

---

---

**Chapter 12.14**

**Legitimate & Alarming  
Explanations for Modern Tongues**

---

---

**Table of Topics**

- A) The Importance of Discerning the Source of Modern  
“Tongues”**
- B) The Certainty of Fraud**
- C) The Likelihood of Fleshly Influences**
- D) The Possibility of Demonic Influences**

*Extras & Endnotes*

### **Primary Points**

- Jesus Christ the King was referring to *glossaism* when He commanded that “**when you pray do not keep on babbling like the pagans.**”
- The Apostle Paul attempted to rid the Corinthian assembly of the pagan version of tongues because of its deceptive and dangerous consequences.
- Because the modern version of “tongues” does not match the biblical version, *glossaists* are guilty of a great fraud and the great sin of lying.
- In the 1970’s the American Lutheran Church and the National Institute of Mental Health conducted a ten year extensive study of the modern tongues phenomenon concluding it was merely a “learned phenomenon.”
- At the very least, modern *glossaism* constitutes perhaps the biggest fraud ever experienced by the Church.
- The addictive, purely emotional, and egotistical nature of modern tongues reveals it to be of the self-centered flesh.
- The fact that modern *glossaists* claim their practice makes them feel better means nothing, as so does running, weightlifting and Budweiser.
- The Apostle Paul was concerned about the influence of demons in the Corinthian worship services
- There are documented cases of modern *glossaism* resulting from demon possession.
- It was a demonically inspired miracle that formed the foundation of modern *glossaism*.
- The *Encyclopedia of Occultism & Parapsychology* states that, “In medieval times speaking in a foreign language unknown to the speaker was one of the four principal signs of the presence of a demon.”
- Although it would be inaccurate to consider all tongues manifestations today as “demonic,” it is rather alarming that something that was automatically labeled as such for over 1500 years of Church history, is now accepted without the slightest suspicion by millions of our Christian brothers and sisters today.

## A) The Importance of Discerning the Source of Modern “Tongues”

We have claimed and attempted to demonstrate in this book of *Knowing Our God* that the modern version of the gift of tongues is unbiblical and that the real version ceased operating c. 350. Even those who would agree with this position may suggest that the issue is not important enough to debate about. They might say, “Let the *glossaists* have their ‘prayer language,’ there is no harm in it.”

On the contrary, we have offered biblical evidence that Jesus Christ the King was referring to *glossaism* when He commanded that **“when you pray do not keep on babbling like the pagans.”** Babbling in incoherent gibberish was being widely practiced by the pagans at the time in the Greek mystery religions and it seems very likely that this was precisely what Christ was referring to, which would also condemn the modern version of tongues. <sup>1</sup>

Likewise, we have noted that when the Apostle Peter gave his instruction for prayer he said, **“think clearly and control yourselves so you will be able to pray”** (1 Pet 4:7 NCV). He did not seem to conceive of a mindless habit of prayer such as claimed by modern *glossaists* as such a great gift from God. Accordingly, the Apostle Paul told the Corinthians he would never merely **“pray in a tongue”** with his human **“spirit”** leaving his **“mind . . . unfruitful.”** Rather, he said he would always **“pray with [his] mind”** (1 Cor 14:14-15) also.

Neither the King nor the Apostles allowed Christians a mindless “prayer language.” Accordingly, we provided evidence that the Apostle Paul desired to stop the pagan variety of tongues in the Corinthian Church. <sup>2</sup> And it was precisely because its presence either resulted in mindless, fruitless activity, gross fraud in the Christian assembly, or fleshly, if not demonic influences in the Church. The same is true today, which we attempt to demonstrate here.

## B) The Certainty of Fraud

*Glossaists* today insist that the modern version of tongues is an authentic, biblical, spiritual gift from God. Yet the fact that it does not match the biblical gift of tongues, and they can train anyone to do it, <sup>3</sup> denies them the right to put such a glorious and supernatural label on something that may be potentially demonic and damaging, and at the least, not supernatural at all.

In the early 1970's the American Lutheran Church and the National Institute of Mental Health jointly commissioned John Kildahl, a clinical psychologist, and Paul Qualben, a psychiatrist, to conduct a ten year extensive study of the modern tongues phenomenon. Their conclusion was that it was nothing more than a "learned phenomenon."<sup>4</sup>

Drs. Kildahl and Qualben also suggested that tongues speaking can be psychologically induced, particularly through motor automatism (the deliberate disassociation of voluntary muscles, like vocal chords, from conscious control). It is interesting to note that when people are being taught to speak in tongues they are instructed to deliberately give up control of their speech.

The study also suggested that modern *glossaists* were among those who are particularly susceptible to hypnotism. The researchers wrote:

Hypnotizability constitutes the *sine qua non* [essential thing] of the glossolalia experience. If one can be hypnotized, then one is able under proper conditions to speak in tongues."<sup>5</sup>

Similarly the study concluded that people who were particularly submissive, or susceptible to the power of suggestion were most likely to be *glossaists* as well.

Along these lines, the great British Bible teacher and doctor, D. M. Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981) wrote concerning the psychological studies that had been conducted on *glossaism*:

What they can demonstrate is that under hypnotism you can make people speak in other languages which they know nothing about and of which they have never heard. And there are people who can hypnotize themselves and make themselves do this without invoking the spiritual realm at all. Purely on the level of psychology, you can reproduce certain spiritual phenomena, such as speaking in tongues by auto-suggestion and auto-hypnosis or by the reviving of something that is deep down and lost in the memory, something of which the man is no longer conscious can be brought to the surface again. There are extraordinary phenomena along that line.<sup>6</sup>

For those who have questioned what the Kildahl and Qualben study exposed about modern *glossaism* in the 1970's, NT scholar Luke Timothy Johnson, notes that other researchers have found the same things, both then and more recently:

Glossolalia appears to be a mimetic behavior; that is, new speakers in tongues follow the patterns of sounds uttered by the lead glossolalist. (J. P. Kildahl, "Psychological Observations", in *The Charismatic Movement*, ed. M. P.

