

THE  
BIBLE

VERSUS

The

Tongues  
Theory

Gould  
BL  
54  
N4  
1946x

B. F. NEELY

GOULD LIBRARY  
EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE

*Rev. Gault*

*The Bible*  
*versus*  
*The Tongues Theory*

---

*Benjamin Franklin*  
*B. F. Neely*



**REVISED EDITION**

Printed in U. S. A.  
1946

**BEACON HILL PRESS**  
2923 Troost Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION .....	5
AUTHOR'S NOTE .....	7
AUTHOR'S APOLOGY .....	9
I. BRIEF HISTORY OF TONGUES .....	11
II. HOLY GHOST BAPTISM SIMULTANEOUS WITH SANCTIFICATION .....	15
III. PENTECOST AND SANCTIFICATION INSEPARABLE...	20
IV. PENTECOST AND SANCTIFICATION INSEPARABLE— Continued .....	23
V. PENTECOST AND CONSECRATION.....	27
VI. BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST ACCOMPLISHES SANCTIFICATION .....	31
VII. THE EFFECT OF SANCTIFICATION AND THE EFFECT OF THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST IDENTI- CAL .....	34
VIII. THE TONGUES THEORY AND CHRISTIAN PERFEC- TION .....	38
IX. BIBLE EVIDENCE OF PENTECOST.....	41
X. HOW DOES ONE KNOW WHEN HE HAS THE HOLY GHOST? .....	50
XI. THE SOURCE OF MODERN TONGUES.....	54
XII. NOT ALL THAT IS MYSTERIOUS IS DIVINE.....	61
XIII. SOME BIBLE TEACHING ON TONGUES.....	68



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2015

## INTRODUCTION

Years ago when the religious movement which is distinguished by its adherents speaking in "unknown tongues" broke out in this country, it drew a large following. While many churches and religious bodies have contributed to the ranks of "The Apostolics," the "Pentecostals" and other branches of the "unknown tongues" movement, by far the greatest relative contribution has been made by the Holiness Movement.

It should not, therefore, be thought strange that men who have given their very lives for the spreading of Scriptural Holiness, as the author of this booklet has done, should be stirred to speak and write to warn and instruct those whose religious tranquility and usefulness have been menaced by the outbreak of this unscriptural and very hurtful latter day heresy.

Brother Neely has been an earnest student of the Bible and of religious phenomena for twenty-five years. He is a careful student, a peerless reasoner and a soundly spiritual man. He is, therefore, well qualified to speak and write on the subject in hand. About fifteen years ago when the "unknown tongues" movement was at the zenith of its power in this country, Brother Neeley brought out his little book, "The Bible Versus the Tongues Theory." The book was highly commended by discriminating readers both in the laity and the ministry and the entire edition was soon sold out. But the arguments of this book are just as true and applicable today as they were in the day when they were written and the scarcity of literature on the subject fully justifies the publication of this new and larger edition.

The nature of the subject is such, and the temper of the people who believe in the "unknown tongues" doctrine is such that personal argument is usually inadvisable. But this book will do a great service for those into whose hands it may be placed. The author's sanity and fairness will commend themselves to all, and the argument presented is so complete and so unanswerable that many are certain to find the light which they need. This book is worthy of a very wide circulation and my earnest prayer is that it may reach and bless its thousands of readers.

JAMES B. CHAPMAN

## AUTHOR'S NOTE

The author has not acted on the impulse of the moment in calling in question the doctrines of the present Tongues movement. Neither has he failed to give the Tongues people a hearing. When he first heard that there were people claiming the gift of tongues, he at once became interested and began to investigate the doctrines of the movement, not doubting for one moment the possibility of the impartation of such a gift. But upon investigation he became thoroughly convinced that it was wrong in its doctrines. About that time there were Tongues meetings being conducted in Memphis, Tenn., and the writer had some friends there who were interested in the subject and they sent him what they thought to be a certain verse in the Book of Isaiah written in four languages by a Tongues interpreter under the direction of the Holy Ghost. Three of them were named, one of which was Greek, but there was not a single Greek letter in the whole conglomeration of crooked marks. The other two the writer had not studied, but was forced to judge them by the one he had studied.

But remembering how the holiness people had been misunderstood, misjudged and misrepresented, he still declined passing judgment as a whole until further investigation. Then he went to Memphis to see and hear for himself. He heard the sermons, went home with the preacher, who was a lawyer, and conversed with him on their doctrines, and with the people on their experiences; and that, with other investigation, put a conviction on him that it was a very dangerous heresy, and that it ought to be refuted from a scriptural standpoint; and all subsequent investigations of the doctrines and observations of the movement have increased that conviction. Hence the book is before you.



## AUTHOR'S APOLOGY

I have two good reasons for publishing the fourth edition of "The Bible Versus the Tongues Theory."

1st. A goodly number of very fine people have been saved from the tongues movement by perusing the contents of this little volume. Some of whom are filling prominent pulpits. And we have good reasons to believe that hundreds have been kept out of the throes of that heresy by this scriptural presentation of the subject.

2nd. All of the books of the other three editions are sold and the people want more. In other words we have done good by putting the booklet into circulation, and have a chance to do more by keeping it on the go.

B. F. N.



## CHAPTER I

### BRIEF HISTORY OF TONGUES

It is possible that many people think that the present "Tongues Movement" is the first to claim the tongues as a divine bestowed gift since the days of the Apostles. But such is not the case. However, the present Tongues movement, with its peculiar doctrines, in all probability, is now making its first campaign.

Investigation will reveal that all along through the years, there have been at different times manifestations of what was claimed to be the restoration of the Apostolic gift of tongues.

Irenaeus, who lived in the second century, stated that there were brethren in his time that "spake in all kinds of tongues, through the Spirit." It seems that Irenaeus thought that this was a continuation of the Apostolic gifts. In the fourth century there was a manifestation of what was claimed to be tongues, which one of the Christian fathers condemns as an evil. We here give the quotation: "The tone in which Chrysostom speaks of them is that of one who feels the whole subject to be obscure—symptoms of what was then looked on as an evil, showed themselves in the fourth century at Constantinople, wild, inarticulate cries, words, passionate but of little meaning, almost convulsive gestures—and were met by Chrysostom with the sternest possible reproof." (Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, vol. iv, p. 3309.)

About A. D. 1830 there was a celebrated Presbyterian clergyman, Rev. Edward Irving, who became the leader

of a "so-called unknown tongues movement," in England. Irving was expelled from his church for heresy, and as a result of his ministry and deposition, many of his congregation also came out of the church with him, and so were called Irvingites. About the time of the death of Irving, which occurred in 1834, the movement took organic form and took the name of Catholic Apostolic Church. They claimed the restoration of the Apostolic gifts and claimed to speak in unknown tongues. "To those who were without, on the other hand, they seemed but the unintelligible gibberish, the yells and groans of mad men. Sometimes it was asserted that fragments of known languages, Spanish, Italian, Greek, Hebrew, were mingled together in the utterances of those who spake in the power." "Sometimes it was the jargon of mere sounds." (Smith's Bible Dictionary, vol. iv, p. 3311, and Universal Cyclopedia, vol. iv., p. 400.)

On April 6, 1830, at Manchester in the State of New York, the "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints," (Mormons) was organized with about thirty members, and in the printed creed given to them by the founder, Joseph Smith, the following statement is found: "We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelations, visions, healings, interpretations of tongues, etc." One of the strongest arguments that the Mormons make to defend their doctrines is based on the miraculous gifts divinely bestowed as they claim, and one of the most important is the gift of tongues.

The present Tongues movement is of very recent origin and its positions diversified. The Tongues people are divided into many factions, each claiming to be the true "Apostolic" people, and that the others are either heretical

or wilful deceivers, claiming by way of defense against the claims of each other that the Devil can give the tongues also, and further that after the gift is divinely bestowed, the recipient thereof may fall from grace and retain the tongues.

One faction of them teaches that entire sanctification is comprehended in regeneration, and that the Pentecostal baptism with the Holy Ghost is a second blessing, and only imparts power and tongues, etc. (Pentecostal Testimony No. 6, which is a Tongues periodical published in Chicago by Wm. H. Durham.) But the following are the distinguishing teachings of the Movement's representative people, and is that for which it stands, and with which, as a distinct movement, it stands or falls, to-wit:

1. That the work and experience of entire sanctification precedes the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

2. That entire sanctification is separate from, and independent of the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

3. That only those who are sanctified wholly by a second definite work of grace, subsequent to regeneration, are eligible to the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

4. That speaking in unknown tongues is the Bible evidence of the Pentecostal baptism.

5. That none except those who speak in unknown tongues have the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

In the following chapters we propose to prove by the Scriptures the following propositions:

- 1st. That the experience of entire sanctification and the baptism with the Holy Ghost are simultaneous.

- 2nd. That sanctification is not separate from, but depends upon the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

3rd. That those who are sanctified wholly do not need a baptism with the Holy Ghost, since they are already in possession of their Pentecost.

4th. That speaking in unknown tongues is not the Bible evidence of Pentecost.

5th. That not all who receive the baptism with the Holy Ghost speak in unknown tongues.

## CHAPTER II

### HOLY GHOST BAPTISM SIMULTANEOUS WITH SANCTIFICATION

The Tongues Theory teaches that heart purity is effected by the act of sanctification, precedent to, separate from, and independent of the baptism with the Holy Ghost, thus separating the work and experience of entire sanctification from the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

But the Bible, to the contrary, teaches that sanctification is simultaneous with the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and is effected by it, and that heart purity is the blessed result. We take the position, on scriptural authority, that the teaching that heart purity or entire sanctification is effected independent of Holy Ghost baptism, forever precludes the necessity or even the possibility of such a baptism from the fact that in heart purity or sanctification the ultimate of the demands of God, so far as an epochal experience is concerned, is fully reached. Nothing beyond heart purity, and its concomitants is included in the commandment. "Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." I Tim. 1:5.

