

## Neo-Pentecostalism Fallacies

William Woodson

---

William Woodson, born September 9, 1931, is a native of Jasper, Alabama.

He began preaching at Christian Chapel, Walker County, Alabama, on September 9, 1950, after which he attended David Lipscomb College in Nashville.

He received his A.A. degree from Freed-Hardeman College in 1954, and returned to complete the third year Bible program. While receiving his training at Freed-Hardernan, Woodson preached for the Shiloh Church of Christ in Walker County, Alabama, the Nauvoo Church, and the Piney Grove congregation near Tuscumbia, Alabama.

In 1953 Woodson married the former Jeanne Creasy of Jackson, Tennessee. They have three children, Melissa Ruth, 16; Bill, 14; and Allison, 7.

He received the B.A. degree from Union University, Jackson, Tennessee; and the M.A. from Harding Graduate School of Religion, Memphis, Tennessee.

Woodson returned to Freed-Hardeman in 1959 to teach Bible and on three different occasions has served as acting chairman of the Bible Department and twice as lectureship director. He began his present chairmanship of the Bible Department in June, 1971. He is also presently serving as director of the 1973 lectureship.

The scholar holds the Th.M. degree from New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary.

Woodson's versatility in writing and preaching has provided the basis for his numerous articles in *Minister's Monthly*, *Power for Today*, *Twentieth Century Christian*, *Words of Truth*, *Spiritual Sword*, and *Gospel Advocate*.

---

One may make two serious blunders as he approaches neo-Pentecostalism. He may assume the case of the neo-

Pentecostalist cannot be argued well with the result that he is ill-prepared and underestimates his opposition. Or he may assume the amount of material to be studied is so immense and some of 'the arguments so plausible that he concludes the neo-Pentecostal case is invincible and thus he makes only a half-hearted attempt to respond. Either blunder will prove to be serious, if not disastrous.

The proper approach would seem to be a thorough study of all aspects of the Pentecostal case with a firm conviction that, though capable of strong defense in the hands of an able advocate, it is erroneous in its essential and peculiar emphases. Basic to such awareness of error is a knowledge of several fallacies of the movement. This study will state and respond to several of the most obvious of the fallacies of the group.

The following fallacies, by no means all one might note, are deemed of major significance in refuting the Pentecostal case. An attempt will be made to indicate general lines of refutation and provide a bibliography and footnotes of value.

#### I. DIRECT OPERATION OF HOLY SPIRIT IS GIVEN TO MEN TO CONVERT AND SANCTIFY

Fallacy 1: The doctrine of salvation, as per the Pentecostal program, is false and counter to the Bible. Behind it lurks the very serious error that God sends the Holy Spirit directly to the sinner or the Christian in order to conversion and/or sanctification. Here Restoration leaders have done battle for many years. Alexander Campbell's debate with Rice, T. W. Brents' *Gospel Plan of Salvation*, the *Hardeman-Bogard Debate*, the *Porter-Tingley Debate*, and hundreds of other encounters with denominationalists, Pentecostal or otherwise, have demonstrated the Holy Spirit operates through and only through, in and only in conjunction with the word of God to save sinners and develop Christians in godliness.

The theory of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit grows out of the false doctrines of Calvinism-total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement (Christ

died for the “elect” only), enabling grace (direct work of Holy Spirit), and perseverance (once saved, always saved). On a thousand battlefields men among us, living and dead, have fully exposed and opposed the mistakes of this system. Men stand ready now to expose and oppose the same mistakes today. At its tap root the first and greatest fallacy of the Pentecostal system is here ; here it must be fought without quarter. If one proves the Holy Spirit works today in conversion and Christian development in, through and by the word of God alone-and it is confidently affirmed such has been and can be done again-the entire Pentecostal system falls. If the Pentecostal cannot prove—and indeed he cannot-that the Holy Spirit today works directly, immediately, without means, to convert sinners and to “sanctify” Christians, all his subtle distinctions, his clever fitting of “conditions,” and his emotionalism go for nothing. Let it be clearly understood: *here is the most basic fallacy*. To yield ground here is to make a fatal blunder.

The direct operation of the Holy Spirit position has been met in a four-pointed counter argument. It may be sketched as follows with details left to be filled in from debates and other books. (1) The first step has been and is to deny the distinctive Calvinistic positions of depravity, limited atonement, unconditional election, enabling grace and perseverance. If the Calvinistic position, particularly as to total depravity, is false, there is *no* reason to argue a case which historically and logically was manufactured to make the perversions of Calvinism acceptable options. Here the whole “revival” movement, from Jonathan Edwards to Billy Graham, has erred and here the Pentecostals are repeating the same mistakes. (2) The second step is to show that faith which results in and entails obedience is taught in and produced by the Bible. One is to hear and believe what the Bible teaches. This produces faith to become a Christian and to live the Christian life. Thus the Bible supplies faith which works by love to become and develop as a Christian. (3) The third step is to refute the arguments of the direct operation advocate, point by point. This usually takes the course of noting the context

for an additional, explanatory thought, of noting a parallel passage which shows the mistake, of showing the position proves more than the advocate will admit, of showing the position contradicts an obvious truth, or a similar step. The direct operation argument cannot be made to stand such analysis and response. (4) The fourth step is to show that what the Bible attributes to the Holy Spirit in conversion and Christian growth is also attributed to the word of God. The conclusion is that the Spirit uses the word of God to convert the sinner and develop the Christian in his growth toward maturity. In this fashion the direct operation fallacy has been met and can be met again.