Harrington [Eerdmans, 1975], 355; M. K. Mayers, "The Behavior of Tongues," in *Speaking in Tongues: Let's Talk about It*, ed. W. E. Mills [Word, 1973], 112-27).

Not surprisingly, extroversion, the ability to be hypnotized, and a willingness to submit to authority, are positively correlated with the experience (J. P. Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues* [1972], 50-53; Kildahl, "Psychological Observations", 353, 365; H. N. Maloney and A. A. Lovekin, *Glossolalia: Behavioral Science Perspectives on Speaking in Tongues* [Oxford University Press, 1985], 77; H. E. Gonsalvez, *The Theology and Psychology of Glossolalia* [Northwestern University, 1978], 107; M. T. Kelsey, *Speaking with Tongues: An Experiment in Spiritual Experience* [Epworth Press, 1964], 220).<sup>7</sup>

These conclusions have also been produced by secular studies of modern *glossaism* in both "Christian" and non-Christian contexts around the world. Accordingly, the standard reference *Encyclopedia of Religion* reports:

Self-reporting by ethnographic consultants and observation of their behavior indicate the presence of a changed state of consciousness during glossolalia, ranging from minimal to quite intense. Therefore, the cross-cultural agreements in the features of glossolalia is attributed to [what is] collectively and popularly called trance, and glossolalia can be defined as a . . . speech automatism that is produced [by] the trance. . . .

As the foregoing characterization of glossolalia indicates, we probably need to view trance as the primary behavior . . . and into which the practitioner switches with the help of a large variety of stimuli, such as singing, dancing, clapping, and drumming. Present research suggests that this trance—a frenzy, rapture, ecstasy, or in more neutral terms, an altered state of consciousness . . . releases tension, thus accounting for the beneficial effects of the experience.

Observation of Christian and non-Western religious communities alike indicate that apparently anybody with a normal physical endowment is able to initiate this process and to switch into a trance. An association between trance and glossolalia is now accepted by many researchers as a correct assumption.<sup>8</sup>

John MacArthur likewise relates findings of an additional study on the tongues phenomenon:

[A] recent study conducted at Carleton University, Ottawa, demonstrated that virtually anyone can learn to speak in

tongues with minimum instruction and modeling. Sixty subjects who had never spoken in tongues or heard anyone else do it were used in the experiment. After two brief training sessions . . . all the subjects were asked to attempt to speak glossolalia. . . . Every subject in the test was able to speak passable glossolalia . . . and seventy percent were able to speak it fluently.<sup>9</sup>

It should not be missed that many of those who are enticed to learn *glossaism* do so under peer pressure and at a time when they are otherwise emotionally distressed about something. Accordingly, even the pro-*glossaist* Richard Quebedeaux warns:

Kildahl, in his ten-year investigation, found that glossolalia often results in a continuing submission to the authority of the "leader" who introduced the phenomenon to the speaker, and a satisfying sense of acceptance following that submission. He reports that in over 85 per cent of the cases examined, a personal crisis of some kind preceded the initial experience of speaking in tongues.<sup>10</sup>

Even if tongues were actually shown to be merely a harmless cultural practice that is not clearly condemned in Scripture, this entire evaluation of modern tongues would still be necessary. This is because *glossaists* insist on labeling their practice as the same miraculous Holy Spirit-empowered gift of being able to speak in foreign human languages. Unfortunately, they are lying. Both to themselves and their brothers and sisters in Christ. There is no evidence whatsoever that their "gift" of tongues comes from the Holy Spirit, but there is a lot of evidence that they are simply learning to do it. Accordingly, at the very least, modern *glossaism* constitutes perhaps the biggest fraud ever experienced by the Church.

Modern *glossaists* are lying about their "gift" and lying in the Church is something the King takes very seriously. He killed Ananias and Sapphira for pretending something that wasn't true (cf. Acts 5:1-11), and the NT is full of commands not to lie (cf. Eph 4:25, Col 3:9, 1 Tim. 1:10, 13), and even teaches that no true Christian will be gripped by this sin enough that they might be called "a liar," for such people are damned to Hell (cf. Rev 21:8, 27 22:15). Therefore, all modern *glossaists* should obey the Apostle's command that if there is not a miraculous and authentic interpretation of the human language they will speak with their "gift" of tongues, then they had better silently and merely mentally mutter their gibberish to themselves in order to avoid the sin of lying that they actually have the gift of tongues.

## C) The Likelihood of Fleshly Influences

Modern *glossaism* not only encourages the sin of lying, but there would seem to be several other temptations of the flesh that are the real source of it. Along these lines, Ben Byrd, a former *glossaist* writes:

To say that speaking in tongues is a harmless practice and is all right for those who want to IS AN UNWISE position when information to the contrary is evident. . . . *Speaking in tongues is addictive.* The misunderstanding of the issue of tongues and the habit, plus the psychic high it brings, plus the stimulation of the flesh, equals a practice hard to let go of. <sup>11</sup>

Likewise, George Gardiner, a pastor and former *glossaist* who left the Pentecostal movement, relates the possibly tragic emotional and psychological consequences of opening oneself to unbiblical experiences like the modern version of tongues:

Such experiences not only give satan an opening he is quick to exploit, they can be psychologically damaging. . . . Charismatic writers are constantly warning tongues-speakers that they will suffer a letdown. This is ascribed to the devil and the reader is urged to get refilled as soon as possible. . . . So the seeker for experiences goes back through the ritual again and again, but begins to discover something; ecstatic experience, like drug-addiction, requires larger and larger doses to satisfy.

