

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church
107 East Austin
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624
830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

A0808 – February 24, 2008 – 1 Cor 13 – The Doctrine Of Tongues

Alright, today we're breaking from our normal verse-by-verse approach and doing a special on tongues. Having run into it in the Acts text we want to deal with it because it's a major source of confusion and controversy today and we need to be clear. By the time we get done, and we'll have to go pretty fast, but if you have questions right them down and I'll field them next week. So far what we've said is that Pentecost is a Jewish feast day. Israel had a calendar and it started with a holiday called Passover which began on the night of the Exodus and typifies substitutionary blood atonement. Then they had Firstfruits a few days later on the day after the next Sabbath when they would take a sheaf of the barley, just raw out of the field to the priest and he would wave it before the Lord. Then, fifty days later they had Pentecost and this is when they would harvest their fields of the wheat and the barley and this time the wheat would be ground and baked into a loaf of bread and they'd take it down to the priests and they would wave it before the Lord. Now, when God wanted to end one of these feasts He'd fulfill it. Jesus' death fulfilled Passover. He's our Passover Lamb says Paul in 2 Cor 5:6-8. Then three days later He fulfilled Firstfruits in the resurrection. That's what Paul says in 1 Cor 15:20, 23. So God's plan is on schedule, these are historically viable fulfillments and what you expect is the fulfillment of Pentecost 50 days later that would be the fulfillment of the New Covenant and the Messianic Kingdom would come. So the Holy Spirit comes, there's this outpouring of the Spirit. But there's a problem. And the problem is Israel isn't ready. So the issue on Pentecost is "What are you going to do Israel?" "Here we are in the plan of God, everything's happening right on schedule, now are you going to get on board?" Up to that point Jesus had offered Himself as the King of Israel, the nation had rejected Him and He pronounced judgment on that generation. Now, we're all familiar with the cross work of Jesus Christ and some of the words that Jesus uttered on the cross. But I wonder if you know what He meant when He said, "Father, forgive them for they do not know what they are doing." What's He praying about here? Well, let's turn it around. What if Jesus had not prayed this prayer? Would the nation have immediately come under judgment? You bet. But God answered His prayer and the judgment was

delayed until 70AD. So that generation was given some time to repent but it's hard to imagine Peter knew that just yet on the Pentecost. But this is where the tongues come in. These were clearly known human languages for they all heard them in their own tongue. And the question is why? And we dealt with Isa 28 that this was a sign of judgment on the nation for their disobedience. It wasn't some kind of blessing. It was the sign of cursing. The nation was so spiritually inept they didn't recognize that when Jesus Christ worked the great and mighty works of God they were the works of God. In Matt 12 they said, "No, we're not buying it Jesus, you're doing the works by a demon." And that's the national rejection of Jesus which put them inevitably on a course of judgment. But Jesus prayed on the cross for a delay, He prayed for His most vile enemies, forgive this generation they don't have a clue what their doing. And God answered and they got an extended hour of grace, time to respond. Now, here come the tongues on Pentecost, you've got a little time here Israel, what are you going to do? And the tongues are a sign of impending judgment on these unbelieving Jews. Isaiah said, "Indeed He will speak to this people" clearly Israel in the context, "He will speak to this people through stammering lips and a foreign tongue." That's Gentile languages proclaiming the great works of God in short little utterances as a sign of judgment. Now, that's what we've seen so far and today we want to go into the doctrine of tongues. If you want to pick a fight this is a topic to bring up. But there's no reason to fight about it. The issue is the word of God. What does the word say? It's not a matter of experience because no experience, however wonderful or uplifting, can ever supersede the word of God. So let's look at the doctrine under five categories; the origin of tongues, the character of tongues, the purpose of tongues, the end of tongues and the history of tongues.

