

---

## Chapter 12.13

# The Historical Cessation of Tongues

---

### Table of Topics

- A) The Importance & Controversy Surrounding the Cessation of Tongues**
- B) Early Church:** *Condemnation of Montanism*
- C) Fourth & Fifth Centuries:** *Augustine: "it passed away"*
- D) Middle Ages & Reformation:** *Condemnation of Jansenists*
- E) 1700-1800's:** *Condemnation of French Prophets, Irvingites, Shakers, & Mormons*
- F) Early 1900's:** *Condemnation of Pentecostals*
- G) 1980's to present:** *Gaining political popularity*
- H) Summary of the History of Tongues**

*Extras & Endnotes*

### **Primary Points**

- References to the biblical gift of tongues were extremely rare in early Christian literature, with the last occurring c. 350. By the fourth century, such Church leaders as Augustine and Chrysostom were claiming the gift had ceased.
- Accusations that the gift of tongues ceased because of the suppression of early Church leaders is unfounded, and illegitimately denigrates all of the most God-glorifying Christian leaders and movements throughout over 1700 years of Church history, none of whom claimed the gift.
- The gift of tongues ceased c. 350 because the NT revelation had been distributed throughout Christianity in NT Scriptures and the gift's purpose of authenticating new divine revelation had ceased.
- The unbiblical version of the gift as practiced today was universally condemned by the Church c. 170 in the *Montanist* movement, including Mormonism, and throughout Church history until the 1980's.
- Every group throughout Church history after c. 350 that claimed the gift of tongues was thought to be heretical by the Spirit-filled Christians of their day.
- The Genesis of modern *glossaism* occurred on the first day of the 20<sup>th</sup> century under the ministry of a racist Ku Klux Klan advocate teaching heresy.
- It is a well-known fact that early 20<sup>th</sup> century *glossaism* was universally condemned as a fraud by all branches of Christianity.
- While excellent historical and biblical critiques of *glossaism* by Evangelical scholars in the 1960's have never been refuted, it has become so popular that modern Evangelicals find it hard to objectively assess such studies.

## A) The Importance & Controversy Surrounding the Cessation of Tongues

Elsewhere in *Knowing Our God* we have thoroughly discussed the historical fact of the cessation of *Scripture* and *sign gifts* (e.g. healing, tongues, prophecy).<sup>1</sup> While the historical evidence is rather clear, it is also rather hotly debated by *glossaists*<sup>2</sup> because of its damning effect on their practice. The history reveals that by around the year 350 A. D. the gift of tongues had ceased to operate. Early Church leaders at the time taught that this was due to the fact that tongues was a miraculous *sign gift* of new divine revelation which was no longer being granted because of the completion and distribution of the NT revelation.

This opinion prevailed universally throughout the Christian Church until *glossaism* gained popularity in the 1980's. *Glossaists* widely admit that the gift was absent from the Church for these 1600 years, but claim God has restored it. However, when the modern version does not match the biblical and miraculous version, other explanations for the modern one should be sought, which we do in the next chapter.

While we believe that the historical testimony regarding the ancient cessation of the gift of tongues in the Christian Church is both clear, conclusiveness, and significant, others have claimed otherwise. For example, Millard Erickson writes in his *Christian Theology* regarding this:

Nor is the historical evidence clear and conclusive. . . . Each group is able to cite an impressive amount of data that are to its advantage, bypassing the data presented by the other group. This lack of historical conclusiveness is not a problem, however. For even if history proved that the gift of tongues has ceased, there is nothing to prevent God from reestablishing it. On the other hand, historical proof that the gift has been present through the various eras of the church would not validate the present phenomena.<sup>3</sup>

First, regarding Dr. Erickson's opinion that there is a great deal of evidence on both sides of this debate and a "lack of historical conclusiveness" on this topic, we believe the following study will suggest otherwise. Secondly, contrary to Dr. Erickson, the historical fact that the gift of tongues *did* cease for many centuries in the Church *is* significant. No doubt, if *glossaists* theologians *could* present proof that the gift of tongues has "been present through the various eras of the church," it would obviously give some validation to their contemporary claims. It will be

demonstrated here, however, that they cannot. And by far the majority of Church historians, including *glossaist* ones, admit this.

Contrary then to *glossaism* is what we refer to as *historicism*. This is the belief that since the early Church, no one has demonstrated the biblical attributes of the miraculous *Scripture* and *sign gifts* (i.e. prophecy, healing, tongues), as evidenced by the universal testimony of the Church for almost 1700 years, and therefore, these gifts do not exist today.