Sometimes the bizarre is introduced. . . . Eventually there is a crisis and a decision is made; he will sit in the back seats and be a spectator, "fake it," or go on in the hope that everything will eventually be as it was. The most tragic decision is to quit and in the quitting abandon all things spiritual as fraudulent. The spectators are frustrated, the fakers suffer guilt, the hoping are pitiable, and the quitters are a tragedy. No, such movements are not harmless! <sup>12</sup>

Mr. Byrd's claim that speaking in tongues is addictive suggests that in some cases, at least, it is simply a thing of the flesh. It is interesting to note the Apostle's warning to the Corinthians in the midst of his attempts to discourage their pursuit of speaking or praying in an unknown tongue: "**Brothers, stop thinking like children. In regard to evil be infants, but in your thinking be adults**" (1 Cor 14:20, to confirm the context see vs. 14-19). It can be suggested that a seeking after of emotional experiences, in the face of biblical truth not to, is a sure sign of spiritual immaturity,

which is exactly what the Apostle thought of the Corinthians (1 Cor 3:1-3).

There is little doubt that modern *glossaism* is purely an emotional experience, absent of any rational thought, and such things can easily involve the sinful, self-centered flesh rather than the always others-oriented, mind-involving Holy Spirit. The fact that modern *glossaists* tell us that their practice makes them feel better and relieves stress means nothing, as so does running, weightlifting and Budweiser.

Elsewhere we have written on the spiritual dangers of emphasizing emotions at the expense of rationality.<sup>13</sup> Nonetheless, *glossaist* exalt the emotional release that occurs in mindless *glossaism*. For example, the *glossaist* Michael Green writes:

Perhaps one of the areas of profit that we may need to be reminded of in an over-cerebral age is this: [praying in an incoherent tongue] allows the human spirit to pray, even when the mind is unfruitful because it cannot understand (I Cor. 14:14). Many people pray in tongues while driving a car or washing up - their mind can be employed elsewhere. Clearly, therefore, tongues is a valuable gift for private edification. It can bring a profound sense of the presence of God, and lead, as a result, to a release from tension and worry, and a deepening of love and trust. As the Holy Spirit leads the believer in such prayer, there is often a deep sense of being in harmony with God.<sup>14</sup>

Several questions arise. If modern *glossaism* leaves "the mind . . . unfruitful" how can it bring any "private edification" of any valuable kind? We have addressed this rather absurd notion elsewhere.<sup>15</sup> Secondly, if the mind and understanding are not operating in a modern tongues experience, then how in the world can the person know they are experiencing "the presence of God" or a "harmony with God"? All that is being experienced is emotion, and without the understanding it is impossible for them to know the source and cause of that emotion.

In the end, this is all arrogant and self-deceiving presumption. We're sure the pagans who have practiced the same gibberish in ancient temples and modern voodoo dances have just as confidently presumed to be experiencing the presence of God as well.

Along these lines, we would repeat the words of D. M. Lloyd-Jones:

Do not be swayed even by the fact that something . . . makes you feel wonderful. You may say, 'Well now surely anything that makes me feel greater love to God must be

right.' Robert Baxter, to whom I have already referred in connection with the Irvingite movement, used to say that he had never felt so much love, the love of God in his heart, or so much love in himself to God as he did at this period. He was ready to leave his wife and family for God's sake. He was filled with a sense of the love of God, he said, that he had never known before, but he came to see that it had all been misleading him.

So we must not judge even in terms of such feelings. You may say, 'I have never known such love, I have never known such peace, I have never known such joy.' The people who belong to the cults will often tell you exactly the same thing. So we must not rely upon our own subjective feelings. Do not dismiss them or discount them, but do not rely upon them. Do not say, 'I feel this is right, everything in me says this is right, all my Christian spirit.' It is not enough. The devil is as subtle as that. Remember our Lord's word—'If it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.'<sup>16</sup>

An additional temptation of the flesh certainly comes into play with modern tongues as well. It was demonstrated elsewhere that showy, supernatural, and "mysterious" abilities were considered a measure of spiritual maturity and power in the Corinthian church, like the nearby pagan temples.<sup>17</sup> This would have been especially attractive to the egotistical, immature, selfish Corinthians.<sup>18</sup> This was precisely why the Apostle *rebuked* them when he wrote "**He who speaks in a tongue edifies himself**" (1 Cor 14:4).<sup>19</sup>

Not surprisingly, several researchers have observed the same psychological and sociological egotism surrounding modern *glossaism*. Accordingly, Quebedeaux notes:

One of the characteristics invariably noted by new tongues speakers was a greater sense of [social & psychological] power. This took the form of a stronger sense of identity and self-confidence in interpersonal relations.<sup>20</sup>

Of course a positive spin can be given to such things, but we must remember that our identity must come from our position in Christ, not the possession of a spiritual gift, and certainly not a fake gift. And it is not "self-confidence" that Christ is looking for "in interpersonal relations," but self-sacrificial love, which has nothing to do with the self-centeredness of *glossaism*.