Let's start with **The Origin of the Biblical Gift of Tongues**. We're not commenting here on the origin of pagan tongues. That's a different issue. There were pagan tongues but they were of a different character. All the mystery religions of Rome practiced ecstatic utterances. That's the problem Paul addresses in Corinth, the mixing of a pagan practice of ecstatic utterance that they had formerly practiced with the biblical tongues. It was a synthesis of paganism with the Bible. Nor is our interest the Tower of Babel except to note the fact that languages there weren't a blessing, they were a judgment for violation of Gen 9:1 the command to fill the earth, so God forced them to scatter by confusing the languages (Gen 9:1; 11:1-9). The point to ponder is the fact they were a judgment and what do we have in Acts but tongues used as a judgment. But our interest for now is the origin of the biblical gift of tongues. Clearly the origin is among the Jews in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost. Moses didn't speak in tongues, Daniel didn't speak in tongues, Jesus didn't speak in tongues, this is the first time anyone received the gift of tongues and the first recipients were twelve Galileans. The metropolitan Jews recognize that all these

guys were from Galilee and from their perspective these were the back country folk, the supposedly uneducated, and yet they are the one's who manifest a genuine miracle of God, high and lofty languages spoken in the native dialects mentioned in vv 9-11 in fulfillment of Isa 28:11-12.

Second, let's look at **The Character of Tongues**. We've worked through the origin now let's look at the character. What are tongues like? Maybe you've heard tongues, maybe you haven't but you can listen to these all over the internet. I had quite a time Wednesday night listening to people talk in tongues and they'd be praying for someone to get tongues and someone would be prompting them by speaking gibberish right in their face to help them get started and every time the whole group went into a frenzy and they'd start dancing or falling into holy laughter and being drunk with the Holy Spirit and rolling all over the place. And they used the name Jesus and the Holy Ghost but this is what is passing for tongues in the modern day, a kind of gibberish, not a known language at all but just kind of this queer phenomenon that seizes people and can take whole groups into its grip. But let's go back and look at the character of tongues in Scripture. We know from Acts 2 that tongues, far from gibberish were known human languages. You have at least 14 languages the apostles spoke, they're all listed there in vv 9ff, v 11 says they each heard in their own tongue. Luke even goes so far as to use the Greek word for dialects in vv 6 and 8 to indicate they even produced the nuances, the tones and inflections of their native languages. That much we know from Acts 2. But some people like to say that what happened in Acts is not what happened in Corinth. That in Acts, yes it's known languages but in Corinth they needed interpreters so it's not human languages. And moreover they are angelic languages and so they say their gibberish is not gibberish but angelic languages, the languages of heaven. To support this they cite 1 Cor 13:1, "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but do not have love, I have become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal." Now obviously they say there are angelic languages and that's what they claim tongues are, angelic languages. 1 Cor 14:2, "For one who speaks in a tongue does not speak to men but to God; for no one understands, but in *his* spirit he speaks mysteries." Here they argue that tongues are not human languages so they have to be interpreted and that's validation that what sounds like gibberish is actually a heavenly language. Finally they cite Mark 16:17, "These signs will accompany those who have believed: in My name they will cast out demons, they will speak with new tongues;" And the argument is see, "They will speak with new tongues" and obviously if they're new they're not human because human languages have been around. What do we say to this? We say that the tongues spoken in Acts are the same tongues spoken in Corinthians, known human languages. How's that you ask? First turn to Acts 19. This is one of those sections in the Book of Acts that Luke did not eyewitness. You can tell in Acts when

Luke was present because he keeps using the pronoun we. We did this and we did that but this is not one of the “we” sections so this had to be related to him by Paul who was the eyewitness. And here’s Paul and he’s run into some strange Jewish believers and in v 6 there’s an outbreak of tongues. “And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them, and they *began* speaking with tongues and prophesying.” And the Greek word used here of tongues is *glossa*, the same word used in Acts 2, Acts 10, Acts 11, everywhere Luke records tongues he uses the same word *glossa*. So what’s the significance of this? It proves that when Paul related this incident of tongues speaking to Luke he related that it was the same thing that happened at Pentecost, they spoke known human languages, there was no different language used to explain a different phenomena because they were the same kind of event, not some gibberish. This has great significance because in 1 Cor 12-14 Paul uses the same vocabulary and by this he intends to convey that what was happening at Corinth, in the valid cases, was the same old Pentecost thing, known human languages. Well you ask, what do we do with these statements in Corinthians? And the answer is, let’s take a closer look at the context. And if you read 1 Cor 13:1 in context, all you have to do is go to the next verse. “If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but do not have love, I have become a noisy gong or a clanging cymbal. If I have *the gift of* prophecy, and know all mysteries and all knowledge; and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but do not have love, I am nothing.” Now, there were plenty of mountains in Asia Minor. Did Paul move any of them? Did any believer move any of them? Clearly not. What do we call this in literature when we talk this way? Hyperbole. Clearly he’s speaking in hyperbole, he’s exaggerating, he’s saying, even if I could move mountains, if I didn’t have love it’d be a waste of time. And so he uses hyperbole, “though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels,” I can’t but if I could, “and had not love,” then it would be just “a clanging cymbal.” Further there’s another problem in v 1 and that has to do with what languages angels speak. Every time we see angels speak, whether it’s Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek, they’re always speaking human languages. There’s not one case in Scripture of an angel speaking any other language than a known human language. What do we do, then, about 14:2? If 13:1 is hyperbole, what do we do about 14:2, that “no man understands,” very simple. In the context he’s talking about the improper way the Corinthians were using the gift. They were using it like the mystery religions of Corinth as a self-serving device. Notice in verse 4, “One who speaks in a tongue edifies himself,” that means without an interpreter. So, Paul is condemning the practice of the local pagan mystery religions, they were confusing ecstatic utterances with biblical tongues. What about Mark 16:17, “you will speak in new tongues.” Simple, there are two Greek words for new, *neos* means “brand new” and the other *kainos* means “new used”. This is *kainos*, all he’s saying is they will speak languages that have been previously known but never studied, just like in Acts 2.