The debates and books noted, along with others, should be restudied on this absolutely essential point. Here denominationalists, accepting in some way or another the modified Calvinism of present religious thought, find themselves helpless to logically and Scripturally resist the Pentecostal case when urged by a competent advocate. Here many among us, lacking knowledge and appreciation for this truth, have erred and lost ground which could not be regained. Later, as the implications of their yielding to error became obvious, there was no adequate defense but there was rather a logical thrust to go further in the same direction. The result is to be read in ***The Acts of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ Today*** and similar works. To meet Pentecostalism, gospel preachers, young and old alike, must restudy and completely understand the truth of the work of the Holy Spirit in conversion and Christian growth only in and by the word of God. This is basic to a successful work of preaching and is fundamental to exposing the Pentecostal fallacies.

## II. PENTECOSTALISM NOT WORK OF GOD, BUT OF PSYCHOLOGY AND EMOTIONALISM

Fallacy 2: The Pentecostal assumes the entire process he envisions and defends-distinction between conversion and sanctification, "conditions," "Holy Spirit baptism," "tongues," and "gifts"-is a work of God and not a false doctrine the distinctive emphases of which are **psycho-**

logically and/or emotionally induced. Omitting for the present Scriptural points, some of which other lectureship speakers will discuss, there is an abundance of material which shows the psychological and emotional origin of the Pentecostal movement. Several studies have argued this psychological explanation with finality. Hoekema argued for a psychological explanation,\* so did William J. Samarin.<sup>2</sup> The most convincing study is that by John P. Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*. Noting such psychological characteristics as dependent and submissive relationships with authority figures (p. 50), speech and emotional regression (p. 53), relative ease of hypnotizability (p. 54), anxiety over a life crisis (pp. 57-59), low level of emotional stability (p. 59), a mechanistic view of how God can or could operate in the world (pp. 60-61), unwillingness to attempt to conceptualize or understand the "experience" in terms of the usual world (p. 61), a profound sense of worthlessness (pp. 63-64), the projection of anger (pp. 68-70), a love for bizarre, histrionic displays (p. 71), and an obsessive preoccupation with "tongues" (pp. 72-74), Kildahl came to this conclusion:

"Tongue-speaking does not look very uniquely spiritual to me after many experiences of watching people teach other people how to speak in tongues. I have observed the same routine everywhere I have been: (1) a meeting devoted to intense concentration on tongue-speaking, followed by (2) an atmosphere of heightened suggestibility to the words of the tongue-speaking leader, after which (3) the initiate is able to make the sounds he is instructed to make. It is the same procedure that a competent hypnotist employs. Like the hypnotist, the tongue-speaking leader succeeds with some subjects and with other does not. I have reached the conclusion that tongue-speaking is a learned phenomenon."<sup>3</sup>

The author's study of the booklet, *The Acts of the Holy Spirit in the Church of Christ Today* confirms the thesis of Kildahl. A few of the symptoms revealed in the writ-

<sup>1</sup>Anthony Hoekema, *What About Speaking in Tongues?* pp. 128-135.

\*William J. Samarin, "Glossolalia As Learned Behaviour" *Canadian Journal of Theology* (January, 1969), pp. 84-90.

<sup>3</sup>John P. Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*, p. 74.

ten work may be noted, with page references being given: Emotionally upset (pp. 12, 14, 15, 16, 19-20, 24, 25, 26, 32, 34, 41, 42, etc.) ; sought authority figure in Pentecostal Movement (such as Dennis Bennett, 27 ; Oral Roberts, 28 ; Harald Bredesen, 17; Justice Duplessis, 36 ; Demos Shakarian, 51, etc.) ; sought bizarre experience (pp. 5, 14, 17, 32, etc.) ; projected anger, especially toward churches of Christ (pp. 22, 35, 38, 42, 46, etc.). One could easily document most, if not all of the symptoms of emotional and psychological instability given by Kildahl by reading this booklet with alertness to this thought.

The significance of this is that the whole program is readily and adequately explained as a psychologically induced phenomena, produced by recognizable means, and palmed off as a Biblically based movement to people who know little about the Bible. The use of Bible verses is invariably to seek justification, in Bible terms, of an "experience" already undergone but which must be pushed and shaped to seem to fit Bible teaching.

### III. SANCTIFICATION (HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM) IS RESULT OF CONDITIONS

Fallacy 3. The third fallacy of Pentecostals is their view that sanctification is the climax of their whole process of conditions which result in "Holy Spirit baptism," "tongues," and "gifts," and is not to be received and achieved by obedience to God's word. A major mistake is the sharp distinction between justification and sanctification so that sanctification is subsequent to justification. Here it is that the quest for being "Spirit-filled" as distinguished from the ordinary believer begins. Here many of our people, particularly the young people, have become confused and have sought an instant "sanctification" instead of a growth in Christian graces.