The pro-*glossaist* researcher H. Newton Maloney concedes in his entry to *Charismatic Experiences in History* that several studies of modern *glossaism* have revealed its function as an egotistical, self-centered practice of those trying to fit in and feel valued:

Pattison <sup>21</sup> . . . reported that there were class differences in his research. Overt psychopathology seemed to be present more often among lower class glossolalics than among middle and upper classes. This accorded with the insight of Boisen, <sup>22</sup> among others, that glossolalia functioned as a status symbol among the isolated and dispossessed.

Hine <sup>23</sup> termed this the disorganization-deprivation theory. Where society was fluid and changing and where a group of people were not succeeding in moving up the socio-economic scale, there glossolalia would be expected to be a compensatory act designed to overcome isolation and lack of status. Boisen, Johnson, Lanternari, and Pattison all concluded that in marginal socioeconomic groups certain religious expressions served as substitutes for lack of achievement.

Another interesting tendency reported by Hine was an inclination for second generation glossolalics to speak in tongues less frequently than their parents who tended to come from denominations where it was devalued.

It has also been suggested that in middle class groups glossolalia meets group goals rather than personal needs. It is more a matter of social conformity than of compensation for [personal self-esteem] loss. <sup>24</sup>

Likewise, NT scholar L. T. Johnson summarizes similar conclusions from such studies:

For the most part, while the experience of tongues has a [socially] integrating effect on the individual, it also fosters among those who practice glossolalia a sense of elitism that proves disruptive in communities. (M. T. Kelsey, *Speaking with Tongues: An Experiment in Spiritual Experience* [Epworth Press, 1964], 223, 231). Despite his overall positive evaluation of tongues, M. T. Kelsey emphasizes their tendency to breed arrogance and elitism in the individual, and consequently divisiveness within groups. . . .

It is certainly conceivable that the party spirit of [the Corinthians] could be correlated with the sociopsychological tendencies of submission to authority figures, elitism, and divisiveness attributed to contemporary glossolalists. Such speculation is given some support by I. M. Lewis's classic study of spirit possession and shamanism (*Ecstatic Religion*, [Routledge, 2003]). Lewis makes no mention of glossolalia. But he does demonstrate how, in cultures that have a generalized belief in transcendental spiritual powers, claims to

the possession of such powers have specific sociological implications.

In particular, spirit possession serves to empower groups otherwise marginal within a society. "In its primary social function, peripheral possession thus emerges as an oblique aggressive strategy. The claim to spirit possession does not rupture relationships but helps vent frustrations among those who do not enjoy overt power within the group. Such claims would understandably have more appeal among the lesser orders, enabling them functionally to destabilize a given authority structure while also grasping a share of power by providing what is, in such contexts, an obvious status enhancement."<sup>25</sup>

It is this fleshly status-seeking in the Christian community that probably explains why an estimated 75% of modern *glossaists* are women. Perhaps they do not accept the God-ordained male authority roles in the home and Church and seek to subvert it through claiming superior spiritual experiences.

## D) The Possibility of Demonic Influences

We have already noted that the Apostle Paul was concerned about the influence of demons in the Corinthian worship services.<sup>26</sup> In fact, he feels the need to tell these Corinthian Christians that "**I do not want you to be participants with demons**" (1 Cor 10:20) which is evidently something Christians can do if they allow pagan practices in their worship services. This is precisely why in 1 Corinthians 12-14 he is trying to help them distinguish between pagan/demonic worship and Christian worship (cf. 12:1-3). Accordingly, we have quoted C. Fred Dickason, former Chairman of Theology at Moody Bible Institute elsewhere as commenting:

The Corinthians [and the Church today!] were . . . naive and presumptuous. They supposed all miraculous tongues were of God. Paul reminded them that they should have been aware of demonically induced tongues, having observed them while in their former pagan life. This supernatural phenomenon is well known today among pagan religionists. . . . Paul concentrated on their error in overemphasis on the gift of tongues, which caused neglect of the greater edifying gifts and gave satan the occasion to infiltrate these believers with a demonic counterfeit.<sup>27</sup>

We have also noted the fact that the modern tongues phenomenon has been observed in several non-Christian environments. Accordingly, the following quote from the *Encyclopedia of Religion* is worth repeating:

Glossolalia (from the Greek *glosse*, “tongue, language,” and *lalein*, “to talk”) is a nonordinary speech behavior that is institutionalized as a religious ritual in numerous Western and non-Western religious communities. Its worldwide distribution attests to its antiquity, as does its mention in ancient documents. . . . There are references to it in the [Hindu] Vedas (c. 1000 BC), in Patanjali’s *Yoga Sutras*, and in Tibetan Tantric writings. Traces of it can be found in the litanies (*dhikrs*) of some orders of the Islamic Sufi mystics. . . .

[Tongues speaking] occurred in some of the ancient Greek religions and in various primitive religions. . . . Paul urged restraint in the practice . . . since such a spectacular spiritual gift could be abused. Edification, as opposed to personal satisfaction, was set as the test of acceptable glossolalia. If the meaning could not be disclosed, Paul regarded it with suspicion. . . .

In the circumpolar region, many shamans [witch doctors], among the Intuit [Eskimo] . . . use their religious ritual’s secret languages that consist of a mixture of nonsense syllables. . . . [T]hese secret trance dialects are taught by the master shamans [witch doctors] to their neophytes. . . . From Africa we have reports of a secret religious trance language used exclusively by women. . . .

When speaking in tongues . . . if the pronouncement is in nonsense syllables, as, for instance, among Christians speaking in tongues or among the nomadic, reindeer-hunting Chukchi of Siberia, an “interpretation” may be provided. . . .