So, as to the character of tongues, all the evidence favors that they were known human languages and not gibberish. In fact, this is what the founder of Pentecostal tongues originally taught, that it had to be a known human language. It was only when linguistic scholars like Eugene Nida of Wycliffe Bible Translators went in, he examined hundreds and hundreds of hours of tape recordings as one the world's foremost linguistics and he says without a doubt this is not a language pattern, it's alliteration and repetition of certain vowels and consonants in a certain sequence but it is not a language. So, of course, then the Pentecostals went in and shifted their doctrine so that now they affirm that *glossa* can be gibberish but the gibberish is some angelic language. In other words, if the evidence isn't there they just shift their interpretation of the Bible to fit their theory, that's what we call Accommodation. Accommodating the Bible to fit your presupposed view. It's playing fast and loose with the text.

One more note on the character of tongues and that deals with who received it. Not all believers speak in tongues. On the day of Pentecost you see it happen to 12 men. And not once do you ever see Peter speak in tongues again. He witnesses tongues but there's no mention he did it again. Lots of people become believers in the Book of Acts and yet, only on two other occasions, maybe three do you see any tongues speaking. Those are in Acts 10 and 19, and probably Acts 8, when God was bringing a new group into the Church. In Acts 8 you have the Samaritans, in Acts 10 the Gentiles and in Acts 19 the disciples of John the Baptist. Not to mention the fact that Paul says all believers are baptized in the Holy Spirit (1 Cor 12:13) but not all believers get tongues. He makes the point five times; 1 Cor 12:10; 12:30; 14:5; 14:13 and 14:27. Not all believers speak in tongues but all are baptized by the Holy Spirit, so that separates tongues from baptism. Okay, so that deals with the character of tongues, we said all the evidence favors that the tongues in Acts and Corinthians and Mark all refer to known human languages and that not all believers receive tongues but all do receive the baptism of the Spirit and thus most of the modern tongues phenomena does not fit the biblical text. So much for the origin and the character, let's turn to something else, something very important.

The Purpose of Tongues. This is the third point. What were they given for? Staying in 1 Cor 14. We said that in Isa 28 the purpose of tongues was to speak to the unbelieving nation of Israel in baby talk, "through stammering lips and a foreign tongue I will speak to this people" clearly Israel. And what was going on back there in Isaiah's day is they were laughing at Isaiah's ministry. Isaiah came into the bar and the national leadership were hammered, drunk as all get out, laying around in their filthy vomit and so when Isaiah comes in with "line on line, precept on precept, order on order" that was the baby talk of the day, that's how you taught a little baby and obviously Isaiah knew they were