Several works of significance should be considered in developing this thought. The *Nichols-Weaver Debate* focuses on this exact issue. H. Leo Boles, *The Spirit: His Personality, Nature, Works* (pp. 187-201, 210-217 especially) discusses sanctification in detail. Alexander Camp-

bell, *The Christian System*, Chapters XIX-XX, has some valuable insights. **One** will be well repaid to read the *Campbell-Rice Debate*, Proposition Fifth, pp. 611-758 on this vital subject.

On the subject of sanctification certain principles are to be noted. One is sanctified in or by truth (John 17: 17, 19); sanctification results from the work of Christ (1 Cor. 1: 30); it is for those who are in Christ (1 Cor. 1: 2); it is effected by faith (Acts 26: 18), it is by the will of God (Heb. 10 :10), by the blood of the covenant (Heb. 10 : 29), by the Holy Spirit (Rom. 15: 16; 1 Pet. 1: 2), by water and the word (Eph. 5 : 26); it involves setting aside Christ in one's heart as Lord (1 Pet. 3 : 15).

One notes with particular interest 2 Thessalonians 2: 13-14 and 1 Corinthians 6: 9-11. The former passage indicates one is called unto sanctification (as well as belief of the truth and salvation) by the gospel, the gospel which had been obeyed. (1 Thess. 1: 9-10; 2: 13; 2 Thess. 1: 8.) The gospel, therefore, brings one to sanctification in the same way it brings one to faith and salvation, by being heard, believed, and obeyed. The latter passage connects being washed, sanctified and justified as occurring together and at the same time; not as separated by weeks or years of eager and restless searching. Also, note that if the expression "by" or "in" the Spirit with reference to sanctification necessitates Holy Spirit baptism as the indispensable prerequisite, why does not the same expression with reference to "washing" and "justification" mean Holy Spirit baptism is the indispensable prerequisite with reference to these?

In the sense of devotion to God, one is sanctified, devoted to God, made holy as a child of God, a saint, at the time of his salvation. (1 Cor. 1: 2; 6: 9-11.) In the sense of being "changed into the image of the Lord" (2 Cor. 3 : 17), being transformed (Rom. 12 :1-2), and having Christ formed in us (Gal. 4 :19), there is a progress in Christian growth which may be termed sanctification and be understood as a progressive achievement moving toward perfection (Phil. 3: 12, 15-16; Heb. 6: 1). The development of this latter growth results from allowing the word of God, as given previously, to prompt and promote one in "perfect-

ing holiness" (2 Cor. 7 : 1), being sanctified "wholly" (1 Thess. 5: 23). The Christian is to "purge" himself of unrighteousness and follow righteousness, faith, love, peace, and every good work so that he might be "sanctified, meet for the Master's use." (2 Tim. 2: 19-22.)

There is, then, Christian growth, development, sanctification, perfection. But such is not achieved by a direct work of the Holy Spirit, as per Pentecostalism, but is the result of following the principle of God's word as to consecration and growth. (2 Tim. 3 : 16-17.) The Pentecostal case is completely false when it contends Holy Spirit baptism is consequent to justification, subject to certain "conditions," and antecedent to and productive of sanctification. Such indicates a lack of understanding of the purpose, the nature, and the result of Holy Spirit baptism in the Bible. It also indicates a complete mistake as to the nature and conditions of sanctification, and particularly the means whereby sanctification begins and develops in the Christian life.

#### IV. HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM TO BE RECEIVED BY PEOPLE TODAY

Fallacy 4 : The Pentecostal position contends Holy Spirit baptism, as in the first century, is to be received by those believers today who have complied with the requisite conditions. At this point, in Pentecostal theory, one reaches the ultimate objective of the whole movement, that without which the movement would lose its identity and distinctiveness. To fail here, for the Pentecostal advocate, is to lose the entire dispute. Here he must do or die, here he cannot yield or he fails at the crucial moment. It is here the fight becomes the fiercest.

Several works are of great value here. The *Nichols-Weaver Debate* has been mentioned. Of value also are such works as these: Foy E. Wallace, Jr., *Bulwarks of the Faith, II*, Chapter IV, "The Influence of the Holy Spirit"; James D. Bales, *Miracles or Mirages*, Chapter XII, "The Spirit Gave Different Gifts to Men"; Gus Nichols, *Lectures on the Holy Spirit*, pp. 87-154. The following summary

reflects frequent use of these and similar works as well as diligent study of the Bible itself.