The word "end" in this passage is defined by Webster thus, "The point beyond which no progression can be made. The ultimate point or thing at which one aims or directs his views." It is from the Greek word, "*telos*," and is defined by Hinds and Noble's Greek Dictionary as "an end accomplished; the completion or fulfillment of anything;" exactly corroborating Mr. Webster.

So, according to the above authority, when one reaches heart purity he fulfills the commandment, or has

the end aimed at by the commandment accomplished in him, and is at "the point beyond which no progression can be made" for "Charity out of a pure heart is the end of the commandment." Therefore if Holy Ghost baptism does not, at least, come simultaneously with purity of heart, then our position is sustained, to-wit, its necessity and possibility are forever precluded.

The question may arise, does the experience of heart purity preclude growth in grace? No, the Bible teaches that although there is beautiful progress in the sanctified life, yet there is no point or experience beyond it to be reached in this life. In other words, the baptism with the Holy Ghost is commanded and the end aimed at by the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, therefore whosoever has heart purity has received the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

The same position is sustained by the following: When Jesus was asked by the lawyer, "Which is the great commandment in the law?" He answered, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind—the second is like unto it, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Matt. 22: 36-40.

Sanctification "is the act of God's grace by which the affections of men are purified and alienated from sin and the world and exalted to a *supreme love to God*." Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. The law demands holiness: "For I am the Lord your God: ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy; for I am holy." Lev. 11: 55. And the prophets dreamed of it, exulted in it, and foretold it, but it is all fulfilled in "Thou shalt love the

Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul and mind, and thy neighbour as thyself."

It was the highest aim of all law and the highest ideal of all prophecy. When Moses remained with God on Mount Sinai for forty days and received the law, no higher ambition ever possessed him, as the result of that law, than that his people should love the Lord with all the heart.

When Isaiah got a vision of God and cried out, "I am undone, for I am a man of unclean lips, for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts," he could have no higher aspiration than that all things contrary to love be taken out of him, for in answer to his cries we read, "For this hath touched thy lips, and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged," then we hear him say, "Here am I, send me," and the Lord said, "Go." Isa. 6:5-9. When Joel took up the prophetic telescope and looked across the stretch of more than eight hundred years into the New Testament dispensation, and foretold the wonderful Pentecostal revival which was ushered in by the pouring out of the Holy Ghost in baptismal power and glory, he saw that all things requisite to measuring up to the highest thought of God for His people, culminated in loving God with all the heart, and one's neighbor as himself, for "*on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*" So the law did not go beyond it, neither did the prophets, Jesus being taken as authority. Therefore whatsoever enables one to love God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself, meets every demand of divine law, and fulfills all prophecy concerning Christian experience, and forever precludes

all possibility of a foundation for another experience beyond it, based on law or prophecy.

Then let us study the Bible and see how this blessed state is obtained. "The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul." Deut. 30:6. Circumcision according to law which was "outward in the flesh" was typical, and was not circumcision in reality; but the circumcision in the above text is that of prophecy, and is the "circumcision of the heart in [or by] the spirit, whose praise is not of men but of God." Rom. 2:29. Then heart circumcision effects that state in which one loves God with all the heart, according to the clear and unmistakable statement of the Word.

Now let us study a fulfillment of said prophecy. Turn to Col. 2:10-12, "Ye are complete in him, in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ, buried with him in baptism wherein also ye are raised with him through the faith of the operation of God."

Now let us consider a few things that are stated in this passage. First, What was the condition of the Colossians? They were complete, perfect in Christ. "Ye are complete in him." Second, What constituted their completeness? The putting off of the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of God. Col. 2:11, and 3:9, 10. Third, By what means is the body of sin put off? By circumcision made without hands. Verse 11.

What is the active agent which effected this circumcision made without hands? Baptism. "Buried with him

in baptism." Verse 11. Was it water baptism? No, for water baptism does not put away the filth of the flesh. I Peter 3:20, 21, And in this baptism they put off the body of the sins of the flesh. What baptism was it? It was the Holy Ghost baptism, "for by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body [or body oneness]." I Cor. 12:13; Matt. 3:12. And the facts in the case all go to show that it was as we have stated, for they were complete in Him.

So to sum it all up, we have this: (a) To love God with all the heart and one's neighbor as himself fulfills all law and prophecy concerning Christian experience. (b) Circumcision enables one to thus love God with all the heart. (c) Circumcision puts off the body of sin. (d) This circumcision was effected by Holy Ghost baptism. (e) And resulted in the completion or perfection of the Colossians, which necessarily, by all the force of logic, common sense and honesty, implies that if "Tongues" were necessary in order to have completeness in Christ they had it; and if they had it, the conclusion is inevitable that they received it at the same time that they got rid of the body of sin, or were sanctified wholly; and if they did not get it then, "Tongues" is not inseparable from Holy Ghost baptism, and further, if they did not get "Tongues," then they did not need it, for they were complete without it.

## CHAPTER III

### PENTECOST AND SANCTIFICATION INSEPARABLE

The Tongues people teach that sanctification and the baptism with the Holy Ghost are separate and distinct; that the former precedes the latter. But the Scripture teaches, to the contrary, that the baptism with the Holy Ghost and entire sanctification are just as inseparable as faith and the new birth, and faith and the new birth are so inseparable that the Apostle declares that "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." I John 5:1. Indeed the state of entire sanctification is effected by the baptism with the Holy Ghost, that is Holy Ghost baptism is the means that Jesus uses in effecting sanctification; therefore it is impossible to be sanctified, wholly independent of the blessed baptism. "That the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." Rom. 15:16. "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." II Thess. 2:13. "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God, through sanctification of the Spirit." I Peter 1:2.

In the three passages above, the inspired writers declared that the Holy Ghost sanctifies; but we are reminded that the Tongues theory teaches that the Holy Ghost bears witness to sanctification, but that Holy Ghost baptism is not included. The record says, however, that they are sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Now let us see. We have already found that in sanctification the Holy Ghost is included, that is, *that men are sanctified by the Holy Ghost.*

We will now study the baptism with the Holy Ghost, to see if sanctification is included, that is, if men are sanctified by the baptism with the Holy Ghost. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and fire, whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor." Matt. 3:12. A thorough purging in connection with Holy Ghost baptism. What could He mean by His floor? "Know ye not that ye are the temples of God and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" I Cor. 3:16. "As God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them and I will be their God and they shall be my people." II Cor. 2:16. "But ye know him, for he dwelleth with you and shall be in you." John 14:17. By the phrase, "His floor," He evidently means His dwelling place, which was in them. What did He mean by the term, "purge," in connection with Holy Ghost baptism? He meant He would sanctify them, for purge means to sanctify, in proof of which, see Heb. 9:13-14, "For if the blood of bulls and goats and ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ purge your consciences." We note that the last statement in this passage depends on the first one for the meaning of the special emphasis placed upon it, by the phrase, "how much more." What does He mean by "how much more"? The thought is, if one could be sanctified to the extent of purification through the types and shadows of ceremonial cleansing, under the law, much more can he be purged by the precious blood of Christ under the gospel. So the phrase, "to purge your conscience," is used in this passage to represent all that was meant by the words, "Sanctify to purifying of the flesh." It is used interchangeably therewith. Therefore, when John spoke of

the Holy Spirit in baptismal function being poured out on them, and thoroughly purging or sanctifying them, he struck the Tongues theory a death-dealing blow.

How is this purging (or sanctifying) to be effected? By the baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire. And to prove that we are not misconstruing the teaching of John, in Matt. 3:11, 12, hear the Saviour on the same subject. "If ye love me keep my commandments, and I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, and he shall abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth." John 14:15, 16. For the recorded fulfillment of His promise to pray for them, read St. John 17:9-17, "I pray for them, I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine, sanctify them through thy truth."

The reason we hold that the above is the fulfillment of His promise to pray that the disciples might have the Holy Ghost, is from the fact that the Holy Ghost sanctifies. Rom. 15:16, "being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." Since He had promised to pray for them to have the Holy Ghost, and John had already taught them that purging (which we have proven to be synonymous with sanctification), came in connection with Holy Ghost baptism, He just prayed that they might be sanctified, which was another way of stating the same thing. To illustrate: If the only legal way to inflict capital punishment were by hanging, and a jury should sentence a criminal to be legally killed, it would imply that he was to be hanged. So when Jesus prayed for His disciples to be sanctified, it implied that they were to have the Holy Ghost and indicated further that sanctification was the primary, and most important item in the office work of the pentecostal baptism.

## CHAPTER IV

### PENTECOST AND SANCTIFICATION INSEPARABLE

(Continued)

When the Holy Ghost (II Pet. 1:2) through the prophet Malachi foretold the first coming of Christ, and ushering in of the Pentecostal dispensation, he made use of a statement which gives the Tongues theory a withering blow, in death-dealing power. We only ask that the reader consider it in connection with the prophecy of the Baptist concerning the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and note how beautifully they harmonize. "For he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap; and he shall sit as a refiner, and purifier of silver, and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver." Mal. 3:3. John the Baptist said, "I indeed baptize you with water, but there cometh one after me that is mightier than I, He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire; whose fan is in his hand and he will thoroughly purge his floor." Matt. 3:11. Now, according to the above scriptures, they are purified by fire, purged like gold and silver. The pronoun, "he," in Malachi 3:3 refers to Christ, "*he* shall sit—*he* shall purify—*he* shall purge." Also the pronouns, "he," "whose," and "his," in Matt. 3:11, 12 refer to Christ; "*he* shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire, *he shall* thoroughly purge *his* floor." Now in both passages we note the fact that it is Jesus that does the purifying and also in both cases it is done by fire; but in the latter instance the Holy Ghost is mentioned, "Holy Ghost and fire." Fire normally inheres in the Holy Ghost; that is, inseparable from Him, "For our God is a consuming fire." Heb. 12:29. Therefore when one re-

ceives the baptism with the Holy Ghost, he receives the baptism with fire, and when he receives the baptism with fire he receives that by which Malachi says the Lord purifies the sons of Levi, "for he shall purge them as gold and silver." Therefore, inasmuch as we are baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire at one and the same time, and are purified or sanctified by fire, we conclude that the baptism with the Spirit and entire sanctification are absolutely inseparable.

