart are frequently stimulated by the theological content and the aesthetic movement of the liturgy. Also the total aesthetic impact of the environment—stained glass, wood carvings, Christian symbols, singing, organ music,incense, candles—helps produce a sense of awe and mystery. But as beautiful and moving as all of these elements are, there is yet a deeper movement of the human spirit as it encounters the Spirit of God. The analytical mind is permitted to rest, and the human spirit is free to experience reality on another level. Also, the very formality of the liturgy and the fixed nature of the responses may save worshipers from undue introspection and thus help them center more fully on the presence of God. And even though feelings are often heightened by liturgical worship, there is no conscious attempt to manipulate the emotions to achieve some desired effect. It is on the level of spirit that liturgical worship becomes most significant.

genuine personal commitment; where everyday-life communication is carried over through traveling evangelists and non-rational signals of belonging together; where people are enabled to initiate change.14

As Romans 8 says, the Spirit is with us in the depths of our lives, in the cries of unredeemed creation, in the solidarity with all who are not yet freed. But genuine charismatic encounter will eventually lead to authentic liberation, to the wholeness of all humankind.

References
8. Ibid.
11. The author of this article is engaged in a study of West Indian churches in Britain; she has visited all their headquarters in North America.
gifts to different situations, in which each can exercise his or her charisma with open ears and humble minds.

The Christian community is therefore charismatic or ecstatic — or nothing at all. Far from uniformity and rationalizations, the faithful step out into the realm of freedom, reflect the dialogue of the charismata, and transcend themselves by the Spirit’s quickening and driving fascination. “Charismatic” for that reason means the way of taking seriously the different gifts, shares, conditions, and vocations as means of mutual service. It describes the liberty to face limits, but to regard those limits as open gates to enrichment and fuller understanding. It emphasizes the commitment to give up all imperialistic, superior attitudes as over against people of different thoughts, behaviors, systems, and cultures. It stresses the power given to us in demythologizing the demons of isolation, oppression, and segmentation. It points to the dialogue of human beings in which alone we can encounter truth.

CONCLUSIONS

Pneumatology, we said, is the reflection of spiritual spontaneity, of the charismatic power in which we face each other as participants in the same reality here and now. It links us with the biblical dimension of the Spirit and its charismata. It has come to us again through the songs and visions, dreams and actions of an oral culture which, in our society and church, we have ignored and despised as unsuitable for doing proper theology. The Spirit, working dynamically with people in human history, has always been free enough to leave the “sacred” places of ecclesiastical institutions and doctrinal formulations. In its historical operations it is not — and never was — locked behind the doors of white supremacy. Its presence is where people suffer, strive for freedom, and hunger for universal communication. Its presence is where the same opportunity is given to non-verbal as to verbal expressions; where democratization of language and spiritual-political alphabetization takes place; where fluid, flexible structures — forms of organization difficult to suppress — are developed; where charismatic (rather than bureaucratic) leadership springs from

“BECAUSE IT’S FUN”

People frequently ask: “But what is the value of speaking in tongues?” One simple response is: “Because it’s a lot of fun.” More and more I am impressed with the element of playfulness in glossolalia, the sheer childlike delight in praising God in this manner. It is a contagious delight, and in many charismatic prayer groups people not infrequently break out in a childlike, spontaneous, almost irrepressible (but not hysterical) laughter right in the midst of prayers. Such laughter suggests an absence of a heavy super-seriousness about oneself and one’s worship. It is not unlike the freedom a child has to burst into laughter even at an important family gathering. It reflects a lack of pomposity, an ability to see oneself, even one’s serious praying, in perspective. It almost always has about it a releasing quality, and although it may sometimes be occasioned by some slight awkwardness of speech or action on the part of someone in the group, it is almost always a sympathetic and joyful laughter, thus ultimately healing and redemptive.

How fascinating then that Romano Guardini refers to the “playfulness of the liturgy.” In his book The Spirit of the Liturgy he contends that the liturgy, analyzed according to its form, is far sooner a kind of play than it is work. The liturgy, he writes,

is life pouring itself forth without an aim, seizing upon riches from its own abundant store, significant through the fact of its existence. . . . It unites art and reality in a supernatural childhood before God. . . . It has no purpose, but it is full of divine meaning. . . . It is in the highest sense the life of a child, in which everything is picture, melody and song."