1. The baptism of or in the Holy Spirit was discussed by John and Jesus. (Matt. 3 : 11-12, Acts 1: 5; John 3: 33-34.) Jesus was to be the administrator and the Holy Spirit was to be the "element" in which the baptism would take place. Boles concludes his definition of the expression baptism of the Holy Spirit by saying, "The baptism of John in water involved as its chief idea an overwhelming, a sudden and complete overpowering of the person submerged by water, and the entering into new conditions and relations, so the baptism of the Holy Spirit was to imply an equally entire subjugation and over-mastery of the soul by the Spirit."<sup>4</sup> J. W. McGarvey said of the apostles in Acts 2, "As the body, when baptized in water, is sunk beneath its surface and completely overwhelmed, so their spirits were completely under the control of the Holy Spirit, their very words being his and not theirs."<sup>5</sup> Nichols states,

"Now, the word "baptize" connected with the Holy Spirit carries with it the idea (although figuratively expressed) of the **amount of the Holy Spirit** given and received in the case. Our Lord's baptism of suffering implies the great amount of suffering he endured. The one baptized in debt was overwhelmed in the enormous amount of his debts. One baptized with questions was submerged or "drowned" in the multitude of inquiries. So likewise we refer to a certain large, voluminous measure (we might say) of the Holy Spirit when we talk about the **baptism** of the Holy Spirit."<sup>6</sup>

These thoughts indicate a bringing of the soul of the recipients of Holy Spirit baptism under the control of the Holy Spirit, and accordingly the conclusion is that the baptism in or of the Holy Spirit, in the New Testament, meant to receive that measure of the Holy Spirit which completely subjugated, mastered, overwhelmed the souls of the recipients and brought their souls under the mastery of the Holy Spirit. Jesus promised this to his apostles,

<sup>4</sup>Boles, *The Holy Spirit His Personality, Nature, Works*, p. 150.

<sup>5</sup>J. W. McGarvey, *New Commentary on Acts of Apostles*, p. 23.

<sup>6</sup>Nichols, *Lectures on the Holy Spirit*, pp. 89-90.

John had indicated Jesus would do the same. This promise was fulfilled.

2. The baptism of the Holy Spirit was promised to the apostles. (Acts 1: 5.) A careful reading of John 13-17 will indicate that the apostles, minus Judas after a time (John 13 :30), gathered with Jesus and were promised twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22: 30). They had been with him from the beginning (John 15 : 27) and were qualified to be his witnesses (John 15 : 27). He had chosen them. (John 15 : 16.) Jesus was to go to God (John 16: 5-7), but he was to send the Holy Spirit to bring things they had heard to their remembrance and to guide them into all truth (John 14: 25-26; 16: 13). To these apostles he later promised the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1: 5) whereby they would have "power" and be able to serve as "witnesses" (Acts 1: 8). It is of utmost importance to observe that the reception of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was not the result of compliance with "conditions" as the Pentecostal case maintains, but rather such reception was a promise as the future tense ("shall ...") and significance of the verses cited indicate. (Acts 1: 5-8 ; John 14 : 26 ; 16 : 13.) The grammatical connection between "they" and "them" in Acts 2: 1-4 with the apostles in Acts 1: 26, not the one hundred twenty (Acts 1: 15), confirms this line of reasoning ;so does the context of Acts 2: 1-41. The promise of Holy Spirit baptism was given to and received by the apostles on Pentecost.

Whatever Pentecostals have or have not received, it is not through compliance with "conditions" antecedent to Holy Spirit baptism as in Acts 2 since in Acts 2 no conditions antecedent to such reception were or had been given. Here the Pentecostal has a most awkward problem and it should be pressed vigorously.

3. The household of Cornelius received Holy Spirit baptism as the apostles had received it on Pentecost. The equality-meaning Holy Spirit baptism in both instances -of the two incidents is shown by several truths: the gift was poured out "also" on the Gentiles (Acts 10 : 45) ; the Holy Spirit was received "as well as we" (Acts 10: 47) ; it was a "like gift" (Acts 11: 17, the Greek word being *isos*,

see John 5 : 18 “equal”) ; the Spirit came “as” (*hosper*) at the beginning (Acts 11: 15) ; the Spirit came “as” (*kathos*) on the apostles (Acts 15: 8) ; and there was no difference (Acts 15: 9). These two incidents entailed Holy Spirit baptism, though the purpose and use made by the two groups of recipients, apostles and Cornelius’ household respectively, were different. Also, we should note that in explaining the incident Peter looked back to the “beginning” for a parallel or comparison with the incident at the home of Cornelius. (Acts 11: 15.) It is indeed strange that, assuming Holy Spirit baptism had been as common as the Pentecostal case would contend, from Pentecost until Acts 10, Peter did not say, “This is the usual thing all people should look forward to receiving and it is occurring all the time.” His looking to the “beginning” is correctly understood as implying no similar incident had taken place between Acts 2 and Acts 10. Thus, these two chapters (Acts 2 and 10) indicate unique incidents respectively, and one cannot find the Pentecostal case either in Acts 2 or 10, or elsewhere in Scripture.

4. The purpose of Holy Spirit baptism in the case of the apostles is briefly summed up in the statement that it empowered them to receive, preach, teach and confirm the gospel so that the cause of Christ might be established in the world. A more detailed statement of the reasons for their reception of Holy Spirit baptism may be found in Nichols, *Lectures on the Holy Spirit* (pp. 102-106), in which some 17 reasons for this reception were recorded.