Now, for the fulfillment of the prophecy of Malachi, Mal. 3:1-3, and John, Matt. 3:11, 12, read Acts 2:1-4, "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting and there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of *fire*, and it sat upon each of them and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost."

Please remember that Malachi said, "as a refiner purifies the silver and gold, so the Lord would purify the sons of Levi," and we know that silver and gold are purified by fire. And the "voice of one crying in the wilderness" had promised that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire, and Jesus had told the disciples to "tarry and wait for the promise," Acts 1:4, 5, and so as He came down upon them, behold there appeared the fire, as if to indicate that it was the fulfillment of Malachi's prophecy, as well as that of John.

And in further proof of the fact of a cleansing at Pentecost, we note that when Jesus, in answer to the request of His disciples to teach them to pray, indicated their need of cleansing, and also the remedy for that need,

by calling them "evil," and prescribed the remedy in the reception of the Holy Ghost. "If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Luke 11:13, mark you, Jesus said, "your Father which is in heaven," and to the Jews Jesus said, "if God were your Father you would love him," John 8:42, so when He said, "your Father" to His disciples, He recognized them as the children of God, and consequently, as those who loved Him. And yet He told them that they were "evil," and that they needed the Holy Ghost. Why did He not tell them to pray for sanctification. Evidently they were not sanctified wholly. And according to the Tongues theory they must first get sanctified before they are fit subjects for the baptism with the Holy Ghost. But Jesus was not supporting the theory of the modern Tongues movement, but to the contrary, His statement positively refutes it. And the testimony of Peter exactly corroborated the construction that we are putting on the passage. Peter said concerning the revival at the house of Cornelius, "As I began to speak the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized you with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Acts 11:15, 16. And again referring to the same event, he said, "and God which knoweth their hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us, and put no difference between us and them purifying their hearts by faith." Acts 15:8, 9.

Now, in these two passages we note that the first says that Cornelius and his friends received the baptism with

the Holy Ghost, as did the Apostles at the beginning. And the second teaches that when Cornelius and his friends received the baptism their hearts were purified. And Peter declared that they received it just like he and the other apostles did at the beginning, and that the baptism had the same effect on the Gentiles that it did on the Jewish Apostles, "No difference between us and them, purifying their hearts." So if the Apostle Peter was not mistaken about his own experience at Pentecost, he received heart purity, or was sanctified wholly at the time when he was baptized with the Holy Ghost and fire. But if the Tongues theory is correct, Peter was certainly mistaken, for it teaches that Peter and the other one hundred and nineteen were sanctified before Pentecost.

In summing up the argument of this chapter, please take your Bible and read Matt. 3:11, 12; Luke 11:11-13; Acts 11:15, 16; Acts 15:8, 9; and note that, first, Jesus Christ is the sole administrator of Holy Ghost baptism, Matt. 3:11, and second, that the Holy Ghost and fire are the sole elements used in this baptism, Matt. 3:11, 12; Acts 2:1-4; and third, the disciples, who have enough carnality in them to be called "evil," and yet enough spiritual life in them to be recognized as the children of God, and as those who love Jesus, John 2:42, Luke 11:13, I Cor. 3:3, John 14:14-16, are the exclusive subjects of this baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire, administered by Jesus Christ, and received by these partially carnal and partially spiritual disciples, and that their hearts were made pure. Acts 2:14; 10:44, 45; 11:15, 16; 15:8, 9.

Therefore, the Tongues theory is incorrect, as it is unscriptural, and consequently not of God, so must be rejected, and deserves the penalty of eternal annihilation.

## CHAPTER V

### PENTECOST AND CONSECRATION

The Tongues theory betrays its error again in separating entire sanctification and the baptism with the Holy Ghost, making the former precede the latter, by giving no well defined conditions requisite to obtaining the baptism. The following are some of their instructions on what it does, and how to obtain this third blessing.

They say that the baptism effects a deeper dying out. To which we reply by asking that if in being sanctified wholly one is cleansed from all sin, what is there in him that ought to die? If all sin has been cleansed away there is no remaining unrighteousness in him, so a deeper death is impossible, unless a good principle dies, and that would be only detrimental. The death of evil is accomplished to preserve the good.

Entire consecration is one of the conditions requisite to being sanctified wholly. This consecration implies a perfect abandonment of one's all to the will of God, not only to live and work, but also to suffer or die for Him. While one does not at the time of his consecration understand in detail all the things that he will be called upon to pass through, yet he makes a consecration so deep that it comprehends it all. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God—that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable and perfect will of God." Rom. 12:1, 2. That this passage sets forth the extent of consecration requisite to being sanctified wholly,

no sanctified person will deny. The Tongues theory teaches that in seeking the baptism, subsequent to entire sanctification, "you must carefully count the cost." "You must give up all hope of ever becoming great in the holiness movement or a leader in the same." "The Spirit and the Bride." Pp. 133-134. To which we reply that if the throne of Jehovah could be bought with one penny of a sanctified man's individual money, he could not purchase it, for his was all surrendered to God in the consecration made in getting sanctified wholly. For when such a consecration is made there is no further meeting of conditions possible to man; he has gone to the limit in consecration. A sacrifice means death. If one will give his body a living sacrifice he will give all things else, since the giving up of the body as a sacrifice to God is the last and utmost item in the deepest consecration possible to man. It was the last and the utmost extremity in the sacrifice of Christ. "He cried out it is finished! and gave up the Ghost." When one thus consecrates himself to God he becomes the love-slave of his Master. Deut. 15:16, 17. All he is and all he has belongs to the Lord, and if he belongs wholly to the Lord, all he will ever have will be the Lord's also. Therefore he could never use any of his consecrated means or powers in meeting conditions to obtain other experiences without incurring the penalty of first taking back part of the price; which caused Ananias and Sapphira to lose their lives.

So when consecration has reached the ultimate and God accepts the sacrifice and attests the same by sending fire down upon the altar in sanctifying power, the transaction is sealed, the offering accepted, the whole belongs solely to God. The sacrificer has sold all to obtain the

pearl of great price and has nothing left. Seeing that this is true and that it takes the baptism with the Holy Ghost to complete the restoration of the souls of men to God, and to obtain the final seal of God to man's redemption, why should the Pentecostal baptism be withheld from a sanctified heart? No impurities remain there to prevent His coming into His temple, no possible conditions on the recipient's part remain unmet, for he met conditions to the deepest depths when he was sanctified wholly; and he cannot reconsecrate unless he has violated his former consecration; and if he has done this he must repent of dishonesty, for he has taken that which belongs to another. Therefore, if he should receive anything from the Master that is not common to all the sanctified after he receives the experience of entire sanctification, it must be one of the spiritual gifts unconditionally bestowed by the exercise of the sovereign will of God. In the Pentecostal narrative it is said that "they began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." And in I Cor. 12: 11, "For all these worketh that one and the self same Spirit dividing to every one severally as he will." "Severally" means individually; and the will of the individual was not even consulted in the matter, but *it was as He willed*. From the fact that if one is wholly the Lord's he has no will of his own, but it is his meat and drink to do the will of Him "that had washed him from his sins in his own blood," and made him "a vessel unto honor sanctified and meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work," therefore if God in His wisdom sees fit to make His servant the custodian of one or more of the special spiritual gifts, He exercises His own high prerogative "and worketh in him both to will and to do of his

own good pleasure." For "He divides to every man severally as *he will*."

Now to sum up the argument of this chapter, we find that the greatest consecration and the most absolute surrender that it is possible for a free agent to make, is made to prove what is the will of God. "Present your bodies a living sacrifice to God—that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect *will* of God." Rom. 12: 1, 2, and "This is the *will* of God even your sanctification." This uttermost surrender is made then in order to be sanctified; so after sanctification one has no reserve forces that God could require him to surrender that He might give him the baptism with the Holy Ghost. Therefore if the baptism with the Holy Ghost is a conditional blessing it must come simultaneously with the sanctification at the end of a complete consecration, when faith becomes spontaneous. And if the baptism is not a conditional blessing, then in the very nature of things, no one need worry about it, since that would leave it altogether to the sovereign will of God.

In conclusion I ask, why does the Holy Ghost not occupy the heart from the moment it is made perfectly pure, and is fully surrendered to Him? It devolves upon the Tongues theory to answer this question, and he who undertakes it incurs a tremendous responsibility.