The case of Anneliese Michel brings up the question of what kinds of religious experience are commonly expressed by glossolalia. In her case, the experience was that of [demonic] possession, and glossolalia was the voice, the “language,” of the demons that she reported were possessing her.

[Demonic] Possession is one of the most frequent [religious worship] ritual occasions for the use of glossolalia. In possession, an entity from the sacred dimension of reality is experienced as penetrating the respective person . . . for instance, those of the dead of the Trobriand Islanders, ancestral spirits in Africa, and various spirits in Haitian Voodoo—have pronounced personality traits that are expressed in glossolalia. . . .

Communication by glossolalia is instituted not only with

unfriendly beings, of course. On a tape recording made in Borneo a female healer can be heard calling her helping spirit [and this is a *friendly* being?]. In the *zar* cult of Ethiopia, the shamans talk to the *zars* [spirits] in a “secret language.” The shamans of the Semai of Malaysia use glossolalia to invite the “nephews of the gods” to a feast, and the Yanomamo Indians of Amazonia chant while in a trance to their *hekura* demons, calling them to come live in their chests”<sup>28</sup>

Such reality concerning tongues demonstrates the importance of understanding and applying the Bible’s teaching on the topic. Dr. Kurt Koch, a Christian theologian, clinician and author who is well known for his work and studies in demonology, also provides several examples of what he views as “demonic tongues” and then warns:

These examples should serve as a warning to all those who put so much stress on speaking in tongues. There are so many possessed people, spiritistic mediums, and magicians in the world today with an ability to speak in tongues derived from demonic sources rather than from the Holy Spirit, that seeking this gift for ourselves can be a very dangerous occupation.<sup>29</sup>

One is reminded of several non-Christian cults that ardently promote and practice *glossaism*. One example would be The Way International, founded by V. P. Wierwill, who among many other heresies, denies the deity of Christ, or that the Holy Spirit is a distinct but equal member of the Godhead, but ardently promotes speaking in tongues. Likewise, the United Pentecostal Church, better known as the “Jesus Only” movement also denies that there is a God the Father and God the Holy Spirit, but would claim that the proof that they are “spirit-filled” is their tongues speaking and other manifestations unique to *charismaticism*.<sup>30</sup> Clearly these phenomena are not being empowered by the Holy Spirit in these non-Christian contexts. And if they are not of the Holy Spirit, then what is their source?

Professor Robert Gromacki writes in his landmark study entitled *The Modern Tongues Movement* of the experience of a former missionary to China who became convinced that the tongues phenomenon was demonic:

Raymond Frame, a former missionary to China, attended a Chinese Pentecostal service in which there was a definite appeal to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit accompanied by the physical evidence of speaking in tongues. During his attempt to receive this experience, Frame came to the

conclusion that the power of Satan, not of God, was operating in his life. Here is his complete testimony:

“When one of my missionary associates standing beside me suddenly became agitated and began shouting loudly in excellent Chinese, leaping and waving his arms and obviously under the control of a power quite beyond himself, my resistance weakened. I didn’t want to be left out of the blessing that he was receiving. I let my mind become quite blank and began yielding myself to the external power outside myself that seemed to be pleading for full control of me.

At once a feeling of paralysis began to numb my feet. It soon affected my legs. I knew that before long I too would be lying helplessly on the floor as were several others in the crowd. At the instant the numbness reached my knees, I became alarmed. “This thing is coming upon me, not from heaven, but from beneath. This is the wrong direction,” I thought to myself.

Without a moment’s hesitation I cried out, “May the blood of Christ protect me from this thing!” At once it vanished and I was normal again. A month later I met that co-worker of mine at another place. He appeared to be a sober and chastened man. “You know Ray, that thing that happened to me that night wasn’t of God. It was of the devil.” . . . My friend then described the spiritual darkness into which he was plunged, following that ecstatic experience.”<sup>31</sup>

We should take note here that the deceived missionary actually and miraculously spoke “in excellent Chinese.” In other words, such an ability can be duplicated by demons in order to deceive people, and such a phenomena is well attested in occultic environments.<sup>32</sup>

Here we are reminded of how modern *glossaism* began. On the first day of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Agnes Ozman, under the teaching of the heretical and racist Charles Parham, miraculously spoke and wrote Chinese. In our opinion, it was a demonically inspired miracle to form the foundation of perhaps the most deceiving, divisive, and damaging movement the Church has ever known.

While we have noted the potentially demonic nature of miraculously speaking in a foreign language, here we will address the definitely demonic nature of Ms. Ozman’s *automatic writing*. The testimony of this foundational event of *glossaism* includes a claim that, “when she tried to write, only Chinese characters would emerge from her pen.” While there is nothing biblical about such a phenomenon, it has been witnessed in demonic environments. The

*Encyclopedia of Mystical & Paranormal Experiences* has the following on this phenomenon:

*Automatic writing* is the act of writing while in a dissociated or altered state of consciousness. Automatic writing sometimes produces astounding results that seem to be beyond the ordinary knowledge or ability of the writer. Many occultists say automatic writing is the product of communication with a discarnate being. Psychical researchers generally believe it comes from the writer's own subconscious mind, or perhaps from information obtained through extrasensory perception (ESP).

Automatic writing is the most common form of automatism, or unconscious muscular movement often attributed to supernatural guidance. Most automatic writers want either to communicate with the dead or to contact a highly evolved discarnate [spiritual] being who will dispense wisdom.

In some cases automatic writing happens involuntarily, as in the case of Anna Windsor. In 1860 Windsor, a hysteric who suffered fits of delirium, began automatic writing with her right hand, which she derisively called "Stump." Stump had a personality of its own, writing out verses and prose while her left hand did other things.