The purpose of the reception of Holy Spirit baptism by the household of Cornelius was to confirm the fact that Gentiles were acceptable to God as were the Jews. God had implied this on Pentecost (Acts 2 : 39), but Peter and others had great difficulty accepting it even after several years. Peter was willing to say “Not so, Lord” (Acts 10 : 14) ; he was prohibited from doubting (10: 20) ; God “shewed” him the propriety of his action (10: 28) ; consequently he could “perceive” the truth God intended him to preach and practice. The six Jewish brethren witnessed the incident at Cornelius’ house (Acts 10: 23, 45-46; 11: 12) and later were with Peter as he explained the matter “from the be-

ginning” and “in order” (Acts 11: 4, 12). Peter’s explanation was that Cornelius stood as a representative of the Gentiles and had received the gift of the Holy Spirit (as the apostles, representatives of the Jews, had “at the beginning”) and this indicated the Gentiles were acceptable to God provided they would “fear God” and work “righteousness.” (Acts 10: 34; 11: 12-17.) The group in Jerusalem, having heard the account of Peter [thus showing an account of an incident involving a miracle can produce understanding and belief without a further miracle] “glorified God, saying, “Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life.” (Acts 11: 18.)

It is apparent, therefore, that the reason for the baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost and at the household of Cornelius was not to sanctify them, to draw them close to God, to remove an “Adamic sin” or a similar purpose attributed to Holy Spirit baptism by Pentecostals. Thus, at the essential point of the purpose of Holy Spirit baptism the Pentecostal case fails.

5. The recipients of Holy Spirit baptism, the apostles and the household of Cornelius, did not receive such by a process of “conditions” as per the Pentecostal claim. In the case of the apostles the baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost was the fulfillment of a promise (Acts 1: 5,8; 2: 33), and not the consequent reception of a blessing through conditions. In the case of Cornelius, no conditions were stated or implied, the result of which would be Holy Spirit baptism. By adding on a set of “conditions” which allegedly result in Holy Spirit baptism, the Pentecostals clearly indicate what they term “Holy Spirit baptism” and what the Bible identifies to be such were and are not the same.

6. It follows then, that the Bible records only two instances of Holy Spirit baptism. After the house of Cornelius there was no further record of such being received. Since the purpose of Holy Spirit baptism was fulfilled in the revealing and confirming of the word by the apostles and in the demonstrating of the acceptability of the Gentiles to God as subjects of the gospel ; since there were no conditions antecedent and contributory to Holy Spirit baptism;

and since there is no promise to others that they should receive Holy Spirit baptism, the conclusion is that Holy Spirit baptism was pertinent and unique to the New Testament age, there is no reason for such today, and the Pentecostal case is an error and perversion which falsely calls an entirely different experience-in nature, purpose, and "conditions"-by a Bible name when it is in truth not a Bible thing.

V. "TONGUES" ARE UNDERSTOOD TO BE  
ECSTATIC UTTERANCE

Fallacy 5: The Pentecostal case contends "tongues" in the expression "speaking on tongues" (*glossolalia*) means an ecstatic utterance, a prayer language, an angelic speech, or similar expression. Though some will contend for a "language," they mean "a language which God hears and understands,"<sup>7</sup> a "heavenly language," a "new language" which one "speaks directly to God in the Spirit in both prayer and praise."<sup>8</sup> Though there is some hesitation on the matter, when pressed," the general position is that of

Stanley H. Frodsham :

"The child of God is privileged to have speech with God and no man understands this secret speech, for the saint is allowed to speak in the language of Divinity-a language unknown to humanity. ... The humblest saint can enjoy supernatural converse with him who made the worlds, in a language not understood by man, or by the devil either."<sup>10</sup>

This issue of the nature of tongues has been given considerable attention. James D. Bales and Jimmy Jividen have clearly stated the case that tongues were languages.<sup>11</sup> Robert Gromacki offered eighteen arguments sustaining the following, "... the usage of *glossa* and the description of the phenomena in the New Testament reveal that only

<sup>7</sup>Larry Christenson, *Speaking in Tongues*, p. 27.

<sup>8</sup>Oral Roberts, *Personal Commentary*, pp. 692, 755.

<sup>9</sup>Brumback, *op. cit.*, p. 112, Note 1.

<sup>10</sup>Stanley Frodsham, *With Signs Following*, p. 242-243. Quoted by Anthony Hoekema, *What About Tongue Speaking?*, p. 44.

