

*Claims from Christian groups of new or added revelations to Scripture are to be suspect as unscriptural.*

Skip Goetzinger

Middler Dogmatics ST 221

In our day many groups calling themselves “Christian” have espoused the theology of added revelation. They claim that they have additional information beyond what is revealed to us in God's Word, His Scripture. These “new” groups of our time range from the seemingly traditional denominations of the Mormons and Christian Science, to the showy denominations of the Assemblies of God (Pentecostals/Charismatics). While these groups call themselves Christian and claim to be Bible-based, in every case they also add some additional teaching apart from God's Word. Some claim added revelation directly from God (Mormons, Christian Science). Others, such as the Enthusiasts, add their own “Bible-based” interpretations of how God reveals His will to man. All err who depart from God's revealed will as it is presented in His written Word.

It is not the purpose of this paper to address the topic of the revealed knowledge of God as it may circumvent or add to an unbeliever's natural knowledge of God. In other words, this paper does not address the matter of an unbeliever coming to faith apart from the means of grace, by immediate revelation. Rather, this paper addresses the matter of a professed Christian who knows the Scriptures, yet claims that they have additional knowledge of God's will apart from His means of grace, His revealed Word. Indeed it is the bias of this paper to hold to 2 Cor. 10:5 and Pieper's statement,

The Christian religion, the religion of grace, is (its?) very truth, the wisdom of God, and men know of it only through God's revelation in the Word. . . . It is “God-made,” and the only source of this knowledge until the end of time is God's revelation in the Word – in the written Word of the apostles and prophets. (Rom 16:25f, Eph. 2:20, 1 Jn 1:1-4) (vol. 1, p. 20,21)

The phenomena of new groups claiming additional revelation apart from God's Word is indeed a very old heresy. The Apostle Paul had to address the problem in Corinth (1 Cor. 14:37), and in Thessalonica (2 Thes. 2:2). The Montanists<sup>1</sup> appeared in the second century. The Gnostics<sup>2</sup> claimed additional knowledge of God that was apart from the revealed Word. Gnostic influence crept into the church from an early time. Many historical influences converge to create what we call gnosticism. Philo (+/- 20 B.C. - 40 A.D.), an early Jewish scholar used the allegorical method<sup>3</sup> to merge Jewish teaching with current Greek philosophy. Clement and Origen (185 - 254 A.D.) represent ecclesiastical forms of gnosticism (the Alexandrian school) that stressed speculation over against the revealed Word. Their Gnostic influence led to many heterodox teachings, primarily docetism<sup>4</sup>.

The claim of additional knowledge apart from God's revealed Word is indeed a very old and corrupting practice. In every case throughout history it has led men away from the true Word of God to a man-centered work-righteous system.

“It is the nature of fallen man, just because he has fallen away from God, the Center of all things, to make himself the center of all things; self-assured, self-centered, self-assertive, he sets himself above God's Word – he is the ‘superman’” (Pieper 1:127).

If we turn our view to the time of the Reformation, we see many during this period that also departed from the revealed Word of God and espoused their own views.

It is interesting to note that those who fall away from the Scripture as the source and norm of faith are also those who hold so tightly to the idea of some form of synergism. That somehow their free will is able to choose either positively or negatively for God. When Luther wrote against Erasmus on the issue of free will, he brought in the interesting point that the humanists were indeed ignoring or nullifying the power or need of the Holy Spirit, “—when you say it can ‘apply itself’; for this means that you completely exclude the Holy Spirit with all his power, as superfluous and unnecessary” (Luther 33:109). There is a close connection between those who are proponents of “free will” and those who advocate immediate revelation. “What need is there of the Spirit or of Christ or of God if free choice can overcome the motions of the mind toward evil?” (Luther 33:125)<sup>5</sup>

One sad example of a sound teacher of Scripture going terribly off course is Andreas Karlstadt. A former associate of Luther's in the cause of the Reformation, he wrote in his 1524 “Whether One Should Proceed Slowly and Avoid Offending the Weak in Matters that Concern God's Will”:

It follows from this that we are fastened to Scripture, that no one may judge according to the good pleasure of his heart (Jer. 26:16 ff), and also those who look to things other than God's Word promote harlotry. And truly, it is genuine harlotry and spiritual adultery, . . . . For God, who is a husband of the created spirit, is scorned, or neglected and forgotten as soon as the soul considers things other than His Word in divine matters. . . (Sider, 51).