## CHAPTER VI

### BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST ACCOMPLISHES SANCTIFICATION

If the Tongues theory is correct in separating the experience of entire sanctification and the baptism with the Holy Ghost, making the former precede the latter, then the idea of cleansing, or purifying should never be associated with either water baptism or Holy Ghost baptism. Nothing should be thought of in connection with baptism, but power and tongues, etc. Now, it is a significant fact that water and water baptism are used typically in the New Testament to represent the Holy Ghost and Holy Ghost baptism. "If any man thirst let him come unto me and drink, and as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water, this spake he of the Spirit that they that believe on him should receive, for the Holy Ghost was not yet given." St. John 7:38, 39. The fact is water baptism would have no right to the name, but for its association with, and typifying of the baptism with the Holy Ghost, for there is but "one Lord, one faith and one baptism." Eph. 4:5. John the Baptist thus associated them. He said, "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Mark 1:18. So water baptism, as an ordinance, is called such because it foreshadows, or is a picture of the real spiritual baptism. Like "circumcision which is outward in the flesh, was not circumcision," but real circumcision "is that of the heart in the spirit." Rom. 2:29. But the former bore the name because it prefigured the real, so

water baptism derives its name from its association with and representation of the Pentecostal baptism, and for that, and no other reason, is worthy of the appellation.

Now to the point. The idea of cleansing was seen in baptism by the early disciples. When the question about purifying arose between John's disciples and the Jews, and John was called upon for decision, "They said, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same baptizeth." St. John 3: 25, 26. The subject under discussion was purifying, and baptism was comprehended. So from the form of their question, as it relates to the subject of their discussion, one would infer that purifying normally inheres in baptism, since it seemed to be the characteristic and significant idea that was conveyed to them by water baptism, for water baptism, as a type, drew all its strength and significance from the real baptism, for we read in Ezek. 36: 25, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you and you shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you." The fact is the idea of purifying is so closely associated with water baptism (the latter so strikingly representing the baptism with the Holy Ghost) that the Apostle deemed it necessary to say that "it [water baptism] is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." I Peter 3: 20, 21; taking precaution, lest the people overestimate the type, like the Israelites did the brazen serpent. Ezekiel used water to represent the Holy Spirit, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean, and from all of your filthiness will I cleanse you." Ezek. 36: 25.

But the Tongues theory begs to differ with the prophet (although he speaks as he was moved by the

Holy Ghost, II Pet. 1:21) and holds that cleansing and the baptism with the Holy Spirit are separate and distinct; that one may be sanctified wholly and never receive the baptism with the Holy Spirit. But Inspiration declares, that by the sprinkling of clean water upon them, He will cleanse and make them clean.

There is one of two things taught in this prophecy, either that water baptism sanctifies, or that cleansing is effected by the baptism with the Spirit, and water is used in the figurative sense, since it was not the former (for Peter said that water baptism did not put away the filth of the flesh, I Pet. 3:20, 21) it must have been the latter; and if so, the passage teaches, primarily that the baptism with the Holy Ghost is bestowed to cleanse and make clean; therefore, there is no harmony between the Tongues theory and Ezekiel's prophecy concerning the Pentecostal baptism.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE EFFECT OF SANCTIFICATION AND THE EFFECT OF THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY GHOST IDENTICAL

We now charge the Tongues theory as a transgressor of truth and logic, on the grounds of separating or putting assunder that which the Bible joins together; in that it separates sanctification and Holy Ghost baptism. Sanctification and Holy Ghost baptism cannot, from a scriptural standpoint, be separated, from the fact that the effect of each is the same, that is, that which is accomplished by sanctification is accomplished by the baptism with the Holy Ghost, and vice versa; in proof of which we submit the following: That oneness in the Lord is the direct result of entire sanctification, no careful Bible student will deny. It was the culminating item in the basic principles of the valedictory prayer of our blessed Saviour. St. John 17:17-23. "Sanctify them . . . that they all may be one—that they may be one even as we are one . . . I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one." All that could ever be meant by oneness in this life was included in the statement, "That they may be made perfect in one." The idea of unity and oneness as the result of sanctification cleaves to the doctrine of holiness all through the New Testament scriptures, and as such is directly stated, or clearly implied several times. In Heb. 2:11, "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one," and in Heb. 10:14, "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." Eph. 4:11-13, "And he gave some apostles,

and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, [What is the ultimate of the perfecting of the saints? The answer follows in verse 13] till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man."

The phrase, "a perfect man," signifies by the singular number, that just one man is referred to, and that with all his varied and multitudinous organisms there is nothing lacking, for he is "a perfect man." Jas. 1:4. There are no divisions, no convicting elements, but unity, oneness and harmony prevail. But when we look back to the first of this verse we note this which has become so unified that it is called a perfect man, is referred to by the phrase, "we all." What does this mean? Is there conflicting testimony? It means that Christian perfection, which is the direct result of the act of sanctification, is the harmonious adjustment of all the members of the body of Christ (which is the Church, Eph. 1:22, 23) in the unity of the Spirit, to that extent that "they are made perfect in one" or "a perfect man," and Christ himself is the head, and all this is the result of sanctification, for sanctification effects Christian perfection, and unity, or oneness normally inheres in Christian perfection, according to Eph. 4:13; St. John 17:17-23; Heb. 10:14; all of which we have already proven.

Now if upon investigation we find that this same oneness is effected by Holy Ghost baptism, we will have proven our assertion, viz., that sanctification and Holy Ghost baptism are inseparably joined together since the effect of each is the same. Now read I Cor. 12:13, "For by one Spirit are we all *baptized into one body*—and

have all been made to drink into one Spirit." Jesus had promised the disciples, John 14:16, 17, "I will pray the father and he shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth. . . . ye know him; for he dwelleth with you and shall be *in* you." And He prayed in John 17:17-23, "Sanctify them through thy truth—that they may be made perfect in one."

So the result of the baptism and that of sanctification is the same, that is, baptized into one body and sanctified that they might be one. But this is not the only identical result of sanctification and Holy Ghost baptism. In John 14:17, Jesus said, "he shall be in you," and also in verse 23, "If a man love me he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him and make our abode with him." In this verse He gives an explanation of the 14-17 verses, that is, in the person of the Holy Ghost and the Father will dwell in them, and all are bound to admit that the Saviour is referring to, and foretelling the Pentecostal experience. Now notice the corroborative point in the prayer of Jesus for the sanctification of the disciples. St. John 17:17-23. "Sanctify them . . . that they be one," and then follows with an explanation, "I in them and thou in me that they may be made perfect in one." So we note that in the Pentecostal experience he was to dwell in them, in a fuller sense, so much fuller, that it could be illustrated by the difference between dwelling with you and dwelling in you. Also there is the same fuller sense of indwelling in sanctification; "I in them and thou in me."

One of the arguments of the Tongues theory to prove that the disciples were sanctified before Pentecost, is to

prove that the oneness existed before the Holy Ghost came in baptismal function, in proof of which they quote Acts 2:1, "They were all of one accord in one place." A Tongues author thinks that passage proves that the disciples were sanctified before the Holy Ghost came. But their mistake is, as usual, the misinterpretation of the word. Men can be of one accord in an evil. Acts 18:12, "When Gallio was the deputy of Achaia the Jews made insurrection with one accord against Paul, and brought him to the judgment seat." If being of one accord in Acts 2:1 meant that the disciples were really one (before the Holy Ghost came) according to the prayer of the Saviour to make them one, what was the one accord in the case of the Jews, relative to the insurrection against St. Paul, evidence of?

The facts are, in both instances the people were of one intention, they had agreed in one case to seek the "one baptism" (Eph. 4:5) with the Holy Ghost, which would put them into the "one body" (I Cor. 12:13) and give them the unity or oneness of the Spirit in the bond of peace. (Eph. 4:3.) And in the other case where they were of one accord they had an evil heart in them and agreed on perpetrating an evil upon the servant of the Lord, and this cannot be denied.

But it is evident that the Tongues theory admits that sanctification makes us one, and when they admit that, and we prove that spiritual baptism makes us one we have sustained the charges made in the beginning of this chapter, to-wit: That the Tongues theory is guilty of transgression of truth and logic, and should receive the just condemnation of all lovers of truth and righteousness.

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE TONGUES THEORY AND CHRISTIAN PERFECTION

In separating sanctification and the baptism with the Holy Ghost, the Tongues theory makes a monstrous blunder, and is forced to a ridiculous attitude toward the doctrine of Christian perfection. For by teaching the baptism with the Holy Ghost subsequent to sanctification, and that it is the duty of sanctified Christians to seek it, thereby teaching that they did not receive such a baptism in sanctification, necessarily, from the nature of things separates sanctification and Christian perfection. Or else, it presumes to prescribe a remedy where there is no disease, or a supply where there is no demand.

Jesus prayed, "Sanctify them through thy truth, . . . that they may be made perfect in one." John 17:17-23. Now by every law of logic and common sense we are forced to the conclusion that when one is perfect he needs nothing more. If one has a single need he lacks that much to be perfect. Then when the Tongues theory says we must have a baptism with the Holy Ghost after sanctification it makes the prescription where there is no need or else takes issue with the Bible and declares that sanctification does not make the recipients thereof perfect.

"But," says one, "when we are sanctified we are perfect so far as the present needs are concerned, but later circumstances will develop a need for the baptism with the Holy Ghost, then we will realize a lack of power, etc., and consequently we will not be perfect." But Paul said, "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified, whereof the Holy Ghost is a witness unto

us." Heb. 10:14, 15. That is, they are perfect now and always will be so long as they remain sanctified, and if there ever comes a time when they are not in that state of Christian perfection it will in itself be *prima facie* evidence that they are not sanctified, for if they are perfect they have every need already supplied, for that is the Bible idea of perfection. "That ye may be perfect and entire wanting nothing." James 1:4.

So the sanctified have no ground for a baptism with the Holy Ghost and fire, from the fact that if they are sanctified they are "perfected forever" and "They are perfect and entire, wanting [or lacking] nothing." Therefore if people need the baptism with the Holy Ghost, it is before they are sanctified, that they experience such a need, and if they receive such a baptism it must at least be simultaneous with sanctification, for when they are sanctified they are made perfect, and when they are perfect, they are wanting nothing, and consequently there would be no need or room for such a baptism.