<sup>11</sup>James D. Bales, *Pat Boone and the Gift of Tongues*, pp. 71-136. Jimmy Jividen, *Glossolalia from God or Man?*, pp. 12-58.

speaking in known languages was involved."<sup>12</sup> The present author has called attention to two articles by Robert Gundry in which he (Gundry) argues "tongues" were and are to be regarded "as the miraculously given ability to speak a human language foreign to the speaker."<sup>13</sup>

The basic argument on "tongues" is to notice the occurrences of *glossa*, "tongue," and "*hermeneuo*" and its compounds, "interpret," which mean to speak and explain known languages. To this one adds the statements in 1 Corinthians 14 which indicate the need of being edified, understood, avoiding confusion, etc. ; and the allusion to the "other tongues" of foreigners in Israel. (1 Cor. 14: 21; Isa. 28: 11.) All of these, and other truths discussed in the books and articles cited above, indicate the "tongues" of the Bible were not some type of gibberish, but were human languages foreign to the speaker but human languages the speaker was empowered to speak by the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit.

An interesting and significant problem is faced by Pentecostals who argue for the "tongue" being a "language" rather than gibberish, as do Brumback<sup>14</sup> and Christenson.<sup>15</sup> The problem is to find someone, other than a Pentecostal or Pentecostal sympathizer, who is qualified as a linguist to verify that a "language" is being spoken. Several competent linguists have spoken to this point. William Welmers spoke as follows, after examining instances of "tongue speaking."

"And I must report without reservation that my sample does *not* (emphasis his, W.W.) sound like a language structurally. There can be no more than two contrasting vowel sounds, and a most peculiarly restricted set of consonant sounds; these combine into a very few syllable clusters which recur many times in various orders. ... Our evidence is still admittedly limited, but from the viewpoint of a

<sup>12</sup>Robert G. Gromacki, *The Modern Tongues Movement*, pp. 67-68, cf. pp. 53-68.

<sup>13</sup>William Woodson, "Acts 2 and First Corinthians 14" I & II, *Gospel Advocate*, January 20, 1972, pp. 35, 38, April 20, 1972, pp. 242, 248.

<sup>14</sup>Brumback, op. *cit.*, p. 112, Note 1.

<sup>15</sup>Christenson, op. *cit.*, p. 27.

Christian (Orthodox Presbyterian, W.W.) the modern phenomenon of *glossolalia* would appear to be a linguistic fraud and monstrosity. ... I do not accuse this alleged speaker in tongues of being deliberately fraudulent ; I rather believe (and the recording includes other evidence of this) that he is an emotional and possibly unstable mystic. ... When Christians publicize, propagate and endeavour to perpetuate an apparent manifestation of psychological instability and an obvious blasphemy as a special gift of the Holy Spirit, I cannot refuse to apply my knowledge and training to the problem. So far, I can only conclude . . . that modern *glossolalia* is a sad deception.““

To the same effect are the words of Eugene Nida, famous linguist of the American Bible Society. This authority stated of an example of “tongue speaking.”

“The types of inventory and distributions would indicate clearly that this recording bears no resemblance to any actual language which has ever been treated by linguists. ... On the basis of what I have learned about this type of phenomena of ‘tongues’ in other parts of the world, apparently there is the same tendency to employ one’s own inventory of sounds in nonsense combinations, but with simulated ‘foreign’ features.”<sup>17</sup>

It is obvious, then, that the phenomenon called “speaking in tongues” is not by any possible use of the term a “language.” Competent authorities have denied it to be such. Examples of a few Latin, German, Hebrew, etc. words or even phrases could not be cited as valid evidence since the person, consciously or unconsciously, could previously have been exposed to such speaking and this would not suffice for the claims made. “Tongues” in the New Testament were languages, the “tongues” of Pentecostals cannot be shown to be languages; and the ecstatic utterance idea cannot be made to fit the Bible account. In simple truth, the Pentecostal claim to “tongues” is false.

---

“William E. Welmers, “Letter to the Editor,” *Christianity Today* VIII (November 8, 1963), pp. 19-20. Welmers is professor of African Languages at University of California, Los Angeles. This has been recently confirmed by a letter from Welmers to the author, October 20, 1972.

“Quoted by Gromacki, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

## VI. MIRACULOUS GIFTS CONTINUE

Fallacy 6: The Pentecostal position contends the spiritual gifts of the first century are available-to those complying with the requisite conditions-to believers today. Pentecostal thought holds the "baptism in-or of the Holy Spirit" is the "gift" of the Spirit and that the "gifts" are granted subsequent to the "gift." Accordingly, those who have had the "gift" and who are "seeking" the "gifts" in the proper way may enjoy "the same supernatural workings which are everywhere apparent in the book of Acts."<sup>18</sup> These "gifts" are wisdom, knowledge, faith, healing, miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, tongues and interpretation of tongues." The similarity between the list by Riggs and the words of Paul is by design though false as to fact. The position of the Pentecostal then is that all the gifts mentioned in 1 Corinthians 12: 7-11 are available today, provided one meets the requirements.

In response to this position brethren have argued several positions which supplement and corroborate each other. The books already cited will provide the position argued and defended by brethren. The basic case has been to argue that except for the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which came directly from heaven to the apostles and the household of Cornelius, miraculous gifts came by the agency of the apostles who laid hands on various recipients and these in turn were miraculously endowed. Inasmuch as there are and can be no apostles today, such miraculous powers cannot be received today. The well done book by James D. Bales, *Miracles or Mirages*, discusses this subject in detail. This basic case is supported and confirmed by the fact that the miraculous gifts of the first century were to' come to an end at the time the New Testament was given in fulness.