However, Karlstadt is supposed to have been heavily influenced by the Zwickau prophets and Müntzer after his separation from Luther. On the one hand Sider (who is in the pro-Karlstadt camp) quotes Mark Edwards from his “Luther and the False Brethren” p. 58-59 as saying “that Luther tended to attribute the views of one set of opponents to all his opponents” (Sider, 40). This is possible seeing how Luther did take seriously all who wrongly taught the counsel of God, whether Roman or Radical. Sider may have a point here that Karlstadt has been wrongly accused. Yet later, Sider states,

Particularly interesting and still relevant is Luther's penetrating critique of what today we would call Karlstadt's pietistic emphasis on religious experience and pious feelings. But if, where Luther could see only hypocrisy and works-righteousness, we discern a piety which, while still grounded in justification by faith alone, nevertheless yearns for what John Wesley would call the “heart strangely warmed,” is Luther's criticism finally justified? (Sider, 92)<sup>6</sup>.

It cannot be denied that Karlstadt did contribute mightily to the promotion of “the new layman” and the general disintegration of education for the ministry. The idea of the “priesthood of all believers” was carried to its extreme all over Germany, and left people thinking that education in the Scriptures was unnecessary. “If we're all priests, we can all preach God's Word properly,” so the popular thought was.

This extremist form of the “priesthood of all believers” was carried out by Müntzer and his Zwickau prophets. Luther himself held to the “priesthood of all believers”, but he insisted upon specialized training for such men.

When Luther preached the spiritual priesthood of all believers, some took it to mean that no formal training was necessary as a preparation for the priesthood. Others went even further, holding that God speaks directly to the human heart; there must be an inner word supplementing the written word. This inner word, this prompting of the Holy Spirit within, wholly independent of any formal education, makes it possible to understand the

written word. For this reason Karlstadt and Müntzer were opposed to learning of any kind, even declaring it to be sinful and devilish. (LW 45:342, 343.)

Müntzer was opposed to any study being required for those preaching the Word of God. Indeed, he held the Word low but held high his belief that the Holy Spirit continued to come to those who were elect. He was given to personal revelations from God, and used these revelations to incite the populace to revolution. His association with the Anabaptists and their revolutionary tactics lead to his death in 1525.

It is true that Luther in a certain sense of the word “rebelled” against the status quo of the Roman church. It is not true that he ever rebelled against the clear teaching of Scripture, this was the foundation of his reformation. It is against such an onslaught of rebellion and fanatical spirits that Luther groups all these rebels together, those who are against the clear word of God, when he writes,

From which you now see that Dr. Karlstadt and his spirits replace the highest with the lowest, the best with the least, the first with the last. Yet he would be considered the greatest spirit of all, he who has devoured the Holy Spirit feathers and all. (LW 40:83)

Luther's opponents couldn't understand why he didn't embrace them; after all, he too was a “rebel.” But those that Luther called radicals, fanatics, enthusiasts, Schwärmer, didn't understand that it was upon God's revealed Word that he stood.