Of all human activities such worship is the least goal-oriented. “The soul,” Guardini concludes, “must learn to abandon, at least in prayer, the restlessness of purposeful activity; it must learn to waste time for the sake of God.” One is immediately reminded of the beginning sentence of the Westminster Shorter
Catechism: “Man’s chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him forever.”

LETTING GO

It is noteworthy that each of the three phenomena we are examining — glossolalia, Quaker silence, and liturgical worship — exhibits a kind of strangeness or peculiar style as over against more usual religious and secular activities. This is perhaps most often felt in the case of glossolalia, but it is not absent from the other two. Significantly, the non-initiate frequently manifests a good deal of resistance when confronted with this strangeness.

Various faith healers point to the resistance often encountered by those seeking healing, and John Sherrill, author of They Speak with Other Tongues, writes that “there seems to be a strange link between taking a seemingly foolish step — which God specifies — and receiving spiritual power.” Billy Graham refers to the same phenomenon and sees the value of the altar call at revival meetings as linked to this. John Sherrill describes his own considerable resistance to the seemingly foolish step of raising his hands to God in praise. Only when he risked his middle-class decorum and respectability through actually praising God in this way did he break through to a deeper experience of the Holy Spirit.

There appears to be a principle of the spiritual life that as long as we insist on keeping full control we cut ourselves off from a deeper relationship with God. Apparently for many individuals a seemingly foolish or ridiculous action is required in order to be released for a genuine spiritual breakthrough. Parenthetically, I would want to add, however, that not every foolish act or belief is valuable. Perhaps it is just foolish.

From time immemorial, saints and mystics have witnessed to the fact that a certain letting go, a being open to, is a necessary requirement for deeper experiences of the presence and power of God. But such a letting go is not easy for those of us today who have been profoundly influenced by Francis Bacon, Descartes, Leibniz, and others who viewed knowledge primarily as the ability to gain power over and control one’s for spiritual reality! No distinction between the exceptional and the normal, the profane and the sacred, the natural and the supernatural, the miraculous and the intelligent gifts! They all, diverse and even contradictory, exist side by side, deeply intertwined, most necessary as complements and corrections to one another. They are the human-spiritual expressions of a holistic life in Christ, and they allow an ad hoc theology which gives full liberty in a given situation.

From a thorough exploration of Paul’s letters we can draw some conclusions. The first and foremost is that this concept of the charismata is utterly Christocentric in the way that it creates personal, corporate, visible, practical responsibility in the community of all vocations. Second, the community of the Spirit is a given fact, not a man-made idea, not invented but discovered as the body of Christ. It is that sphere, that part of the world which has admitted to the lordship of Christ and is driven by the power of his resurrection. The church’s spirit is the antithesis of spiritual inwardness. It is the dynamic and gracious power of the risen Christ in our embodied lives. It is intensely interlaced with the structures of the present world, which only by its force will be liberated and transformed. Its members are those who bodily, mentally, and emotionally become involved in everyday-life devotion, because they attain their full humanity — grace, freedom, and togetherness. Third, the community of the Spirit is signaled in the worship of the congregation, as the different gifts and conditions lead to love and communication. True worship, as expressed in the spontaneity of songs, instructions, stories, parables, visions, ecstatic utterances, and the interpretation of such utterances (1 Cor. 14:26), is the dialogue of the charismata, is the ability to communicate with one’s fellow men and thus to participate in God’s diverse unity, which is in fact his commitment to peace and justice and his special concern for those who are oppressed and expelled. It is the demonstration of the new order of spiritual generosity toward everybody and hence of sharing the goods of the earth. It is the training field or playground for open liturgies which apply the different
ticular share which the individual has in grace, in the Spirit of Christ, to be practiced by him in his personal way.