little babies, but they were so prideful in all their drunken glory that it made them mad, what are you bringing us this baby talk, we're not babies." And this really got under God's skin and he said, "Fine, you don't want baby talk doctrine then how 'bout I give you some more baby talk, this time from the Gentiles and we'll see how you like that." It's a warning of impending judgment. "Get with it spiritually Israel." And this is why in Acts 2 when that baby talk occurred it wasn't a coherent gospel message, it was more or less short sentences, little tidbits of God's might works through Jesus Christ, so that Peter had to get up and give the explanation and a complete gospel presentation. So, with that background look at v 20. What's the context, "Do not be children in your thinking," see the same context of Isaiah 28, childishness, immaturity and he goes on, "in your thinking be mature. In the Law it is written," and Paul quotes Isa 28:11, an exact citation from a Jewish context. Most of your translations will have different lettering there to indicate that's a quote from the OT. And Paul quotes Isaiah 28 right out of the Old Testament. And it's applied the exact same way Isaiah applied it, as baby talk to Jews. Now in verses 22 and 23 Paul says something that apparently conflicts. I want you to look carefully at your translation. Read carefully with me as we look at this because I want you to feel the tension before we resolve it. "So then tongues are for a sign, not to those who believe but to unbelievers; but prophecy *is for a sign*, not to unbelievers but to those who believe.

²³Therefore if the whole church assembles together and all speak in tongues, and ungifted men or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are mad?" Now, you can't read those two verses carefully without seeing an apparent contradiction. In verse 22 tongues are for who? Unbelievers. But in verse 23 we're told not to use tongues around unbelievers because you'll confuse them. How do you get those two together? Obviously there's an apparent conflict. Well, it's very easy, we go back to the original languages and examine the text a little bit more carefully. We notice, "tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but them that believe not." The word is a Greek noun that means unbeliever, plus the article. What he is saying in verse 22 is he's interpreting Isaiah for us; he's just cited Isaiah in verse 21, now he says, "therefore tongues are for a sign, not to the believers but to the unbeliever," a particular group of unbelievers, "the unbelievers," the unbelievers par excellence, who would be "the unbelievers?" The ones that Isaiah 28 mentions; and who are the ones that Isaiah 28 mentions? The Jewish people who had rejected Isaiah's ministry, that's who. And so who are "the unbelievers" in verse 22? They are simply the nation Israel as it existed in that day, "the Jewish unbeliever." But now in verse 23 an entirely different group of people are in view. "Therefore if the whole church assembles together and all speak in tongues, and ungifted men or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are mad?" no article there, just plain unbelievers, signaling a different group. So, these are Gentile unbelievers in v 23 while the unbelievers in v 22 are Jewish unbelievers. That's the only interpretation you can come up with that's going to avoid the conflict of

verse 22 and 23 and as an excellent rational thinker as Paul is, he doesn't deliberately write illogical literature. So verses 22 and 23 are speaking of two different groups and it simply fortifies our claim, not weakens it, fortifies our claim that tongues were originally given for the purpose of witnessing to Jewish unbelievers.

Alright, we've looked at the origin of tongues, the character and the purpose, now we come to the fourth point, **The End of Tongues**. "Oh," you say, "it can't be, Paul said 'don't forbid speaking in tongues'" and that he of all people was glad he spoke in tongues. But has the NT phenomenon called tongues ceased? Turn to Hebrews 2:3-4. Hebrews was written late in the NT period, AD67 and by this time the nation of Israel had been witnessed to, witnessed to, witnessed to and witnessed to until they were almost at the time of judgment, AD70. And here in the book of Hebrews, whoever wrote it, the epistle of Hebrews is addressed to the second generation group of Jews. If a Jew was say 30 years old in 30 AD then how old would he be now? He'd be almost 70 and so by that time there would be newer, younger people that had become Christians. So the epistle to the Hebrews was written for that second generation of Jewish believers. Now notice what the author of Hebrews says in vv 3-4, "how will we escape if we neglect so great a salvation? After it was at the first spoken through the Lord, it was confirmed to us by those who heard, ⁴God also testifying with them, both by signs and wonders and by various miracles and by gifts of the Holy Spirit according to His own will." The main verb is there in verse 3, "it was confirmed" and that's an aorist tense, that's a past completed action, it's not being confirmed, "it was confirmed." And notice that the author of Hebrews is including himself there as a recipient of the confirmation. But who confirmed it? Not the author of Hebrews but "those who heard." He deliberately excludes himself because he did not hear but those who did hear confirmed it to him and other second generation believers. Continuing v 4, "God also testifying with them," that first generation, "both by signs and wonders and by various miracles..." The point is that by the second generation those signs and gifts had already begun to fade out and the generation of the author of Hebrews did not see them, they did not witness them but they were confirmed to have taken place by those who did. And the year here is 67AD, so he's looking back and he's saying that was the glorious age when signs and miracles were happening but that's already passed. If you want to know who did those signs and miracles then there are two passages, Mark 16:14ff and 2 Cor 12:12. Mark 16:9-20 is the debated portion of Mark, the argument is whether these verses are original or not. There are four different endings in the Greek manuscripts but either way there's nothing here out of kilter with the rest of Scripture. Now, people argue here that all believers will manifest miraculous things like tongues and snake handling. "These signs will accompany those who have believed;" and then he goes on to spell out the miraculous.