The Reformed “Enthusiasts,” in like manner, berated Luther's firm adherence to the Word of Scripture as dead *Buchstabentheologie* (literalism) and unevangelical Christianity. Their aim was to clear the way for that “Holy Spirit” who does not need a “vehicle” (*vehiculum, plaustrum*) and finds the use of it beneath His dignity. But since it is the way of God's Holy Spirit to use a “vehicle,” namely, the means of grace, they were in reality – whether they were conscious of it or not – enthroning in God's church their own spirit, which was supposed to deal with the Holy Ghost immediately. . . . The divine authority which is taken away from Scripture is actually awarded to the Ego of the theologian. (Pieper 1:63)

Indeed, the theology of those promoting additional revelation apart from God's revealed Word is not new at all. In our own day we have the Mormons with their additional revelation of Jesus Christ, the Book of Mormon.

Mormons claim to accept the Bible as a source of their doctrine. In truth the theology of Mormonism is “based upon the revelations of Joseph Smith as contained in the Book of Mormon, Pearl of Great Price (selections from Genesis with Smith's additions), and Doctrines and Covenants (the dreams, visions and revelations of Joseph Smith)” (Mayer, 82, 83).

Christian Science promotes the Bible and the writings of its founder Mary Baker Eddy. Today's Pentecostals, essentially Assemblies of God, add to Scripture in a slightly different mode, but still qualify the revealed Word of God. Pentecostals (Charismatics) maintain, as did the Zwickau prophets, that the Holy Spirit is not contained to a “vehicle” such as the written Word of Scripture. Thus they believe that the speaking in tongues, healing, all such outward “gifts of the Spirit” are not only still probable, but are to be expected as signs of true conversion.

After this rather lengthy review of the various groups that promote additional revelation apart from God's revealed Word, what is a Christian to think? Is there any basis in fact for those claiming added revelations? Is it possible that today's Pentecostals

who claim “added insight” may just actually be receiving revelation (prophecy?) from God? For the answers to these questions we must see what Scripture has to say on the subject.

## II

### ***What Scripture says: Its historical character.***

The Bible is God's Word. Its absolute completeness, unity and inerrancy is due to this fact. To know and trust this is a gift of faith. To doubt this is to have a weak or non-existent faith. The fact that God has chosen to deliver His will to us by means of the written word is not a deficit in him, but rather shows His good and gracious will (1 Tim. 2:4).

Scripture has, as Pieper calls it, a historical character. When God spoke to Adam in the Garden, He used words. As the world progressed, and the history of His plan of Salvation unfolded, God spoke to His prophets. Moses and these prophets wrote down for posterity what God had spoken to them (Heb. 1:1; 1 Pt. 1:10-12). Thus, God's written Word is His actual Word (Ex. 17:14, Ex. 24:4, Dt. 31:9). Whether directly, as one could say in the case of Adam and Moses (Lev. 6:8), or by inspiration (Is. 1:1, Jer. 1:2), essentially these two modes of God's communication to man are the same; by immediate revelation His will is made known to us.

In the Scripture, God the eternal became temporal.

Scripture testifies that the eternal Son of God became man and thus entered “history.” The Eternal became temporal. Scripture furthermore tells us that this wonderful divine mystery was revealed by the command of the eternal God, through the prophetic writings, in human language and thus became a part of recorded history. (Pieper, 1:73)

That the Bible is God's inerrant, inspired, true Word is an article of faith. It cannot be proved by scientific means. If one is a Christian, this is a basic tenant.

### ***What Scripture says: Immediate Revelation through prophets and apostles.***

When God spoke to Abraham He did so both by vision (Gen 15:1) and directly (Gen 17:1). The same can be said for Moses (Ex. 3:1ff) and all the other prophets of the Old Testament period. Every time that a prophet received immediate revelation from God it was for the purpose of bringing His chosen people, and all the world, His plan of salvation. Everything that God did throughout Old Testament history was for the purpose of pointing to the coming of His promised Messiah – His plan of salvation for fallen mankind (1 Pt. 1:10-12).