In this way life is understood as diversified unity, as the fullness of the blessings of the Spirit given to us, in which we all participate through different experiences in different situations, so that "there is indeed no single gift you lack" (1 Cor. 12:7 NEB). According to Käsemann, Paul distinguishes between many forms of ministry: ministries of kerygma or proclamation — apostles, prophets, teachers, admonishers; gifts of inspiration, ecstasy, and interpretation; ministries of diakonia or service — deacons and deaconesses, giving, visiting, helping by charity or assistance, performing miraculous healing and exorcism; kybernetic or guiding ministries — those who direct the community, leaders, pastors, bishops, elders, administrators; gifts of wisdom, knowledge, and the discernment of spirits; and charismatic suffering, the solidarity of the charismata, described in 1 Corinthians 12:7-13 as the weakness and indigence of those who have been made a spectacle to the whole universe. It is highly significant that parallel to extraordinary functions are listed the ordinary ones, technical and lower services, which are marked as gifts of equal importance and quality. Because charisma is the individuality of one and the same Spirit distributed to each man — as the Lord has called him (1 Cor. 12:7) — even married and celibate, circumcised and uncircumcised, slave and free man can be named among the vocations. Any human condition can be transformed into a situation of truly spiritual encounter which is the very offering of ourselves, the "living sacrifice" responding to the gift granted to us (Rom. 12). Hence official functions in the community are exercised side by side with Christian principles and private virtues.

In Paul's interpretation, Pentecost is a deeply humane, extremely awakening, intensely Christocentric vision. It corresponds to Ezekiel's dream of the field of dry bones that were gathered together, covered with flesh and skin, and made alive by the spirit of prophecy (Ezek. 37). No human condition, no talent, no manifestation of life that cannot become transparent environment. Moreover, as many today have increasingly lost faith in a transcendent God and in the reality of the resurrection of the dead, death is no longer seen as a rite of passage to fuller life, but rather as a confrontation with nothingness and the abyss and as the final loss of self-control. To let go in a world without God is to risk chaos and the destruction of the self.19

It is not surprising that the church has been influenced, by this cultural framework and has also come to be wary of the loss of control, especially as this occurs in religious ecstasy. One of the few writers who addressed himself directly and consistently to this issue was the late Paul Tillich. He contended that the church "must avoid the secular profanization of contemporary Protestantism which occurs when it replaces ecstasy with doctrinal or moral structure." 20 Indeed, Tillich viewed the entire Part IV of his Systematic Theology, entitled "Life and the Spirit," as "a defense of the ecstatic manifestations of the Spiritual Presence against its ecclesiastical critics." 21 The church's strongest weapon in this battle is the New Testament in its entirety. But, Tillich continues, "this weapon can be used legitimately only if the other partner in the alliance — the psychological critics — is also rejected or at least put into proper perspective." 22 But Tillich perhaps sensed how easy it would be to misuse these words, for he also insists that structure as well as ecstasy is needed in the church, and "the church must prevent the confusion of ecstasy with chaos." 23

Tillich's comments cannot, of course, be used to validate glossolalia or other charismatic phenomena in the church. At the very least, however, they might encourage greater openness to such experiences among non-charismatics and also a more sustained attempt to understand these phenomena in relation to the totality of the church's thought and worship.

If there is an underlying functional similarity between glossolalia, Quaker silent worship, and traditional liturgical worship, as we have been suggesting, why have so many Catholics and Episcopalians and a smaller number of Friends sought and experienced glossolalia? Perhaps these three types of religious practice can complement and build upon each other. Not
a few classical Pentecostals, for example, have in recent years come to a new appreciation of liturgical worship, and Catholics are increasingly open to silence in public worship. Or it might be that for some people in our culture speaking in tongues represents a more decisive break with the hegemony of the church and thus opens the way to spiritual growth beyond what has previously been experienced.