The writer usually is unaware of what is being written. Some people experience a tingling sensation in the arms or hands. Typically, automatic writing is far more rapid than normal writing; as a consequence many words are joined together. The script is larger and more expansive than the writer's own script, and in some cases has duplicated the handwriting of the deceased person who has been contacted. .

. .

Automatic writing was used a great deal during the height of Spiritualism [i.e. 18<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> century occultism], when mediums found it to be a better means of communicating with the dead than the laborious methods of rapping or the planchette (the precursor of the Ouija). . . .

From the mid-nineteenth century and early decades of the twentieth century, many people attempted automatic writing as a way to communicate with dead friends and relatives. Numerous literary works were produced through automatic writing from unknown discarnates who suddenly announced their appearance. . . .

Automatic writing continues to be used in modern times in attempts to reach the dead or discarnate beings. It was used in the early twentieth century in the famous "psychic excavations" of Glastonbury, England. Automatic writing has

periodic upswings of popularity, influenced to a great extent by popular authors on the occult.

Critics warn of dangers in automatic writing. According to some, the writer is vulnerable to harassment or possession by demonic spirits and the evil-minded dead. . . .

Problems associated with motor automatism [like automatic writing] include compulsion, obsession, and a feeling of possession. The automatism may go out of control until a person feels taken over by it. Some people who experiment with automatic writing, inviting communication from any entity who cares to answer, say they feel possessed by demons who torment them mentally and physically, even rape them. . . . The effects usually disappear in time, or after an exorcism. . . .

<sup>33</sup>

The fact that *automatic writing* is closely associated with demonic possession, and has no biblical support, makes it particularly alarming that it was a fundamental phenomenon at the very beginning of the modern *glossaist* [tongues] movement.<sup>34</sup>

Accordingly, the warning of Dr. Lloyd-Jones is important:

There are such things as phenomena belonging to spiritism. I have no difficulty in believing this, because I believe the whole of spiritism is the manifestation of the work of evil spirits. There are evil spirits who can produce phenomena and can do amazing things. . . .

In other words there is no question—and it has been reported and established many times over—that in spiritism you have people who can speak in tongues. Evil spirits can make people speak [and write] in strange tongues and languages that people do not understand. They can counterfeit the speaking in tongues produced by the Holy Spirit. To all appearances they appear to be identical. Not only that, but there is no question that healings can happen in the realm of spiritism. This again has been checked by careful observers and people who do not believe in spiritism at all.<sup>35</sup>

Therefore, unfortunately, the otherwise astute Thomas Edgar is wrong when he claims, “A miraculous, immediate ability to speak previously unknown foreign languages is unknown in paganism.”<sup>36</sup> On the contrary, this miracle has been observed in demonic contexts many times.

Accordingly, based on his experiences in the mission field, Raymond Frame was to later write:

Evil spirits can easily find opportunity to operate in the believer’s emotional life—especially when the believer is

persuaded to suspend all intellectual activity and to yield his will over to an invisible intelligence (whom the Christian, of course, is persuaded to regard as being the Holy Spirit Himself). For this reason the child of God who becomes preoccupied with that least of all gifts, tongues, places himself in a particularly vulnerable position in relation to the danger of demon depression, obsession, or actual possession.<sup>37</sup>

More recently, several authors in the spiritual warfare movement have voiced their concern regarding the connection between demonic influences in Christians' lives and the tongues phenomenon specifically. C. Fred Dickason, former Professor and Chairman of the Theology Department at Moody Bible Institute is an example of a man who is highly respected, both as a Christian scholar, and an expert in demonology. His balanced and biblical approach to the subject is revealed in his book, *Demon Possession and the Christian*.

In one section of the book, Dr. Dickason shares some of the counseling experiences that he and others have had with what he believes to have been authentic Christians. Dr. Dickason adds that these excerpts can be confirmed by either tape recordings of the sessions or written confirmations of the counselees, all of which he has on file. A few of these sessions seemed to involve demonic influence in a Christian's life through seeking the experience of speaking in tongues. For example, Dr. Dickason writes of a young lady he calls Alice:

She came to me complaining of harassment of her thoughts . . . Her need for acceptance had led her at one time to a charismatic group that practiced speaking in tongues. They laid hands on her that she might receive the gift, and she had a "tongues experience." She had taken that as a sign of God's acceptance and practiced it sometimes in public meetings and sometimes in private, thinking it gave her meaning and relief.

. . .

She asked God to show her the truth about her tongues experience. . . . I then commanded that if there were any tongues spirit present he would come to the fore and answer me as I claimed the authority of the crucified, risen Savior. A tongues spirit did manifest itself in sullen fashion. It resisted me but did confess that it had come in through the laying on of hands. It took the occasion to come in to give her what she desired [a false, worldly sense of acceptance apart from Christ] and to lead her astray. . . . Alice had rejected his false acceptance and the false sign of acceptance, the tongues, and

acknowledged her full acceptance by Christ apart from tongues or any works of human effort.<sup>38</sup>

Similarly, Dr. Dickason writes of a young lady he calls Carla:

I remembered her telling me of the laying on of hands by elders of a charismatic Lutheran church. I immediately suspected a tongues spirit. . . . I continued, 'Tongues spirit, are you the one who came in at that church?' 'Yes' came the forced, clear answer. . . . 'You came in to give Carla what she wanted didn't you?' 'Yes,' came the weakling answer. 'What was it that she wanted back then? Tell me!' A pause. Then the spirit stated, 'She wanted a real spiritual experience with God.' 'How did she seek it?' I asked. Another pause. 'Through the baptism of the Holy Spirit.' 'Who laid hands on her?' 'Men of the church.' 'What did they promise her through the laying on of hands? What did they tell her she would have?' 'That she'd have a fulfilled life with the Lord,' he said. 'What was to be the evidence of this?' Came the answer, 'The speaking in tongues.' . . . 'Why did you come in?' 'It was an opportunity for me.'<sup>39</sup>