It can be noted here, that God's prophets of the Old Testament were generally reluctant to take on this role. Moses objected five times, in five different ways at the idea of being God's messenger (Ex. 3:11,13; 4:1, 10, 13). Samuel was reluctant to tell Eli of his vision (1 Sam. 3:15). Jeremiah tried to bow out of his invitation from God (Jer. 1:16,17). Hesitation accompanied many of God's messengers when they were called. If not stated directly by the prophet, a great amount of convincing on God's part is associated with the call of each of His prophets. Contrast this with today's alleged prophets. The teachings of the Pentecostals maintain that proof of the Spirit is by a gift of the Spirit. It is a badge to be worn as proof of being a true Christian. This is in stark contrast to the attitude of many Old Testament prophets.

When today's Charismatics say "Why can't God come to us immediately? He came to His Old Testament people frequently by direct revelation and vision." One can remind them, as with conversion, the Holy Spirit works when and where it pleases Him. Even during Samuel's time the Scriptures state "In those days the Word of the Lord was rare; there were not many visions" (1 Sam. 3:1).

Regarding God's immediate revelation to His New Testament apostles, there is really only one; the Apostle Paul. The other twelve were all eyewitnesses to Jesus himself. Immediate revelation was facilitated because Jesus was physically present as he taught His chosen twelve.

It is interesting to note that the testimony of the NT apostles is given as much validity and authority as the OT prophets. Eph. 2:20 states: "Built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, with Christ Jesus himself as the chief cornerstone." Note the one definite article with the two nouns. This is a unit: the Apostles and the Prophets are one idea. Thus the testimony of the Apostles (the teachings of what they learned from Jesus) is of the same strength, validity and authority as that of the prophets. They are both revealing God's Word to humanity. Col. 2:7-10, 16-20.

The teachings of the apostles then, are to be considered God's Word and used for teaching the Word of truth (Rom. 10:17; Heb. 1:1,2; Heb. 2:3; Jn. 17:20; Acts 2:42; Rom. 6:17; Rom. 16:25,26; Col. 2:7; 1 Jn. 1:1-4).

#### ***What Scripture says: Mediate Revelation.***

Quenstedt defines "revelation" this way: (Quenstedt, Note IV, p.134,5)

I) Materially, the revealed thing itself.

(It's "revealed" because you can physically see it.)

II) The act of revelation by God.

A) Revealed by God.

1) As if hidden under a veil, revealed by manifestation from God.

2) Natural (revelation) knowledge. Rom. 1:19.

B) Revealed by God. Narrowly and specially made in the Word.

1) In an absolute way.

2) With supernatural revelation through the Spirit of God.

Mt. 11:25,27; Mt. 16:17; 1 Cor 2:10.

III) Direct illumination.

The narrowest sense. Revelation made to the prophets and apostles by a direct inflowing of the Holy Spirit.

When the dogmaticians speak of the "source" of Scripture, it is always assumed that Source = God and Source of Scripture = God. "Whatever God has revealed in His Word, or, which is the same, whatever Holy Scripture teaches, that is infallibly true and must be reverently believed and embraced" (Quenstedt, Note IX, p.136).

We could add,

Nothing must be injected into the *corpus doctrinae* of the church which is not contained in Scripture. And in order to accentuate this characteristic feature of the Christian doctrine, they have called objective theology *theologia ektupo*", ectypal, or derived, theology, that is, a reproduction, re-presentation, of the *theologia ar̄chetupo*", the archtypal, or original, theology, which is that

knowledge of God and divine things originally found only in God, but which God has graciously communicated to man through His Word. (Pieper 1:58)

With regard to Scripture being the final revelation of God's Word,

Only the revelations once committed by the divine inspiration to writing by Moses, the prophets, and the apostles constitute the source of knowledge of theology, for no other divine revelations are surely and undoubtedly given. For after the canon of Scripture was fixed, direct revelations ceased in the church. (Quenstedt, Note XII, p. 136,7)

Where I have underlined “theology”, we could add “source and norm for faith and life”, as Quenstedt goes on to explain. If the Scripture is a source for theology, it follows that it is a source and norm for faith and life. “It is impossible to separate these two functions of Scripture: to be the source of Christian doctrine and to be its norm” (Pieper 1:62).