But the verb “believed” is an aorist passive, another past tense. What Jesus is saying is that signs would accompany those who had already believed; and the sense is that miracles would follow them around. Wherever they went signs would follow with them. In other words you have these believers before Pentecost, we’d call them OT saints, they were already justified by faith and then they crossed over at Pentecost and received the Spirit. And this plays out as you trace the miracles through the Book of Acts. Almost all the signs and miracles are done by the apostles not their converts. So, Acts records the fulfillment of Mark 16. Time and again you see the apostles doing signs and miracles. So Mark 16 is the general statement. The particular statement is in 2 Cor 12:12. Here’s we get confirmation that this is the right interpretation of Mark 16. And Paul says, “The signs of a true apostle were performed among you with all perseverance, by signs and wonders and miracles.” Now, if all believers do signs and miracles then all believers are apostles. And further that would mean that they were not a sign of a true apostle. So, only apostles did signs, wonders and miracles, they were the ID badge of apostles so others knew they were authenticated by God as His messengers. So, either Mark 16 was fulfilled by the apostles in Acts or Mark 16 is a lie and contradicts 2 Cor 12. But the main point is that when you couple these passages with Heb 2:3-4 you realize signs and wonders were already fading out by 6AD. The author of Hebrews says he didn’t see these things.

Second passage that shows the end of tongues is 1 Cor 13:8, this is a controversial passage, many charismatic types will disagree with this, I’m not going to push this text but I think it plays in the equation and it certainly spells an end of tongues. “Love never fails; but if *there are gifts of prophecy*, they will be done away; if *there are tongues*, they will cease; if *there is knowledge*, it will be done away.” Notice three things are mentioned, three of the sign gifts of the early church: prophecy, that was speaking prophesies; tongues, that short tidbits of praising God; and knowledge, and that is giving new doctrine; three gifts. Let’s start with some observations, both prophecy and knowledge “will be done away”, they both use the same verb *katargeo* and it’s a passive voice. That is someone or something from the outside will do away with them. Obviously it’s God. Paul’s saying God is going to do away with prophecy and knowledge. Now, sandwiched in between these is tongues, known human languages, but it doesn’t say they will be done away, it says “they will cease”, and that’s the Greek verb *pauo*, it means “to stop” but it’s a middle voice, not the passive like you might expect, and the middle means they will stop of themselves. God’s not going to stop them they’re just going to stop.

Now how’s that? Well, it’s simple, God gave the gift to certain people in the 1st century to fulfill their purpose in that first generation of unbelieving Israel and when those people died the gift died. “Okay fine but can we say more? Can we get anymore out of these verses?” Well, there’s indication here that they will cease before prophecy and knowledge. V 9 goes on to treat prophecy and knowledge but notice tongues has dropped

out of the picture. “For we know in part and we prophesy in part; but when the perfect comes, the partial will be done away,” etc...etc...Now, the debate is about “the perfect”. What’s the perfect? What’s interesting is that “perfect” is in the neuter so it can’t be Christ, Christ is masculine. And obviously what he means by *teleios* is maturity here in contrast to childhood and the two gifts prophecy and knowledge are the revelatory gifts used to write Scripture. So I take it this is the completion of the canon but I’m not going to prove that now. What I want you to see is that tongues are not the issue anymore. Tongues don’t end when the perfect comes. Why? Because they cease before that. They cease before prophecy and knowledge. They cease of their own accord and more precisely, when that first generation of Christians that had the gift died. Also notice the abiding character of love, that love will remain, v 13, that’s the key point, that these others things are temporary but not love. So, all lines of evidence indicate that tongues were for that first generation of unbelieving Israel to fulfill Isa 28 and they served primarily as a sign to warn Israel of impending judgment. So, I fully affirm what Paul said when he said, “do not forbid speaking in tongues” because in his time, in his day, at that time they were a legitimate instrument of God, necessary in many cases for the salvation of the Jew. But when the judgment came on Jerusalem in AD70 when Jerusalem was razed to the ground, when by AD73 no organized Jewish sect remained because Rome had completely dismantled Jewish opposition in the land they ceased. Jesus’ prayer delayed Israel’s judgment but now it had fallen and with it tongues ceased. So, logically when the purpose for tongues ceased the tongues also ceased. That’s the logic of the argument. You don’t need a sign if the fulfillment has already happened. And clearly from Heb 2 we see signs and wonders were dying out in the mid 60’sAD. How then, you ask, do you explain the modern tongues phenomena? To answer this question let’s conclude with a history of tongues.