Two general arguments may be noted on this latter thought. These are drawn from Ephesians 4: 8-13 and 1 Corinthians 13: 8-10. The latter passage has become something of a battleground of late and this increased interest will justify a treatment of the verses, in summary,

---

<sup>18</sup>Riggs, Concerning *Spiritual Gifts*, pp. 4-5, 72.  
*Ibid.*, p. ix.

even though another speaker will consider the subject in greater detail.

1. One should note that the nouns "prophecies," "tongues," and "knowledge" (verse 8) are used in the same way. This is shown by the fact that the two verbs (*katar-geo*, "shall fail" K.J.V., "shall be done away" A.S.V. and "shall vanish away" K.J.V., "shall be done away" A.S.V. and *pauo* "shall cease" K.J.V. and A.S.V.) are alike in that both imply some action taking place which is brought to a halt. Thus, by joining the nouns (prophecies, tongues, knowledge) and the verbs (as just noted), it becomes evident the reference is to the **act** of prophesying, the **act** of receiving or imparting knowledge and the **act** of speaking in tongues. The reference then is not to content or message, produced by the act, but the act or action itself in each case.

2. The two verbs (*katar-geo* and *pauo*, "fail" and "cease" respectively) are of major interest. *Katar-geo* (verse 8) means "to cause to cease, put an end to, do away with, annul, abolish," and in the passive "to cease, pass away, be done away."<sup>20</sup> References are (in the passive as in 1 Corinthians 13: 8) 2 Corinthians 3 :7, 11, 13, 14; Galatians 5: 11. Of the word Cremer states, "... it clearly signifies more than hindering, or cessation from outward activity, or to rest ... it signifies to make to cease." Concerning the verb and the preposition, *kata* (compound verb) Cremer states of Paul's use, "with him it always denotes a complete, not a temporary or partial ceasing. Elsewhere it signifies a putting out of activity, out of power or effect; but with St. Paul it is = (equivalent, W.W.) **to annihilate, to put an end to, to bring to nought; ...**"<sup>21</sup> The reference is, therefore, not to a temporary cessation for whatever reason with a "latter rain" concept of possible reinstatement as per Pentecostalism, but rather to a complete removal of the thing involved, in this instance "knowledge," "tongues," and "prophecy."

*Pauo* (in 1 Corinthians 13 : 8 in the future middle indicative) means "to cease, leave off."<sup>22</sup> References in the

<sup>20</sup>Thayer, *Lexicon*, p. 336.

<sup>21</sup>Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, pp. 260-261.

<sup>22</sup>Thayer, *Lexicon*, pp. 496, 497.

“middle” voice are Luke 8 : 24 ; Acts 20 : 1, and 1 Corinthians 13: 8. Other references, with a participle of the action or state desisted from, are Luke 5: 4 (middle) ; Acts 5: 43 (middle) ; Acts 6: 13 (middle) ; Acts 13 : 10 (middle) ; Acts 20 : 31 (middle) ; Acts 21: 32 (middle) ; Ephesians 1: 16 (middle) ; Colossians 1: 9 (middle) ; Hebrews 10: 2 (middle). These uses of **pauo**, in the middle voice, indicate the reference is to an action or state which up to a certain point was or is in progress but at a certain point was or will be made to cease, be brought to an end, come to an end.

The words are equivalent to each other in signification. This is shown by the fact both are translated “cease” as is shown by Thayer (pp. 336, 496, 497) ; **pauo** is translated “cease” in 1 Corinthians 13 :8 (K.J.V. and A.S.V.) and **katargeo** is translated “cease” or “ceased” Galatians 5: 11 (K.J.V., Moffatt, and Williams). Cremer adds in 1 Corinthians 13: 8, 10 that **katargeo** is synonymous with **pauo** in the passages.<sup>23</sup>

The conclusions which are drawn from this series of truths are as follows: (1) The verbs indicate an activity in progress which was to cease at a definite time. (2) The “ceasing” would be complete, once for all and not a temporary discontinuance. (3) No essential difference can be drawn from the fact that two verbs are used since for all practical purposes the verbs are the same in meaning, the differences being due to the nouns, not the nature of the activity of revealing God’s will through the gifts mentioned.

3. Two reasons for the cessation of spiritual gifts are given, one negative, the other positive. (Verses 9 and 10.) In verse 9 a **negative** reason is given, i.e., “for we know in part.” The term “for” (*gar*) is of significance in that it gives the reason for the lack of endurance in the previous verse. As a conjunction the term *gar* gives the reason for the preceding statement and is everywhere used in reference to something “expressly stated.”<sup>24</sup> The expression “in part” (**ek merous**) means in part, partially, i.e., imperfectly, and it is used “in express opposition to the idea of a com-

<sup>23</sup>Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon*, p. 261.