To illustrate, when a mechanic has declared a piece of workmanship to be perfect, he means that he can see no addition or subtraction or change that could be made that would be for the better. He has done his best, and the workmanship measures up to his highest ideal, therefore he pronounces it perfect.

So when our heavenly Father pronounces us perfect, it means to us that we measure up to His ideal. Thank the Lord! And that He has done His best for us, and He says when He sanctifies He makes us perfect, and that it is forever, and there will never come a time when our spiritual man will need any thing else, in the way of an epochal experience.

Now, on the authority of the Scriptures that we have been considering in this chapter, we hold that those who are seeking the baptism with the Holy Ghost as a third experience, or a work subsequent to sanctification, are not sanctified wholly. If they have been sanctified, they have failed to retain the blessing. We make the above charge on the ground that the Bible says (Heb. 10:14, 15) that the Holy Ghost is a witness to the sanctified that they are perfect, and if the blessed Holy Spirit bears witness to a sanctified heart that it is made perfect, it would be hard to convince that soul that it needed anything more, and if that soul should be convinced that it needed something more it would in that event reject the counsel or testimony of the Holy Ghost and accept an impression from another source and you can see the result.

Say, reader, do you know the Holy Ghost? I must say that I am sorry for that one who has no better evidence of the Pentecostal baptism than the giving forth of utterances that he himself does not understand. Oh, brother, Jesus said, "My sheep know my voice." Thank God! He came into my heart in Pentecostal power, by the hand of Jesus (Matt. 3:11, 12; Mal. 3:3), and sanctified me wholly, (Rom. 15:16) and now whispers to my heart "ye are clean and made perfect in love," and that "there is nothing wanting," so I can say with David of old that "He satisfieth the longing soul." Psalms 107:9. And as long as He bears witness that I am sanctified and thereby made perfect and entire, wanting nothing, I can never be induced to seek another experience. Oh, hallelujah! I know Him, and He witnesses now to my love-ravished soul that I am "complete in him."

## CHAPTER IX

### BIBLE EVIDENCE OF PENTECOST

One of the most monumental errors of the Tongues movement is the teaching that speaking in unknown tongues is the Bible evidence of the baptism with the Holy Ghost.

This is a fundamental doctrine of all branches and various groups of the tongues movement, without a single exception.

I. They teach that all who receive the pentecostal baptism with the Holy Spirit speak in unknown tongues, and that "speaking in unknown tongues is the Bible evidence of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit." That is, this unknown tongue is the Spirit's testimony to the seeker that He has come to his temple. "Never hold up until the Spirit manifests Himself with your tongue. He will testify when He comes." (Spirit and the Bride, by G. F. Taylor, page 125.)

But unfortunately for the tongues theory, the Bible is directly against the position herein set forth. "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, *not to them that believe*, but to them that believe not." I Cor. 14:22. How can this statement of Saint Paul be reconciled with the tongues statement that "speaking with tongues is the Bible evidence to the believer, or his sign that the Holy Spirit has come"?

One tongues author says: "That it is true that all who receive the Baptism speak with tongues, the Bible nowhere denies." But is that any proof in favor of the

tongues position? The Bible nowhere denies that all who are converted have the physical peculiarity of one black eye and the other blue, but you have never seen anyone examining the eyes of new converts to determine if they were really converted.

However, the Bible does deny, most emphatically, that all who have the baptism speak in tongues. In the twelfth chapter of I Cor. St. Paul gives a minute discussion of the gifts of the Spirit, and their relative value in the church. He emphasizes three points: first, that God is the author of all the gifts; second, they are bestowed according to the sovereign will of God; and third, the Lord chose certain individuals singularly, to the exclusion of all others, to whom these gifts were imparted. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit—and there are differences of administration, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all and in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal, for to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit—to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another the discerning of spirits; to another *divers kinds of tongues*; to another the interpretation of tongues: but all these worketh that one and the self same Spirit dividing to every man severally as He will. . . . "For by one Spirit are all baptized into one body."

They were *all* baptized by the "One Spirit," but the gifts of the Spirit, *including the tongues*, were divided to *every man* severally as he (the Holy Spirit) willed. (I Cor.

12:4-13). Then further down in the same chapter Paul gives added emphasis to the matter of singling out certain bestowments (including tongues) on certain individuals, to the exclusion of the other members of the church. "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, government, divers kinds of tongues." Then he proceeds to use the figure of speech, known as *interrogation*, which is only used when a negative answer is self evident; and is therefore the most emphatic way of expressing a denial. Now follow him: "Are all apostles?" (How about it, were they all apostles?) "Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?"

In the foregoing passage the apostle not only denies that all who have the baptism have the gift of tongues, but he denies that they all speak with tongues. Not only that, but by using the GIFT of tongues and speaking with tongues interchangeably, he shows that there is no difference. That is, only those who have the gift of tongues speak in tongues; and that it is preposterous to expect all the Spirit baptized ones to be: apostles, prophets, teachers, workers of miracles, to have the gifts of healing or to speak with tongues.

II. The Tongues Movement also teaches that after one has received his pentecost and the gift of tongues as the evidence, he may become a backslider and be on his way to hell, and yet retain the tongues.

They are forced to take this position in self defense, for many of their outstanding people, including leaders, have done just that. They have fallen into deep sin,

especially social sins, and continued their ministry and continued to talk in tongues. In a personal letter to the writer from a tongues preacher in Houston, Texas, he says: "The precious gift sometimes (if not indeed always) remains, even though the giver is grieved away." Then he gave two local examples.

But what right does the Unknown Tongues movement have to make the Holy Spirit belie Himself? And thus to violate His own essential nature? For He is the Spirit of Truth. (John 14:17, 16:13). Their teaching is that the unknown tongues which always accompanies the reception of the baptism is the Spirit's testimony to the recipient that He has come. "Never hold up till the Spirit has manifested Himself with your tongue. He will testify when he comes." (Spirit and the Bride—page 125). Now if the Holy Spirit leaves His testimony with the backslider, after He Himself has been grieved away, where does this place the Holy Spirit?

If John Doe posts a sign on his door, saying: "I, John Doe, owner and occupant of this residence, do hereby certify that I am at this time, as at all times, dwelling within the interior of this building"; where upon investigation reveals that John Doe has vacated the building, and it has been turned to, and is being occupied by another; and that the said John Doe is not to be found anywhere thereabout; and furthermore the said notice on the door was left there with the knowledge and by the permission of the said John Doe, that notice would be branded as a falsehood, and John Doe would be branded as a liar.

Who could have the temerity to advocate a position which would place the Holy Spirit in the position that

John Doe places himself? But the conclusion cannot be avoided. Is it not blasphemy to say that the Holy Spirit will leave His testimony which says He is with a backslider in pentecostal power, when the facts are He is not with him?

The tongues movement can take either horn of the dilemma: If they do not give up their theory that speaking in unknown tongues is the Bible evidence of pentecost, they must line up with the unfortunate John Doe, since there are those who continued to speak in tongues after it has been made clear by their sinful conduct that they do not have the Holy Spirit.

III. The Unknown Tongues Movement teaches, also that a person who has never been converted may receive the tongues from the devil, if he seeks it before he gets divine love. "Satan would be pleased to give you the tongues, if you seek it before you get divine love." (Spirit and the Bride, page 66—by Rev. G. F. Taylor)

Therefore, according to the standards of the tongues movement, a person belonging to any one of three groups may have the tongues. First, those who have the baptismal blessing now, second, those who have had the blessing of pentecost, but have grieved God from their hearts by sin, and yet retained the tongues, third, those who have never been converted, but sought the tongues before they obtained divine love, and received it from the devil. But these three groups include everybody. For there is not a living person but has the Holy Spirit with him now, or he has had Him with him at some time in the past, or those who never did have Him. Therefore, according to the tongues theory, if one is to act on the knowledge that is brought to him by hearing someone

speak in tongues, he must conclude that the person thus engaged either has the Baptism, or he has had the baptism, or he never did have the baptism. Hence, the inevitable conclusion is: that speaking in tongues cannot be depended on to indicate a person's relationship to the pentecostal baptism with the Holy Ghost. For it only indicates that the person speaking in tongues, is doing what he is doing—and that is all.

IV. An observation of the tongues movement in action, and discussion of tongues with a lawyer.

My singer and I went to Memphis, Tennessee, to attend a tongues meeting. My effort was to make a sincere investigation, based upon first hand observation. (I think I was as unbiased as I was the day I was converted; and since the day my heart was made new "by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," I have loved the truth with a passionate love. Since that glorious day there has never been a time when I would have hesitated to change crowds if the vein of truth had pointed in another direction.) I went to this meeting with the conviction that if my Lord was the leader of this movement I would be able to sense it. My mind was open for light and my heart was open for conviction.

It was a typical tongues meeting, as many later observations have confirmed. The crowd was large, and the performances must have been, at least, up to par. Many of the people were very vocal, and the demonstrations and contortions not a few. But the whole thing seemed altogether weird and unnatural to a spiritual mind. I neither saw, nor heard, nor felt any evidence of the divine endorsement of the program. As a result of my

observations, I believed less in it than I had expected when I came.

We were introduced as workers from western Texas; and the preacher invited us to his home for lunch. We were glad to accept the invitation. He was an attorney at law. Seated in his nice parlor, he turned to me and said, "My brother, do you have your pentecost?" To which I promptly replied: "Yes, sir, I have." He said: "Did you talk in tongues when you received your pentecost?" I said: "No, I did not." He replied, "My brother, you do not have your pentecost!" Then he quoted: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come they were all with one accord in one place, and suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind and it filled all the house where they were sitting—and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." He said: "If you had your pentecost according to Acts 2:1-4 you would have spoken in tongues as they did on that day. Nothing can justly be called pentecost that does not include everything that is herein set forth."