What so-called occurrences do we find in **Church History**? There’s no question they occurred in Acts and at Corinth but that was during the first 30 years of Church history. The question is have they legitimately occurred after? The history of tongues is sketchy. There’s no continual witness. The first mention of tongues in Church History is by Montanus the Heretic in 150AD. Montanus was “a man of extravagant opinion and ascetic rigor” (10:18). Eusebius, a fourth-century historian, tells us that he was possessed of a spirit which made him rave in a kind of ecstatic trance and babble in a jargon similar to what is called tongues in our day. He claimed to be a prophet and, together with two prophetesses named Maximilla and Priscilla, who had deserted their husbands to follow him, he began his “ministry” in the region of Phrygia. He claimed for himself and his two prophetesses the supernatural powers and gifts of the apostles and prophets. His work was characterized by ecstasies and utterances which added to the Holy Scriptures. He

claimed that “as the writings of Paul superseded those of Moses; so his ecstasies and utterances were to supersede those of Paul” (10:18). So, Montanus claimed to be writing Scripture. So much for him. We jump to the 1300’s, A.T. Schofield, M.D., in his book *Christian Sanity* says, “In 1374 there was a dreadful religious dancing mania which began in Aix. There were hundreds of dancing men and women screaming and foaming at the mouth, and all this coupled with wonderful visions of Christ and the Saints. There were many cases of recovery of sight to the blind. This mania spread all over that part of Germany like wild fire, and yet there can be no doubt that multitudes carried away by it were earnest and true Christians.” His point is to show the disorderliness of these practices and as such cannot be of the Spirit of God. Nothing about it during the Reformation when you had a return to the Scriptures. Then, “In 1707 and following years London was disturbed by a noisy group of French and English fanatics, who combined the highest religious pretensions and the most Scriptural language with prophecies, speaking in tongues which were accompanied by all sorts of contortions and by many immoralities.” Again, the point is that these groups are often plagued by immoral practices indicating demonic activity. Alright, we’ve looked at the post-apostolic period, the middle Ages and post-reformation, now we come to the modern tongues movement. “The movement most like the Pentecostalism of this century was led by Edward Irving. When this Scotsman left the Presbyterian Church, many went with him, and began a church of their own to “demonstrate a higher style of Christianity”. For a time his following was large; but when meetings became very disorderly, people were repelled...Prominent Irvingites claims are certainly in line with those we shall find in Pentecostalism; harmony of practice with the primitive church, a work greater than the reformation, restoration of the gifts in these last days, this restoration a “warning cry” to prepare for the second coming, prophecy in interpretation of Scripture. Irving himself held “the idea that disease was a sin, and that no man with faith in the Lord ought to be overpowered by it”. The charismatic movement of today has it’s roots in the so-called Irvingite Movement. So I want to read from a Mr Robert Baxter, one of Irving's disciples, he’s a first-hand witness and participant in these activities, so this is no late-comer. This is a person in the movement. “In the midst of a prayer-meeting for the first time I was myself seized upon by the power, and in much struggling against it was made to cry out (in a loud and commanding voice) and myself give forth a confession of sin, a prophecy that the messengers of the Lord would go forth and publish to the ends...the near coming of the Lord Jesus.” Did you hear about being seized and being made to cry out? He didn’t have control, it just took him over. That’s not the tongues of the Bible because the tongues speaker could always control it. They were commanded to control it if no one was there to interpret. So what’s being described is anti-biblical. He goes on, “By a constraint I cannot describe, I was made to speak, at the same time shrinking from