Notes
2. From what little I have been able to learn about the phenomenon of quaking among Friends, one apparently has less control over the practice than does the one speaking in a tongue, and one cannot necessarily terminate the practice at will.
3. It is at this point that Quakers remain understandably cautious and choose for themselves utterly simple surroundings for worship. Their fear is that one can be so captivated by external form and beauty that worship will remain on the level of the aesthetic. This has been perhaps a necessary corrective within the total life of the church and reflects an austerity not unlike the Old Testament prohibition against making graven images. At its worst, however, Quaker worship sometimes suggests a Gnostic-like repudiation of the rich beauty and vitality of our somatic existence.
4. On the other hand, the fixed quality of the liturgy can be used to insulate from real change. In this case the regularity of the liturgy imprisons rather than frees the person. But it could be argued that roughly the same insulating effect can take place in Quaker silent worship and in glossolalic worship. Rather than using the silence to center down into a creative openness to the leading of the Spirit, the Quaker worshiper may simply become drowsy or retreat into a kind of numb withdrawal from reality. Likewise, glossolalic speech may be employed in a given situation to escape from a more reflective understanding of God's will or a specific decision of the will to be obedient to God's leading.
5. Although I have been greatly helped by Romano Guardini in The Spirit of the Liturgy (1935), I cannot fully agree with him that thought is dominant over feeling in the liturgy. To be sure, as he argues, emotion in the liturgy generally is "controlled and subdued" (p. 129), but I have difficulty with his statement: "The heart speaks powerfully, but thought at once takes the lead" (p. 129). The more accurate contrast, I believe, is that between thought and feeling, on the one hand, and between reason and intuition, on the other.

ing present world-wide phenomena, such as the early pentecostal movement, the struggle for liberation from oppressive structures, the charismatic expressions inside and outside the established church, the need for imaginative intelligence in politics and communication, the whole spiritual encounter of those who want to become fully human. The Old Testament had already presented an image of the Spirit in which the mysterious and the creative, the unpredictable and the logical, the intuition and the intelligence, the unnamed and the orderly, the unstructured and the structured belonged utterly together in the wholeness of life, as for instance Numbers 11 shows. But Paul even more points to the necessity of an ecstatic understanding which does not stem from logical thinking only but from the sudden discoveries and imaginative movements of the Spirit that have to be mediated on and reflected upon but not turned into frozen pictures or static arguments. Even the Old Testament said much about the prolific, dynamic, historical tension between the structured and the unstructured manifestations of God's power, between the office and the charisma, between the institution and the function. But Paul even more appears to view them both together as belonging to the same source of life, as expressions of the same reality, as the experience of the power of spiritual communication. For the Spirit of God is not too short; it fills, carries, inspires all human thoughts and emotions. It is present among us in the dynamics of life which becomes whole through its operations. Leonard Lovett, with reference to black Pentecostalism, writes: "Objective evaluations of Pentecostalism collapse when it faces a dimension of spiritual effusion that cannot be pre-structured, pre-planned, pre-programmed or regulated by any official ecclesiastical decree." 14

Charisma is described in Paul's writings mainly in Romans 12 and 1 Corinthians 12-14 and also in Ephesians and in other references to the gifts, services, and energies of Christians. It is the "concretion," the spiritual embodiment of the one gracious and dynamic power behind, under, above, and all around our lives. It is, technically speaking, the specific par-
Another step would be to broaden our understanding of the biblical dimensions of the Spirit by paying particular attention to Paul and to his teaching on the charismata. I wish to enlarge on this second step. Paul seems to offer us a unique pneumatology, which is truly and admirably pneumatology in action — and that means spirituality in reflection.

THE CHARISMATA IN PAUL'S WRITINGS

Paul's teaching on the charismata or gifts of the Spirit has long been an almost forgotten biblical dimension. It is a way of reflecting on spontaneous and corporate expressions of the Christian faith which did not easily fit into the conceptual language of propositional theology. Hence it either was watered down into the limited doctrine of seven or nine spiritual gifts, existing in a certain hierarchical order, or it had to give way altogether to a less dangerous manner of describing the manifestations of the Spirit and the ministry of Christians. The thorough investigations by Eduard Schweizer and Ernst Käsemann have thrown light on pneumatological practice and theory in early Christianity — light which uncovered meaning in the interdependence, response, and freedom of those filled with the Spirit (and the vulnerable structures of their communities) and which also opened up new horizons for the fresh interpretation of contemporary experience. It is certain that Paul himself did not merely develop a theory of the presence of the Spirit which he afterwards imposed on the newly founded congregations, but that he rather discovered spiritual reality among them and then reflected on already existent phenomena. He truly started from the quickening and driving fascination by the Spirit in the midst of people's lives, tried to follow up its signs in early Christian congregations, and developed a pneumatological theory which had its roots in spontaneous participation and in an order of mutual assistance. And to describe this reality he introduced the word charisma into theology. He unfolded it in an open theology that can also be used as an acceptable instrument for interpret-