Then said I: "Since you have elected to examine me to determine if I have my pentecost, I think I will examine you and see if you have yours." I said, "Have you received your pentecost?" He said: "I have." I said: "You talked in tongues?" He said: "I surely did, praise the Lord!" I said: "You must remember that tongues was not the only phenomena that characterized the pentecost as recorded in Acts 2:1-4." Then I said: "Were there any cloven tongues like as of fire sitting on your

head when you got your pentecost?" He said: "No." I said: "Then you do not have your pentecost. For the absence of the tongues of fire in connection with your pentecost is a more conclusive proof that you do not have yours than the absence of speaking in tongues was in my case. For the cloven tongues of fire 'sat upon each of them,' while on the other hand 'they only spake with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance'; and there is no proof that he gave all of them utterance." Then, I said: "When you received your pentecost, did you hear the sound of the rushing mighty wind." He said: "No, I did not hear anything like that." I said: "You do not have your pentecost by evidence number two." Then I said: "Have you ever witnessed a case where the wind and the fiery tongues were present?" He said: "No, I have never seen or heard anything of the kind." Then I said: "You have never witnessed a case of real pentecost, according to the rule by which you have denied that I have my pentecost." Then said I again: "When you spoke in this new tongue, were there any people present who did not understand English and did understand this new tongue in which you spoke and were instructed thereby in the way of life and were converted?" He said: "No!" Then I said: "The only characteristic of the pentecost of Acts 2:1-4 which you claim beyond what I claim is speaking in tongues; and that is proven, in your case, not to be genuine, when compared with what happened on that day; for the record says: "The multitude came together and were confounded, because every man heard them speak in his own language," and again: "How hear we every man in his own tongue wherein we were born?"

At this juncture, lunch was called and the conversation

was never resumed. The Lawyer-Preacher and I have not met again since that day.

Finally, when anyone claims to have pentecost, according to Acts 2:1-4 and at the same time admits that the tongue in which he spoke was an unknown tongue, he is either inexcusably ignorant or wilfully untruthful. For there were present on that day: "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and in Capadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, and Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and Prosolytes, Cretes and Arabians, *we do hear them speak in our own tongue, the wonderful works of God*" (Acts 2:8-11).

## CHAPTER X

### HOW DOES ONE KNOW WHEN HE HAS THE HOLY GHOST?

How may one know that the Holy Ghost has come on him in Pentecostal power?

We unhesitatingly reply that the manifestation of the Holy Spirit himself, to the spiritual man, imparting the knowledge of His presence and the performance of the functions of His office, constitutes the evidence; and this communion of Spirit with spirit gives assurance that so far transcends all others that it leaves no room for comparison.

Speaking of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost in Pentecostal power, the Saviour said, "Ye know him! for he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you." But He said, "The world cannot receive him because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him." He assigned the reasons why the disciples could receive Him and also why the world could not receive Him. For if the world cannot receive Him because it does not know Him, and the disciples could receive Him because they did know Him, then knowing Him is a condition of receiving Him; and the disciples had met that condition, "Ye know him." Therefore they did not need any kind of a physical phenomenon to introduce His incoming, so far as they were individually concerned.

The Bible has much to say on the subject of people's knowing God. (Daniel 11:32; I Chron. 28:9; Jer. 9:24; Hos. 4:1; John 17:3; I Sam. 3:7; Job 19:25; Heb. 8:11; Hos. 2:20; John 10:14; I Tim. 1:12; I John 2:4.)

To successfully impart knowledge, the instructor must

begin at a point of knowledge which is common to the teacher and the pupil. If he should discuss quadratic equations for the benefit of kindergarten pupils he would lose his labor. If I should be called on by a Christian to tell him how I know I have received the Holy Ghost, I would simply say, that He made me conscious of His presence when I accepted Him by faith (Luke 11:13). "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us" (Heb. 10:14, 15). But if I should be called on by an unconverted person to give an explanation of how I know God, I would proceed something like this: There is a natural man and there is a spiritual man. The way the natural man receives information is through his natural senses. They constitute the only avenue through which knowledge can be conveyed to him. If a man could live without a single one of his physical senses he would be altogether out of touch with his physical environment; hence there would be no way to impart information to him, but these senses are fundamental to his physical being. If a man is blind, he is a physical man minus sight; and so on with the rest of his senses. It takes them all to complete the man. But there is not only a natural man, there is a spiritual man as well; and if the physical senses are fundamentally a constituent part of the natural man, and further, if the physical senses constitute the means by which the natural man receives information concerning the world of things with which he has to do, it stands to reason that the spiritual man has corresponding spiritual senses; and by these and these only can he come in touch with spiritual things. Therefore we read "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God neither

can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (or known). (I Cor. 2:14.) And yet when one possesses eternal life he knows God (John 17:3), but knows Him (not by His being manifested to the physical, nor through the physical, but), because He has been manifested to the spiritual man; and because the spiritual man is able to comprehend Him by means of the spiritual senses which are fundamental to his spiritual being.

During the earthly ministry of our Lord, some people tried to discern Him by external comparisons. But those who thus tried to comprehend Him did not arrive at the truth. For some identified Him as John the Baptist, some as Jeremiah, some as Elijah and others as one of the prophets; and consequently they rejected His claim to the Messiahship. But there were others who accepted His claim by simple faith (John 1:41-51), and therefore they received a revelation of the Christ to the spirit-man that amounted to positive knowledge. "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my father which is in heaven" (Matt. 16:17).

Personally, I have a very dear and intimate friend. Our first associations caused mutual admiration. Close and continued friendship developed into love and we got married. When I came to really know her, I decided that I wanted to effect a permanent union with her, and the reason I effected this union with her was because I understood her; and she seemed to understand me; and understanding each other as we did, we discovered in each other those qualities of character that appealed each to the other respectively. Yes, I know her better than I do anybody else in the world; and since I came to know

her so well, it has never been necessary, nor even desirable for her to perform a miracle and speak in an unknown language to me in evidence of her presence. In fact I am unable to discover how that would, or could increase the assurance of her presence. For through my senses I perceive her known characteristics in such a way as to give the most satisfactory evidence of her personal identity.

But I have a spiritual friend that I know better in the spiritual realm than I know the wife of my bosom in the natural realm; for sometimes the latter and I are separated, necessarily, by miles. But "He shall abide with you forever." I am in spiritual touch with Him, and it is mine to remain in this holy association constantly. These affiliations that we have each with the other are called in the Bible COMMUNION of the Holy Ghost (II Cor. 13:14), and the FELLOWSHIP of the Spirit (Phil. 2:1), and these relations and associations can exist only when there is intelligent and mutual understanding of a common interest between individuals. Therefore I could not have a semblance of a desire for a physical manifestation to evidence His holy presence. For He said, "My sheep know my voice."

It can be nothing short of an insult to the intelligence of the Holy Spirit, and a burlesque on His personality, to instruct those who seek Him in His fulness to look for and demand a physical manifestation to evidence His presence. For when He comes in baptismal function and glory on the trusting heart, the recipient will know He has come "FOR YE KNOW HIM."

## CHAPTER XI

### THE SOURCE OF MODERN TONGUES

What is the source of what the tongues people call speaking in unknown tongues?

We are frank in the assertion that we have never been able to obtain authentic proof that any one in modern times has ever spoken in tongues in such a manner as to be worthy of comparison with the incident recorded in the second chapter of Acts. But charity for some whom we believe to be good men and women, who are mixed up with the tongues heresy, forbids our attributing it to the Devil in a broadcast sense. On the other hand, our knowledge of the subject and our love for the truth of God and our interest in the cause of righteousness forbids our attributing it to divine activity. Therefore turning from these two sources, one or the other of which most people look upon as being the source of all phenomena which transcends the ordinary, we look through psychic research to the fields of subjective activity for the explanation; and this is not a barren field, for it abounds with illustrations of all kinds.

Discriminating students of psychic phenomena have discovered that (1) humanity has a dual mentality, a conscious mind and a subconscious mind, and (2) that the subconscious mind is the seat of the memory, and also the depository of certain psychic powers which under certain abnormal conditions become operative; and thus are

performed many of the spectacular feats which attract so much attention among people of a certain type of mind.

This is doubtless the source from which the phenomena of Spiritism, Telepathy, Mind-reading, Mental-healing and all of the different forms of Hypnotism spring. We believe an impartial investigation of the basic principles of the subjects referred to above, will reveal it as a fact, that the principles of hypnotism are employed, either directly or indirectly in all the manipulations which result in the demonstrations of these occults which attract so much attention and induce so much comment.

The writer of these lines has never seen a professional hypnotist perform. But he has studied the subject in connection with other psychic principles.

It is held by those who claim to know how to induce the hypnotic state, that it is accomplished by the holding of the attention and the gaze of the subject to be hypnotized on one thing steadily and persistently for an extended period of time, with, or without the suggestion that he will be brought into the hypnotic state; and it is claimed that a willing subject can thus be easily hypnotized, or brought into the subconscious state. Then when once he is in that condition, his active mind is in abeyance and his subconscious mind is in the ascendancy. Now the subconscious mind is amenable to control by suggestion. Therefore whatsoever the operator suggests to the one in the state of hypnosis, which is not contrary to the subject's conception of right, he will do.