This is not some sensational kook that is testifying to these counseling experiences, but rather one of the foremost Christian scholars on the topic of demonism, teaching at one of the most respected Christian institutions of our day. His concerns, and the similar concerns of many others, should not be hastily brushed aside, because if there is any truth to them this is a very serious matter.<sup>40</sup>

Mark I. Bubeck, pastor, popular author, and noted counselor of demonized persons shares the following warning in his classic book *The Adversary*. After sharing some historical information regarding what he feels were demonically influenced phenomena during the Welsh Revivals and commenting on Christ's warning of demonic counterfeits, he shares his own warning:

The tendency in revival or any spiritual movement is to accept all supernatural manifestations as being authored by God. Such a tendency, according to these warnings of our Lord [Mt. 24:24-25], is very dangerous. This is why the Word of God calls upon believers to test the spirits to measure and evaluate with care that which appears to be good. As stated earlier, the Holy Spirit will not be offended by this trying of the spirits. He is the One who told us to do it.

This is one of the reasons I am greatly concerned about some segments of the Charismatic movement, with its broad emphasis upon the baptism of the Spirit and the experience of

speaking in tongues. A spirit of caution is rarely heard by proponents of Charismatic gifts.

Luke 11:11-13 and Matthew 7:9-11 are often used to prove that there is no danger of wicked powers deceiving when you are asking for the Holy Spirit and good gifts from God. What is forgotten is that this same Lord is the One who urged us to try the spirits and to believe not every spirit. If I seek some experience which does not have a sound biblical foundation, I am opening my life to some deceiving spirit to come as an angel of light. . . . All experience must be measured and understood in the light of the truth of the Word. Error that is contrary to God's Word must be repudiated, renounced, and removed from one's life and practice, or Satan will soon move in advantage against him.

I have many friends and loved ones who are ardent advocates of the Charismatic movement and do not see the dangers I seek to bring to view. I do not mean this expressed caution to be a blanket condemnation of the movement or of them. However, I have had to deal with too many oppressed and afflicted people, who have opened their lives to demonic forces while seeking some supernatural experience, not to sound the alarm.<sup>41</sup>

So we see that speaking in tongues can certainly be a demonic experience, which is why the *Encyclopedia of Occultism & Parapsychology* states that, "In medieval times speaking in a foreign language unknown to the speaker was one of the four principal signs of the presence of a demon."<sup>42</sup> This was not only because of the centuries-long absence of the authentic gift of tongues in the Church as noted above, but because all of the known examples of it occurring then were in demonic settings. Although it would be inaccurate to consider all tongues manifestations today as "demonic," it is rather alarming that something that was automatically labeled as such for over 1500 years of Church history, is now accepted without the slightest suspicion by millions of our Christian brothers and sisters today.

When the truth is fully known on that Day, we believe it will be recognized by all that modern *glossaism* was simply a successful means by which satan infiltrated the lives of Christians and the Church resulting in all kinds of demonic fruit including false pride, deceptive spirituality, a pursuit of satisfying the flesh, and a multitude of split churches and divisions within the Body of Christ. All in the name of a move of the *Holy Spirit*.

## **Pastoral Practices**

- The King warned us that **“many”** of those who **“prophesy . . . and . . . drive out demons and perform many miracles”** in the Church, even as they proclaim His **“name,”** will be demonically empowered **“evildoers”** deceiving themselves and others (Matt 7:22-23). The Apostle warned that there would be **“deceitful workmen”** in the Church, **“masquerading . . . as servants of righteousness”** but who would actually be demonic plants. This is because **“Satan himself”** is eager and able to **“masquerade as an angel of light”** (2 Cor 11:13-14). This is why the Apostle Peter warned us to, **“Be self-controlled and alert. Your enemy the devil prowls around like a roaring lion looking for someone to devour. Resist him, standing firm in the [sound doctrines of the] faith”** (1 Pet 5:8).

With these biblical warnings in mind, why would it surprise us that demonic counterfeit people and experiences would infiltrate Christian worship practices on a massive scale as it has through *glossaism*?

We as pastors need to heed these biblical warnings and understand that satan and his servants and deceptions can infiltrate our church as well.

---

## ***Extras & Endnotes***

---

### **A Devotion to Dad**

*Our Father, we again ask You to help us “ride forth victoriously in behalf of truth, humility and righteousness” (Ps 45:4) in regards to all harmful and unbiblical error in Your Church. Give us victory over our enemy of deception, help us stand for the truth, act with humility, and produce more righteousness in Your Church, all to make Your Church more pleasing to You.*

### **Gauging Your Grasp**

- 1) Why do we claim that modern *glossaism* is a major and serious fraud in the Church? Do you agree or disagree and why?
- 2) What do we claim are typical, fleshly, self-centered aspects of modern *glossaism*? Do you agree or disagree and why?
- 3) What evidence do we provide for claiming that modern *glossaism* can be demonic? Do you agree or disagree and why?