Quenstedt is writing here against the Papists, who claim that foreign sources or methods other than Scripture can be used as a basis for theology; as a source and norm for faith (*norma normans*). He would be referring to the accumulated writings of the church fathers, the Popes and the Councils<sup>7</sup> which we would call their *Norma Normata*. Plainly said, Quenstedt is laying the foundation that Scripture, and Scripture alone, is the basis of determining God's revealed Word, and that it is His final Word.

Now if this argument can be used to refute the Papists, who wish to add to Scripture, it can also be used for the Enthusiasts.

Therefore, in the first place: Scripture claims itself to be God's Word. Ex. 17:14, Ex. 24:4; Ps. 78:5; Jn. 4:25,26; 2 Tim. 3:16; Jas. 1:18;

Secondly, it claims itself to be the source and norm for faith and life (*norma normans*). Ps. 19:7; Jn. 17:17; 2 Cor. 6:7; Eph. 1:13; Jas. 1:18; 2 Pt. 1:19

Thirdly, it urges everyone who reads it to cling to it alone as the source and norm of faith and life. Jos. 23:6; Lk. 16:29; 2 Pt. 1:19.

Fourthly, the Holy Spirit does not work outside, or apart from the Word. 1 Pt. 1:23; Rom. 10:17; Jn. 6:63.<sup>8</sup>

Fifthly, it condemns anyone who adds or subtracts from its contents. Dt. 4:2, Dt. 12:32; Is. 8:20; Rev. 22:18,19.

### III

#### ***Summary and Conclusion***

On the one hand we denounce the anti-supernaturalism of the negative critic. On the other, we look askance at those who embrace a false kind of supernaturalism. An extreme that pulls them away from that which God has revealed about Himself; His Word. We reject those who add to Scripture from foreign sources, both extra-human and intra-human.

Distinguish between that which is known by its nature and in itself, and that which is known to us. Holy Scripture is known by its nature, for it is revealed to all, it is clear to all, it communicates knowledge of itself to all who search it properly, even if it does not actually become known to all. . . truth is learned by reduction to prime principles known per se. Thus truth is learned in the Scriptures taught by catholic teachers with regard to things that are held by faith, by reduction to the Scriptural canons that we have by divine revelation, in which falsehood can in no way be hidden. (Quenstedt, IV, p.148)

What Scripture teaches is God's Word and will for man. It is open and available to all, it is objective (1 Jn. 5:9).

Scripture is God's Word and claims to be so. Additionally, it is testified to by both its inspired writers and by the Holy Spirit working in those who read it (1 Cor. 2:14). Since it is God's Word, and it does claim for itself to be the only source and norm for faith and life, it is therefore a complete unit which is not to be added to or subtracted from. It found its fulfillment and its close in the work of Jesus Christ.

The purpose of the written Word, from first to last, was to make God's plan of salvation known to all mankind, (Jn. 8:31,32; Rom. 16:26,27). Since it has, and continues to, accomplish that purpose perfectly, there is no need of any additional revelation (2 Tim. 3:15-17, Jn 17:20; 1 Jn 1:3,4).

Divine revelation is the first and last source of theology; advance beyond it is not allowed in theological discussion among Christians. For all doubt regarding religion is ended by divine revelation in the mind of a truly Christian person, and his faith finally so overcomes, rests, and is founded in it (divine revelation), that the mind of one who assents is freed from all fear and suspicion of deception and is made sure. Therefore papistic definition, human reason, and the direct revelation of the fanatics are false sources of faith and theology, since they do not do this. (Quenstedt, V, p.148)

This should sufficiently close the discussion with regard to the Book of Mormon and any other group that claims additional revelation from God apart from His written Word. It is clearly unscriptural to claim such, and it is forbidden (Rev. 22:18,19).