The tongues teachers do not stipulate well defined conditions, looking to the reception of the baptism with the Holy Ghost that can be supported by the Word of God. But to the contrary, they instruct their seekers to "Praise

through"! They say "the very last step is praises." Seekers are induced to say, "Glory," "Glory," "Glory"—!!!! or some other ejaculation constantly and persistently for a long extended period of time, as fast as they can until finally, by the co-ordination of mental concentration and vocal conglomeration the hypnotic state is induced; and thus begins subconscious activity in harmony with the suggestion, which was the goal of his seeking; and the incoherent sounds, which they call speaking in tongues begins. For like all others in the state of hypnotism they obey the dominant suggestion; and with them, that suggestion was that they would speak in tongues; therefore the subconscious mind thus produces that which is in harmony with the dominating suggestion which they had in mind when they started in quest of the spectacular.

Under such conditions as described above, it is possible and not altogether improbable that one might speak some words or phrases, and in rare instances some sentences of a foreign language. For if he has heard some foreigner speak ( and there are few but have), and whatsoever is heard is registered in the subconscious mind, it is highly possible that foreign words would be produced when one goes into the subconscious, or hypnotic state, with the suggestion that he is to talk in tongues. To illustrate: On the grounds at the City Hall at Waco, Texas, Rev. Hinds, a returned missionary from Old Mexico, heard a woman talking in tongues. He said she was mixing with her jargon and gibberish one word of Spanish, which she repeated over and over. The meaning of the word, according to Mr. Hinds, was *sweet-potato*. Could anybody have the credulity to believe that God would inspire a woman to say sweet-potato constantly for an

extended period of time? Rev. H. E. Toms of Colfax, Wash., gave the writer this incident: In the Apostolic-Faith Mission in Seattle, Wash., a certain man claimed to have received the gift of the Chinese language in connection with his Pentecost; and a prominent business man of the city had a Chinese servant whom they sent out to hear the man talk in tongues, who reported that he was talking Chinese. He said the man was cursing God in the Chinese language. When the man was told that he was cursing God, he became furious and denied it hotly. What was the explanation? The man had simply heard some Chinese cursing and when he went into the semi-hypnotic state and the subconscious mind became operative, and he having the suggestion that he would talk in tongues, simply produced from the record of subconsciousness what was there that would correspond to his dominating suggestion. It is a well known fact that a person in the state of hypnosis can have the suggestion made to him that he is a dog, and he will bark and exhibit other characteristics of the canine creature. Or he can receive the suggestion that he is in the water and he will go through the motions as if he were swimming, in fact, he can be thus induced to do almost anything by the power of suggestion.

This peculiar mental condition has been produced by fever, and fractures and various diseases. People who could neither read nor write have been brought into semi-conscious states and have spoken sentences of Greek, Latin and Hebrew, and when they would be restored to the normal condition could not understand a word of it. Here is a case of record and open to the investigation of the public. "A young woman of twenty-four or twenty-

five, who could neither read nor write, was seized with a nervous fever. She continued to talk incessantly in Greek, Latin and Hebrew, in very pompous tones and with very distinct enunciation. The case had attracted the attention of a young physician, and by his statement many eminent physiologists and psychologists visited the town and cross examined the case on the spot. Sheets full of her ravings were taken down from her own mouth, and were found to contain sentences, coherent and intelligible each for itself, but with little connection with each other. The young physician traveled to the place where her parents had lived, and found a surviving uncle, and learned from him that the patient had been charitably taken by an old Protestant pastor, at the age of nine, and had lived with him till the old man's death. A niece of the old pastor who had lived with him as his housekeeper, and who had inherited some of his effects, remembered the girl. He learned from her that it had been the habit of the old man to walk up and down a passage of his house into which the kitchen door opened, and to read to himself, with a loud voice, from his favorite books. A considerable number of these were still in the niece's possession. She added that he was a very learned Hebraist. Among the books were found a collection of the Rabbinical writings, together with several of the Greek and Latin Fathers; and the physician succeeded in identifying so many passages with those taken down at the bedside of the young woman that no doubt could remain in any rational mind concerning the true origin of the impressions made on her nervous system" (*Biographia Literarie*, Volume 1, page 117, Edition 1847). This is an unanswerable argument in

favor of the position which we take that in any state which approximates hypnosis there may be brought from the memory of the subconscious mind that which has been lodged there at any previous time.

This is what we believe to be the source of what the tongues people call "speaking in tongues" when he begins to get in earnest in his seeking. For when a person has been hypnotized once it is easier the next time to induce that state; and it becomes more easy with each recurring experience. We know a young woman who tells us that she never speaks in tongues except in her secret devotions. This is auto hypnosis and could serve to no practical use, only to keep one in a state of self-deception.

If the tongues people say, "We sought the baptism with the Holy Ghost and received the tongues; and therefore it must be the evidence of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost," we reply that they only sought the Holy Ghost theoretically. Practically they were seeking the tongues. For when one contends that certain phenomena must appear before a divine work can be accepted as having been accomplished, and he is seeking to have such a work accomplished in himself, he is, in reality, seeking for the phenomena. A man who insists on getting the witness of the Spirit to his justification, before he accepts pardon, the authority of revealed truth, is in fact seeking the witness of the Spirit. Theoretically he is seeking pardon, but practically he is seeking the witness of the Spirit; and if he should have some kind of a strange pleasant feeling he would then believe he had received the pardon which he was theoretically seeking.

God promises the Holy Spirit to those who ask for Him (Luke 11:13), and commands those who ask to be-

lieve that they receive what they are asking for (Mark 11:24), and He says they shall receive what they thus ask for. But God only assumes responsibility for what happens to a man when the man is doing what God tells the man to do.

## CHAPTER XII

### NOT ALL THAT IS MYSTERIOUS IS DIVINE

Many have been peculiarly impressed with the apparent miraculous manifestations which have at times accompanied the Tongues meetings, and have been induced to espouse their cause thereby. But such a method of determining the source of singular or spectacular demonstrations or the validity of their claims will render those who adopt it an easy prey to the deceptions of Satan, and the defenseless victim of "the sleight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." The Devil would not have a better thing than for people to take everything as from God that seems to be of a miraculous or inexplicable nature, for then he would take advantage and make use of every accessible agent of the kind in accomplishing his diabolical purposes, in turning hearts away from Jesus Christ.

Let us consider a few occurrences of the past which are in their very nature, marvelous and inexplicable, and which are attributable to no other source than a diabolical one. Three such cases are recorded in Exodus 7:9 to 8:19. When the Lord would bring the Israelites up out of the land of bondage, He sent Aaron and Moses to Pharaoh to ask for the release of His people, and when Pharaoh demanded a miracle to establish the validity of their claims, and Aaron's rod was turned into a serpent, the magicians of Egypt duplicated the miracle, "For they cast down every man his rod and they became serpents." Next Aaron stretched out his rod upon the waters of

Egypt and they became blood, and the magicians did likewise with their enchantments and turned the waters into blood. And when Moses and Aaron brought forth the frogs from the rivers, the magicians brought up frogs also.

Now suppose the magicians with their claims should have been accepted by the Israelites because they did these wonderful things, fatal would have been the result.

It has been said that the Devil does not possess miracle working power, therefore every marvelous manifestation is the result of divine effort. But read the Bible to the contrary. "And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles which he had power to do." Rev. 13:13, 14. "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are spirits of devils working miracles." Rev. 16:13, 14. Also Rev. 19:20. "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, *with which he deceived* them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that had worshiped his image."

These three passages state positively that Satan does have miracle working power. Spirits of devils were seen to come out of the mouth of the dragon, beast and false prophet, and by them they worked miracles; and the last quotations declare that by these miracles the false prophet deceived such as had the mark of the beast, and had worshiped his image. They were deceived into worshiping the beast and receiving his mark. The fact is, signs and wonders are employed by Satan as one of his favorite

methods of deceiving. True it is said in II Thess. 2:9, 10, "Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs of lying wonders, and all the deceivableness of unrighteousness, in them that perish." If Satan's miracles are not genuine, but all counterfeits, who is it that is a wise man and able to discern these things?

The Bible says the spirits of devils worked miracles. They were lying wonders in that they caused the people to believe a falsehood and thereby to be deceived. One could scarcely conceive of Satan's performing any kind of a wonder, which in its tendency was not calculated to deceive. "For when he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar and the father of it." John 8:44.

There are many things transpiring daily in the world now through Spiritualism, hypnotism, mind-reading, Christian Science healing and other forces of like character, some of which are both interesting and dangerous to investigate. Interesting because of the mysterious and striking phenomena, and dangerous because of the close proximity to miraculous demonstration. The creed of Spiritualism teaches that communication of the spirits of the dead with the living through mediums, is an ordinary possibility, and also that such communications may be accompanied by certain physical phenomena which transcend all ordinary natural laws, attributable to either the direct action of spirits, or to some force developed by the medium's own personality. It is claimed by Spiritualists that "precipitated writing," that is, writing supposed to be produced on paper without visible means, by table-turning, either with or without contact of the medium, is a reliable source of information. That one may receive messages from the dead, and moral and philosophical in-

structions, etc. They produce unaccounted for "lights, musical sounds, as of invisible instruments, played on, or playing of real instruments by invisible or materialized hands; moving of furniture, and other heavy objects; the passage of matter through matter, as bringing of flowers or other material objects into closed rooms; materialization of hands or other parts of the body or of complete human figures; spirit-photography; and finally, phenomena immediately affecting the medium, such as levitation, or floating in the air without visible support, the elongation or shortening of his body, and fire tests, when the medium handles live coals and gives them to others to handle without injury. . . . The object of these phenomena is considered by Spiritualists to be the attestation of the genuineness of the communication, and they bear to Spiritualistic belief much the same relation that miracles do to revealed religion." (Universal Encyclopedia, vol. 11, pp. 64, 65.)