<sup>24</sup>Thayer, *Lexicon*, p. 111.

plete whole.”<sup>25</sup> Thus, the prophecies, tongues, and wisdom specified in the preceding verse were “in part” in express contrast with the whole which would consist of all the “parts” being given and collected. If that is not its meaning, the words have no real significance. This becomes increasingly important as the study proceeds. The negative reason is that the preceding activities were in part. One is reminded of Peter’s statements about the prophets (1 Pet. 1: 10-12), and the words to Paul in which Jesus indicated he would appear to him (Acts 26 : 16). The *positive* reason is given in verse 10, “when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.” The sentence continues the thought of verse 9 but makes a distinction so that a contrast is implied as is shown by “but” (*de*). The term “when” (*otan*) refers to things which will really occur, the time of which occurrence, however, not necessarily being known at the time of the statement.<sup>26</sup> “That which is perfect” (*to teleion*) was to come, and when it had come that which was in part would be done away.

*Negatively*, because in part, and *positively*, because that which was perfect, complete, hence better, was to come, the prophecies, tongues, and knowledge were done away.

4. The heart of the dispute turns on the meaning of “that which is perfect.” Several thoughts are of utmost importance.

a. That which is in part and that which is perfect must refer, logically, to the same realm. It is not possible, therefore, to have “that which is in part” refer to one level or kind of activity and “that which is perfect” to refer to an entirely different level or kind of activity. This would be to compare apples and horses and would reduce Paul’s points to nonsense.

b. “That which is in part” must refer to the activity or process involved in prophecy, tongues, and knowledge. A close comparison of 1 Corinthians 12: 8-10; 13: 2 (*echo propheteian*, to “have *the gift* of prophecy” A.S.V.), and 13: 8-10 indicates the expression “that which is in part” referred to the transmission, the activity of transmitting

<sup>25</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 401.

<sup>26</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 458.

divine truth by revelation, by the Holy Spirit. Thus, “that which is in part” referred to the transmission of divine truth by revelation.

c . “That which is perfect” must then, as per the observation above, refer to God’s complete revelation of truth, the entire New Testament. Verse 9 shows the knowing is “in part” and the prophesying, for example, is in part and refers to the giving and receiving of God’s revelation in a particular situation. When all God’s revelation (that which is perfect) had come, that which was in part, in God’s revelation, would be done away. Thus the expression “in part” and “perfect” referred to the revelation of God’s truth, the New Testament, the former referring to the communication of this truth in part, while in process, the latter to the truth in fulness, when the process had been completed.

d. “That which is perfect” refers to God’s complete revelation of truth, the entire New Testament. Jesus promised the Holy Spirit to guide into “all truth” (John 16: 16) ; Paul was told he would receive revelation as Christ appeared to him (Acts 26: 16-18). When all had been completed, that which was in part would be done away. An illustration would involve the thought that in building a house one uses ladders and scaffolds, but when the house is completed the ladders and scaffolds are taken away. Thus, when the New Testament was given in fulness, the revelatory and confirmatory gifts came to an end. (Mark 16 : 20 ; Heb. 2: 1-4.)

5. It is beside the point to argue, as some do, that the expression “that which is perfect” (*to teleion*) is neuter in gender and cannot, therefore, refer to the “covenant” (feminine), the “Scripture” (feminine), or the “word” (masculine), or the “law” (masculine). One might note in retort that one Greek term (*rhema*) is translated “word” (Matt. 4: 4; John 8: 47; 12: 48; Acts 5: 20; 11: 14; Rom. 10: 17; Eph. 6: 17) and is neuter in gender. The truth is that the neuter *to teleion* “that which is perfect” and *to ek merous* “that which is in part,” as has been shown, refer to the process of God’s revelation and serve to sum up the thought of the process, a summarizing or collective use of

the neuter singular which is common.<sup>27</sup> An interesting parallel is the use of “that (*touto*, neuter) not of yourselves” (Eph. 2 :8) referring not to “grace” (feminine) or “faith” (feminine), but, as even A. T. Robertson, a Baptist, admits, “**and that**, neuter, not feminine **taute**, and so refers not to **pistis** (feminine) or to **charis** (feminine also), but to the act of being saved by grace conditioned on faith on our part.”<sup>28</sup> This clever dodge is merely that and does not touch the essential point of the argument, namely, the process of revealing God’s truth was in progress (in part) in Paul’s day and would continue until it was complete (perfect) ; then those things which were in part-here represented by prophecy, tongues, and knowledge, the full list being given in 1 Corinthians 12-would be done away. Paul used the neuter singular because it was the precise construction which would gather up this thought of process in motion which would later be completed. Then the activities “in part” would be done away.

#### CONCLUSION

This study has noted and elaborated on six of the basic fallacies of the neo-Pentecostal movement. Various books of value have been noted. The neo-Pentecostal movement is built on a series of basic fallacies. Once these have been ferreted out and exposed the distinctives of the movement cease to be a serious problem. It is hoped the present article will contribute to this end.

---

<sup>27</sup>A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, pp. 409, 411.

<sup>28</sup>A. T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament*, IV, p. 525, (on Ephesians 2: 8).