#### ***With regard to the Enthusiasts:***

God has nowhere in Scripture promised to give the gift of the Spirit at any time. Like conversion, the Holy Spirit works when, and where, He wills. Gifts of the Spirit (carisma<sup>9</sup>) then are neither to be expected nor awaited. They are gifts freely given by God when, and where, it pleases Him. All of God's salvation history has been worked to bring salvation to man. That history has found (huſhke) its fulfillment in Jesus Christ. The act of bringing that salvation history to its fulfillment (the process of bringing the plan of salvation to all mankind), is done and complete. The results of that act are still ongoing.

An integral part of the act of God's plan of salvation was to use immediate revelation; it was intimately entwined with God's unchanging purpose of bringing salvation to us. Since the act is complete, the use of immediate revelation can be safely concluded to be complete.

Does this mean that God is incapable of immediate revelation? On the contrary. God is capable of doing anything (except lying, He cannot deny himself. 2 Tim. 2:13b). But for what purpose? (cf. Quenstedt, V, p. 188) His greatest and best purpose has already been fulfilled. To speculate about why God would use immediate revelation today, would be to delve into the hidden things of God (cf. Quenstedt, VI, p. 188); where we have no place in going<sup>10</sup>. All that has been revealed to us is everything that we need for our salvation; we need nothing more (2 Tim. 3:16-18, 1 Cor. 13:12, Rom. 11:33).<sup>11</sup>

God's use of immediate revelation (the time before the sending of the Holy Spirit in the narrow sense), and the sending of His Holy Spirit at Pentecost always centered upon the message of Christ. It did not bring attention to itself, rather it brought attention

to Christ and His work of atonement. This is exactly opposite to those who claim to have gifts of the Spirit today. They bring great attention to themselves (1 Cor. 14:4) and bring no benefit to the church (Col. 2:18,19).

Their reliance on immediate revelation (gifts of the Spirit) gives them a theology of self-assurance, rather than Scripture-assurance. Their theology is inner-based, rather than outside of themselves (Mt. 24:35).

The theologian who actually cuts loose from Scripture is no longer in contact with God and the divine truth; he is communicating only with himself and his own human thoughts; he is, as has been aptly stated, in communication with the "projections of his own Ego." (Pieper, 1:123)

In closing, it can be mentioned that the various phenomenon of "immediate revelation" may or may not impart a new doctrine. If it does not, then we can say "so what" to your revelation. We already knew that from Scripture, and without denying the ability of God to give that revelation - we can dismiss it as a product of their imagination or self-delusion (paraphrase, Brug, Oct. '98).

After the completion of the canon of Scripture no new and immediate divine revelation was given to be a fundamental source of doctrine, 1 Cor. 4:6; Heb. 1:1,2. (Hollaz; Mueller, 16)

If they do impart some new doctrine, we have to say: "if it is not from God's Word, anathema to you!" Paul severely warns of false prophets (Dt. 13:1-5; Jer. 23:16; Acts 20:29,30; Gal. 1:7-9; Col. 2:6-8; Col. 2:18-19; 1 Tim. 6:3; 1 Tim. 6:20,21; 2 Tim. 3:5,7,9; 2 Jn. 9-11). Be warned that those who claim additional revelation may also be of the devil (2 Cor. 11:14; 1 Tim 4:1,2). "Whatever does not have its origin in Scripture is surely of the devil himself" (Pieper 1:69).

Finally, the subject rests upon God's revealed Word as the final source and norm for authority. "For prophecy never had its origin in the will of men, but men spoke from God as they were carried along by the Holy Spirit." (2 Pt. 1:20).