The effects of these demonstrations have been very disastrous in many cases where people have attended their public gatherings. The writer has in mind now an incident that occurred in this state (Texas), of a Methodist preacher who went before a Spiritualist medium for a sitting and as a result went back on God and religion, and the last we knew of him he was an infidel. Among the things which made him believe in Spiritualism, one was this: The medium told him his wife was dead, and several things that he knew to be true which he was certain the medium had no opportunity to have previously known. The medium told him that he had a certain number of children that had died, and he disputed it saying, "You are mistaken, I have not lost so many children." But the

medium contended that she saw all of them and that one was a very small infant, and then the minister remembered that he had buried a tiny, premature baby in the early part of his married life, that he had not thought of for a long time. Thus he became interested in Spiritualism and lost faith in Christianity and became an infidel. It was all because he had not given due consideration to the Bible statement that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light, and would if possible deceive the very elect."

However it is not true that all mysterious phenomena which do not come from God are the direct results of diabolical effort. There are many marvelous things accomplished by the power of the mind over matter, for instance, a number of persons can concentrate their wills and the power of their minds and make tables walk, and rap, etc. By this power of the mind over matter Christian Science has effected many healings that are noteworthy. The writer had a stranger, who had no possible opportunity to have previously known him, to look at the palm of his hand and tell him that he was a "good man and a preacher." The former we hope is true, the latter we know to be true. Many more incidents could be given, but space forbids.

So it is easily seen that mysterious and marvelous demonstrations cannot be taken as evidence of the genuineness of any movement. If so, to be impartial we would have to endorse Spiritualism, etc. The fact is God forbade the Israelites doing that very thing. And to test their fidelity He sometimes permits Satan, through men to perform miracles and do marvelous things, that even Christians might be tried. "For the trying of your faith

is much more precious than that of gold which is tried in the fire."

We find the proof of this in Deut. 13:1-3, "If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or wonder, and the sign or wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or dreamer of dreams; for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether you will love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul." In such cases as this, it is according to the permissive will of God, that miraculous demonstrations be brought to bear, as a means of testing the experiences, and fidelity of the sons of God. If one has not the perfect love of God which casteth out fear, and comprehends not only the grace of regeneration, but also of entire sanctification, the miraculous will probably have more or less effect on him; especially if he be on a strain, trying in himself to make true that which is true of itself, and for which he should trust God.

Satisfaction is what the human heart craves, and perfect love implies perfect confidence, perfect trust, and perfect heart obedience, and these will bring perfect satisfaction.

In summing up the argument of this chapter, we note, First, that the Scriptures teach that Satan will do many wonderful things to deceive the people (if possible the very elect), "spirits of devils working miracles." And, Second, that Spiritualism, hypnotism, Christian Science, fortune telling and witchcraft, etc., work many marvelous things, some of which are the works of the Devil;

others may not be directly the works of Satan, but the results of telepathic influences. And, Third, we are informed that God permits wonders to be performed by men, false prophets, to try His people, that it may be proven as to whether they will stand the test, and prove true, and love the Lord with all their heart, soul, mind and strength. Deut. 13:1-3.

Therefore, the logical conclusion is that if we are to believe that the Tongues theory is true because there are mysterious manifestations and demonstrations among them, impartiality will force us to admit the claims of Spiritualism, etc., hence, miracles no more prove that the Tongues theory is correct than miracles proved the magicians of Pharaoh were right in their claims, or the evil spirit that brought fire down from heaven. God has put us on our watch.

“And when they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits, and unto wizards that peep, and *mutter*: should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead? To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because they have no light in them.” Isaiah 8:19, 20.

## CHAPTER XIII

### SOME BIBLE TEACHING ON TONGUES

That the Scriptures teach that there were tongues and interpretations, etc., given to the Apostles and early Christians, no students of the Word can deny. It was used by the Holy Ghost in proclaiming the gospel message.

On the day of Pentecost, when the blessed Holy Ghost came on the people, "And they began to speak in other tongues as the *Spirit gave them utterance*," the word of the Lord was spoken in sixteen different dialects (and we do not know how many more), for there were Jews, devout men of every nation under heaven, and they said, "How hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?"

The gift of tongues was given for a sign to them that believe not. I Cor. 14:22. Those who did not believe needed the gospel message, and that it might be speedily given, the gift of tongues was imparted, and when the people heard the disciples of Jesus Christ speaking unto them in their own language, they were pricked in their hearts and said, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" But such results do not accompany the jabber of the modern Tongues movement. No one understands them, they do not understand themselves. It remains as yet for them to send their first missionary to the heathen with the ability to preach the gospel to them through the medium of their divinely (?) bestowed gift of tongues. Somehow they can find the people whose language they have, although they have gone to the mission field repeatedly

with the persuasion that they had the language and have been utterly disappointed to find that they had made a great mistake.

In New Testament times, those who had the gift of tongues were forbidden to exercise it unless they had the use of an interpreter. "If any man speak in an unknown tongue—let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter let them keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself and to God." I Cor. 14:27, 28. It is hard to believe that the Holy Ghost is in the present Tongues movement, from the fact that they do not follow the Scriptures in their teaching and practices. The above is a plain command not to speak in unknown tongues if there be no interpreter, yet the people of the Tongues movement utterly ignore this command. They often jabber in the public congregation several at a time, and no one present who claims the gift of interpretation. And their teaching is that the Holy Ghost takes possession of their vocal apparatus and speaks through them. It would be hard to harmonize the statement of the Holy Ghost through St. Paul ("If there be no interpreter let him keep silence in the church." I Cor. 14:28) and the statement the Holy Ghost (?) makes through them. There is certainly a grave mistake somewhere. The Holy Ghost did not speak through Paul and forbid speaking in tongues in the absence of an interpreter, or else He does not speak in unknown tongues through these people when there is no one to interpret. It is not reasonable that the Holy Ghost would lay out a stipulated rule for speaking in tongues and then violate it Himself.

If the Tongues theory (that all who are baptized with the Holy Ghost speak in unknown tongues) is true, no

one could get the baptism with the Holy Ghost in a public gathering unless an interpreter was there, to tell what the Holy Ghost would say when he came. "For if there be no one to interpret let him keep silent in the church." But the Bible does not teach that all who receive the baptism speak in tongues, but to the contrary teaches that not all do. In I Cor. 12:7-11, the Holy Ghost gives the Bible teaching on the manifestation of the Spirit. "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal, for to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge by the same spirit; to another faith, to another the gifts of healing, to another the working of miracles, to another prophecy, to another discerning of spirits, to another divers kinds of tongues, but all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit dividing to every man severally as he will." And then the Apostle illustrates the differences in these gifts by the different members of the natural body for he adds (in verses 12 and 13) "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body, so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body." The manifestation of the spirit in this chapter is represented by the nine gifts. But the result of the baptism by the one spirit is that "oneness." Verse 13. "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body." The same result that Jesus said would come by sanctification; (St. John 17:17-23) and the Bible teaches in this chapter, I Cor. 12, that the speaking in tongues is no more evidence of the baptism than any one of the other eight gifts. They were all given by the same spirit to profit withal. And the Apostle makes an argument against giving one gift too much prominence, and

underestimating some other. He takes up the different members of the body to illustrate his argument, and compares these to the different gifts and offices in the Church. Verse 28, "For God hath set some in the church, first apostles; secondly, prophets, thirdly, teachers, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." Then he begins to ask the question, "Are all apostles? [What about it, were they? The answer is plain, we know they were not.] Are all teachers? Are all workers of miracles? Have all the gift of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?" To ask these questions is to answer them. This gives the attitude and work of the Holy Spirit relative to speaking in tongues, and positively teaches that they do not under the baptism with the Holy Spirit any more all speak in tongues, than all are apostles, prophets and teachers and workers of miracles. The manner in which he asked all these questions, based on his illustration of the relation of the members of the natural body, absolutely forces a negative answer to every one of them, and is the strongest affirmation that they who were all baptized by one Spirit into one body, did not any more all speak in tongues, than they were all apostles or all prophets, or teachers. Nor did they any more all speak in tongues than did they all interpret or had the gifts of healing or miracle working. And the offices and gifts were no more common to all the members individually of this Holy Ghost baptized crowd than the functions of one member of the natural body are common to all the members of the body. That simply means that it would be as reasonable to expect one to hear with the eyes and smell with the ears and see with the nose, etc., as that all who receive the baptism with the Holy Spirit speak in tongues,

or that any other of the gifts should be common to all. And we note he did not say, "Do all have the gift of tongues?" but he said, "Do all speak with tongues?" and he was talking about those of them who had been baptized by one Spirit into one body. I Cor. 13: 12-31. And the unavoidable answer is a negative one. They did not all "speak in tongues." But the Tongues theory is that all who receive the baptism speak in tongues, and that a failure to speak in unknown tongues is in itself evidence that one has not received the baptism.

Hence the Bible versus the Tongues theory.

NEASE LIBRARY EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE  
 BL54 .N4 1946X  
 Neely, Benjamin Fra/The Bible versus the  
 3 2999 00024 5949

GOULD LIBRARY  
 EASTERN NAZARENE COLLEGE

DATE DUE

1 July 88			
NY 22 '95			

Gould BL 54 N4 1946x 552  
 Neely, B. F.  
 The Bible versus the tongues  
 theory.

DATE	ISSUED TO
1 July 88	ILL / McAtister Library
NY 22 '95	Jonathan Stotler <i>AS</i> 841

Gould BL 54 N4 1946x 552  
 Neely, B. F.  
 The Bible versus the tongues  
 theory.