### **Publications & Particulars**

- 
- <sup>1</sup> For further discussion of what we believe to be the King's condemnation of *glossaism* see section 12.11.C.
  - <sup>2</sup> For further discussion of the Apostle Paul's desire to rid the Corinthian Church of the pagan variety of tongues being practiced in the local temples of the Greek mystery religions see chapter 12.7.
  - <sup>3</sup> For further comment on the *glossaists* habit of teaching people their "gift" of tongues see section 12.4.C.
  - <sup>4</sup> John Kildahl, *The Psychology of Speaking in Tongues*, (Harper and Row, 1972), 74.
  - <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 54.
  - <sup>6</sup> D. M. Lloyd-Jones, *The Sovereign Spirit: Discerning the Gifts* (Harold Shaw, 1985), 66
  - <sup>7</sup> L. T. Johnson, *Religious Experience in Earliest Christianity: A Missing Dimension in New Testament Studies* (Augsburg Fortress, 1998).
  - <sup>8</sup> *Encyclopedia of Religion (ER)*, Mircea Eliade ed., 16 vols., (Macmillan Publishing Co., 1987), V.562-64.
  - <sup>9</sup> John MacArthur, *Charismatic Chaos* (Zondervan, 1992), 293.
  - <sup>10</sup> Richard Quebedeaux, *The New Charismatics: The Origins, Development, and Significance of Neo-Pentecostalism* (Doubleday, 1976), 202.
  - <sup>11</sup> Ben Byrd, *The Truth About Speaking in Tongues* (Brentwood, 1988), 49 (All caps were in original and italics were added for emphasis).
  - <sup>12</sup> George E. Gardiner, *The Corinthian Catastrophe* (Kregel, 1974), 55.
  - <sup>13</sup> For further discussion of an over-emphasis on emotions in spirituality see chapters 4.8-11 and section 4.6.C.

- 
- <sup>14</sup> Michael Green, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* (Eerdmans, 2004).
- <sup>15</sup> For further discussion of the unbiblical and inhuman idea that spiritual edification can occur apart from our understanding see section 12.10.C.
- <sup>16</sup> Lloyd-Jones, 68.
- <sup>17</sup> For further discussion of the use of the modern version of tongues in the temple worship of the Greek mystery religions of the first century see section 12.7.A.
- <sup>18</sup> For further discussion of the spiritual selfishness and immaturity of the Corinthians, which played into their practice of the pagan variety of tongues, see section 12.6.C.
- <sup>19</sup> For further discussion of the proper interpretation of Paul's charge that speaking in an incoherent tongue edifies the self (cf. 1 Cor 14:4) see section 12.6.C and 12.10.A.
- <sup>20</sup> Quebedeaux, 202-03.
- <sup>21</sup> M. Pattison, "Behavioral Science Research on Glossolalia," *Journal of the American Scientific Affiliation* 20 (1968): 73-86.
- <sup>22</sup> T. Boisen, *Religion in Crises and Custom: A Sociological and Psychological Study* (Harper, 1955).
- <sup>23</sup> H. Hine, "Pentecostal Glossolalia: Toward a Functional Interpretation," *JSSR* 8 (2, 1969): 211-226.
- <sup>24</sup> H. Newton Maloney, "Debunking Myths about Glossolalia" in *Charismatic Experiences in History*, Cecil M. Robeck Jr. ed. (Hendrickson, 1985), 104
- <sup>25</sup> Johnson, 127-8.
- <sup>26</sup> For further discussion of the Apostle's concern of demonic influences in the Corinthian worship service see chapter 12.7.
- <sup>27</sup> C. Fred Dickason, *Demon Possession & the Christian* (Crossway, 1987), 126.
- <sup>28</sup> *Encyclopedia of Religion*, V:562-565. (underlining added for emphasis). Thomas Edgar claims that the 14th edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* also describes some obviously demonically controlled instances of tongues speaking ("The Cessation of the Sign Gifts," *Bsac* 145 (1988), 219).
- <sup>29</sup> Kurt Koch, *Occult Bondage and Deliverance* (Kregel, 1970), 134.
- <sup>30</sup> For a definition of *charismaticism* see endnote in chapter 12.1.
- <sup>31</sup> Robert Gromacki, *The Modern Tongues Movement* (Presbyterian & Reformed, 1967), Appendix III.
- <sup>32</sup> See the article on "Xenoglossy" in the *Encyclopedia of Occultism & Parapsychology*, J. Gordon Melton ed., 4th ed., 2 vols. (Gale Research,

---

1996).

- <sup>33</sup> "Automatisms" in *Harper's Encyclopedia of Mystical & Paranormal Experience*, Rosemary E. Guiley (Harper Collins, 1991), 46-48
- <sup>34</sup> Regarding the fact that *automatic writing*, which is closely associated with demonic possession, and has no biblical support, was a fundamental phenomenon at the very beginning of the modern *glossaist* [tongues] movement, see section 12.13.F.
- <sup>35</sup> Lloyd-Jones, 65
- <sup>36</sup> Edgar, 154.
- <sup>37</sup> Raymond Frame, "Something Unusual" in *His* magazine, (December 1963), 26.
- <sup>38</sup> Dickason, 189.
- <sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 194-195. Dickason adds:  
Although we do not accept the testimony of demons as the truth of God, there are times when they are forced to tell the truth as they did when confessing that Jesus was the Son of God. The demon's statement is only confirmation of what we had discovered before. His forced admission was significant. (*Ibid.*, 191).
- <sup>40</sup> Not surprisingly, some *glossaists* have attempted to deny even the possibility that their experience could be demonic. For further discussion of their arguments see section 12.7.B.
- <sup>41</sup> Mark I. Bubeck, *The Adversary* (Moody Press, 1975), 129-130.
- <sup>42</sup> *Encyclopedia of Occultism & Parapsychology*, 1423.