## Bibliography

### *Primary sources:*

- Becker, S. The Charismatic Movement. 1974. EF 1100. 1-14.
- Balge, R. "Some of the Cults which are likely to disturb our people." Our Great Heritage. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991. vol. 2, p. 517-552.
- Bente, F., ed. Concordia Triglotta. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.  
Ap XIII, ¶3, p. 309; ¶13, p. 311;  
S3, art. VIII, ¶3-13ff, p.495; ¶9-13, p. 497  
FC, Through Declaration, II. Of Free Will, ¶46, pg. 899
- Chemnitz, M. Ministry, Word, and Sacraments: An Enchiridion. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1981. 39-41, 77.
- . The Doctrine of Man: In Classical Lutheran Theology. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1962. xiii - xv, xx, 123, 143, 156.
- Crane, C. The Bible and the Mormon Scriptures Compared. Joplin, MO: College Press, 1989. 5-35, 58-61.
- Hageman, G. Sketzhes from the History of the Church. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, no date. 140-141.
- Henry, C., ed. Revelation and the Bible. Phil. PA: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1958. 73-104.
- Hoerber, Robt., ed. Concordia Self-Study Bible, NIV. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1986.
- Kittelson, J. Luther The Reformer. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1986. 115, 119, 124, 137-140, 169, 170-191, 196-98, 200-203, 248.
- Knox, R. Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion. Oxford, England: The Clarendon Press, 1959. 1-24
- Kurtz Church History. New York, NY: Funk & Wagnalls, Co., 1888. vol. 1, ¶26, ¶1, p. 98-100, ¶2, p. 100-101; §31, ¶5, p. 154-6; vol. 2, §124, ¶1, p. 246; ¶3, p. 247, ¶4, p. 248, ¶5, p. 248-249.
- Lange, L. Outline of the Book of Concord. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1994.
- Latourette, K. A History of Christianity. Peabody, MA: Prince Press, 1997. vol.2, p. 719, 725, 780, 783.
- Lawrenz, C. "The Absolute Authority of the Word of God in matters of Faith and Life." Our Great Heritage. Milwaukee, WI: Northwestern Publishing House, 1991. vol. 1, p. 2-39.
- Luther, M. "The Bondage of the Will." Luther's Works. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1972. Vol. 33, 5-295.
- . "How Christians Should Regard Moses." Luther's Works. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1960. Vol. 35, p. 158, 164.
- . "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church." Luther's Works. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1959. Vol. 36, p. 77.
- . Luther's Works. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1971.  
Vol. 38, p. 110, 217, 221-223 (re: The Private Mass)

- . “Against the Heavenly Prophets in the Matter of Images and Sacraments.” Luther's Works. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1958. Vol. 40, p. 73-131, 141-170, 176-179, 189-192, 199-204, 212-223. (115 pp)
- . “To the Councilmen of Germany.” Luther's Works. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1962. Vol. 45, p. 342,343.
- Mayer, F. American Churches: Beliefs and Practices. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1946. 44-49, 81-92.
- Mueller, J.T. Christian Dogmatics. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 1946. 16, 95, 96, 134-138, 453-455.
- Pieper, F. Christian Dogmatics. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Pub. House, 1950. Vol. 1, p. 20, 21, 48, 58-75, 112-130, 142-7, 168-9, 193-367
- Schaller, J. Biblical Christology: A Study in Lutheran Dogmatics. Milwaukee, WI: NPH, 1981. 25, 28, 30, 38, 202.
- Sider, R. Karlstadt's Battle with Luther. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1978. 1-159.
- Quenstedt J. The Nature and Character of Theology. Trans., Ed. Luther Poellot. St. Louis, MO: Concordia Publishing House, 1986. 133-148, 187-204.
- Valleskey, D. “Evangelical Lutheranism and Today's Evangelicals and Fundamentalists.” WLQ. 1983: 180-220.

***Sources that after reading, did not apply to topic.***

- Melancthon - LOCI, BX8064.C4613
- Nafzger, S. Scripture and the Word of God. EF 1462. p. 107-123. (17)
- Niebuhr, H.R. The Social Sources of Denominationalism. New York, NY: Meridian Books, Inc., 1960.