utterance. The utterance was a prayer that the Lord would bestow on me the gifts of His Spirit, the gift of miracles, the gifts of healing, of prophecy, of tongues, and that he would open my mouth to declare His glory. This prayer was forced from me by the constraint of the power which acted upon me: and the utterance was so loud that I put my handkerchief to my mouth to stop the sound that I might not alarm the house. When I had reached the last word the power died off me, and left me filled with amazement, and with a strong conviction, "This is the Spirit of God." Now, listen, as this man reflected years later on this experience. "I must testify that looking back upon all that is past (now I know it is of the devil) whenever the power rested on me, I seemed to have joy and peace in the Holy Ghost, and I cannot even now, by feeling alone, discern that it was not really such!" If he'd been studying the Scriptures he would have known. Now, that's an "eye witness account" of the beginnings of Pentecostalism from one who was obviously deeply involved. Alright, now, from the Irvingite beginnings, the movement spread worldwide. "Modern Pentecostalism is traced to a sort of Bible school in Topeka, Kansas, where, on January 1st, 1901, Mrs. LaBerge, after studying the baptism in the Holy Ghost and praying much in an upper room, asked that hands might be laid upon her head that she might "receive the gift of the Holy Ghost". She says, "It was as hands were laid upon my head that the Holy Spirit fell upon me and I began to speak in tongues, glorifying God. I talked several languages, and it was clearly manifest when a new dialect was spoken." Again, here's another one taken over by the tongues. Clearly anti-biblical. "Pastor R.E. McAlister, former General Secretary-Treasurer of the Pentecostal Assemblies of Canada, went all the way to Los Angeles to "seek the baptism", and returned to spread the new doctrine. Soon the movement reached London, England, where Mrs. Catherine S. Price was the first to receive "the Pentecostal experience." In 1907 a Pentecostal revival swept Scotland. From London it spread to Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Russia and Germany. Of the last it could be said in 1912 that "the whole country is honeycombed with Pentecostal missions and assemblies." Pentecostalism also spread to the East in China and India; to the South, in Central and South America; to Egypt, Liberia, Central and South Africa; to New Zealand and Australia. Thus it became a world fellowship within twenty-five years (81:16-18)." So, it's all over the world now. And I want you to listen now as tongues has become ecumenical and remember in the latter days there's going to be a one world ecumenical religion and tongues is a tie. The neo-charismatic movement differs from the mainline old fashioned Pentecostal movement in that it's spilling over into every denomination. And you have people from different denominations getting together in the name of unity about this common experience. You have Protestants and you have Catholics who appear to be unified, who appear to have healed the breach made by Martin Luther and John Calvin over matters of truth and doctrine of Scripture but now in the name of experience we regain the lost unity. Says

one of the great Catholic scholars who has studied the phenomena from the Catholic side of the fence, Edward O'Conner of Notre Dame, (quote): "Catholics who have accepted Pentecostal spirituality have found it fully in harmony with their traditional faith and life. "Moreover," says Father O'Conner, "the doctrine that is developing in the Pentecostal churches today seems to be going through stages very similar to those which occurred in the early Middle Ages when classical doctrine was taking shape." Now if Father's O'Conner's observation is correct and we indeed see the rise of classical doctrine of the Middle Ages now in Pentecostal circles what he is admitted is that we see a synthesis; classical doctrine was a synthesis of Greek Aristotelian philosophy with the Scriptures and what he's saying is that in the Pentecostal movement we're seeing a synthesis of human viewpoint and divine viewpoint; this time the human viewpoint is not the human viewpoint of the Greek philosopher Aristotle; this time the human viewpoint is the human viewpoint of the modern existentialist, where there's no such thing as absolutes, everything is relative and it depends on a crisis moment in the present.

So in conclusion to the doctrine of tongues, it is my frank confession that tongues were known human languages that operated during the first 40 years of the church, that signs and wonders were operative through the apostles primarily for that nation of Israel that was under impending judgment for rejecting the Messiahship of Jesus. What was being condemned at Corinth and which Paul would condemn today is this fraudulent pagan thing which I fully believe has always been and will always be demonic activity or psychologically induced phenomena that is not true languages but ecstatic utterances and is a demonic attempt to supplant the word of God with an experience that will stunt true spiritual growth. Now, as always I'm open to questions on this and you have every opportunity to write your question and put it in the little church in the back of the church.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2008