***Sources that would be good to check in the future:***

I would have liked to check, but time did not permit.

- Becker, S. The Word of God in the Theology of Martin Luther. 1963. EF 1068.
- . The Working of the Holy Ghost. 1974. EF 639.
- Boettner, L. The Reformed Faith. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub'g Co., 1983.
- Braaten & Jenson - BT75.2.c48
- Bruner, F. A Theology of the Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1970.
- Calvin, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, BX9422.W28
- Carl Barth's idea of revelation, BX4827.B3M6
- Cross, W. The Burned-Over District: The Social and Intellectual History of Enthusiastic Religion in Western New York, 1800-1850. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press, 1950.
- Demarest, B. General Revelation: Historical Views and Contemporary Issues. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982.
- Gerhard - found nothing so far
- Gieschen, E. What does the Formula of Concord say to us about Unionism, Ecumenism, and Fanaticism (Pentecostalism)?. EF 1496
- Hoenecke, Adolf - BX8065.H6413

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Montanists: Practice glossolalia (speaking in tongues as described in 1 Cor. 12-14), and considered themselves spiritual while other Christians were base or carnal.
- <sup>2</sup> While gnosticism held to various teachings and doctrines, its basic characteristic was that of syncretism. It combined other religious teachings to that of the Bible teachings. It tended to view God's revealed will as a process, so that by ignoring older religious teachings one was ignoring the accumulated wisdom of God's revealed will. For the most part the tradition of ancient wisdom as the communicated secret doctrine stood higher than holy Scripture. Thus they could claim under this view, an added knowledge of God that was not revealed in the Scripture alone. Cf. Kurth.
- <sup>3</sup> Allegory is a speculative method of interpreting Scripture that looks for a deeper meaning.
- <sup>4</sup> Jesus was not really human but only appeared to be so, and primarily the denial of the resurrection of the body.
- <sup>5</sup> Included as "Enthusiasts" during the Reformation period would be the Anabaptists and the Schwenkfeldians.
- <sup>6</sup> Is Sider here admitting to Karlstadt's "enthusiast" leanings? Kittelson (pp.188-9) and Latourette (p. 725) both infer that Karlstadt was only guilty by association with Müntzer. However, Hageman states plainly that Karlstadt "in 1524 united with Müntzer, the leader of the Zwickau fanatics . . . . and shared his doctrinal views" (Hageman, 140). Quenstedt clearly calls Karlstadt an Enthusiast (IV, p. 191).
- <sup>7</sup> "such as unwritten traditions, decrees of councils, definitions of Popes, the authority of the Fathers, arguments of reason, new revelations, and other things, which sources are associated by the heterodox with the Word of God" (Quenstedt, Note XIII, p. 138).
- <sup>8</sup> "But," says an Enthusiast, "God does use 'means' to communicate His revelation to me. He speaks directly to my mind (or to my heart)." By "means" we signify some material vehicle by which the Holy Spirit communicates. God's written Word is a "means." His sacrament {Augustine: "The Word of God, combined with the earthly element."} of the Lord's Supper is a "means." Baptism is a "means." "And it is the external divine act by which God revealed Himself to mankind through His Word, that it might have saving knowlwdge." (Quenstedt, 134) If by "means" they mean "experience", faith is indeed an experience, but it is the Gospel that must produce this faith, or this experience (Jn. 8:31,32; Jn 17:20). (cf Mueller, p. 454).  
cf. also Ap XIII, ¶3, p. 309.
- <sup>9</sup> *carisma*; The noun (cognate) from *cari*", "grace." Meaning a divine gift.
- <sup>10</sup> cf. Pieper, p. 119.
- <sup>11</sup> cf. S3, VIII, ¶3-6, p. 495; Ap XIII, ¶13, p. 311.