While *glossaist* and *historicist* historians agree that these gifts ceased in the early Church, they differ on the all important question of why these gifts, including tongues, ceased. Elsewhere in *Knowing Our God* we discuss the primary reason offered by *glossaists* who admit the gift of tongues ceased in the early Church.

<sup>4</sup> Their claim is that this occurred because early Church leaders suppressed it. Besides the lack of any historical evidence for such a thing, it is difficult to believe that if the gift was a private prayer language given by the Holy Spirit, that Church leaders would be able to stop at least its private use. The fact is, no respected leader of the Church believed the gift came in this form until very recently, yet even the modern version was absent except among groups deemed to be heretical by the majority of the Church.

Along these lines, Professor Douglas Judisch, formerly at Concordia, has written:

[*Glossaist*] contend that the lapse of the [gift of tongues] at one or more points in the history of the church was only temporary, caused by spiritual deterioration in Christendom, and that God has now in these last times restored the most spectacular powers in abundance to His people.

As an initial response to this assertion, we for our part are unprepared to grant to the "tongues-speakers" of today a measure of spiritual maturity greater than that attained by Augustine and Chrysostom and all the other holy preachers and teachers, missionaries and martyrs, who for almost nineteen centuries have considered speaking in tongues a thing of the past.

Much less are we ready to admit that the participants in the Charismatic movement are more open to the Spirit than was Doctor Martin Luther, whom God prepared and sent forth as His special messenger to proclaim an eternal gospel to those who dwell on earth. . . . If God were going to give spectacular gifts to anyone in postapostolic times, surely He would have bestowed them upon the man whom He raised up to restore to His church the apostolic doctrine. Yet the Reformer, so far from exercising [miraculous] gifts, repeatedly denounced those who laid claim to them.<sup>5</sup>

Instead of illegitimately and rather arrogantly condemning centuries of Church leaders and Christians as unspiritual and disobedient, and being the cause for the absence of the gift of tongues, it is better to look at its biblical purpose and discover why it ceased. As we have demonstrated elsewhere, the biblical gift of tongues was the miraculous ability to speak in a real human foreign language for the purpose of authenticating new divine revelation, particularly to the Jews.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, we can readily understand why the gift ceased c. 350, which is the same time that the NT documents had been widely copied, recognized, and distributed, and other gifts of new revelation such as apostles and prophets had ceased as well. In other words, as discussed elsewhere, with the completion of the miraculously authenticated NT, there was and is no longer a need for the gift of tongues.<sup>7</sup> In fact, we argue elsewhere that the Apostle Paul predicted this very thing when he wrote:

**Love never fails. But where there are prophecies, they will cease; where there are tongues, they will be stilled; where there is knowledge, it will pass away. For we know in part and we prophesy in part, but when [the completed thing] comes, the [incomplete] disappears.** (1 Cor 13:8-10)

It is a historical fact that at the time that the NT revelation was substantially recognized, copied, and distributed is the same time the early Church testified the gift of tongues had ceased. Accordingly, because we do not believe the Apostle was a false prophet, we believe his prediction was accurate, and this is just one of several reasons to believe that the "**completed thing**" he was referring to was the NT revelation.<sup>8</sup> Contrary to the claim of *glossaists*, the Apostle Paul did not predict these gifts would cease because they would be suppressed by church leaders.

We would not wish to put God in a box, and perhaps He could initiate a period of new miraculous revelation needing new miraculous authentication.<sup>9</sup> But the fact that the *Scripture* and *sign gifts* being claimed today do not match the attributes of those described in Scripture, proves that they are not operating today, including the gift of tongues.<sup>10</sup>

Elsewhere as well we discuss and reject the primary "biblical" evidence claimed by *glossaists* for the return of the gift of tongues. This is referred to as the "Latter Rain" theory and can be demonstrated to be based on a very loose interpretation of Joel's prophecy to the Jews that God will bless their crops with the normal cycle of rainfall *after* the Second Coming of Christ.<sup>11</sup>

Obviously, historical facts can never dictate our understanding of the Word of God. All history can do is possibly confirm the correct interpretation of Scripture, and it is suggested here that history will always do just that. If our interpretation of Scripture regarding these miraculous *Scripture* and *sign gifts* (e. g. knowledge, prophecy, healing, tongues, etc.) is correct, and they were given to accomplish the reception and authentication of the OT and NT revelations, then we would expect history to reflect the fact that as that process was accomplished, these gifts did indeed cease. Therefore, although Church history does not prove a cessationists interpretation of the Bible, it will be demonstrated here that it certainly reflects it.

Regarding Dr. Erickson's claim of bias in historical studies of the cessation of the gift of tongues, we would simply offer the evidence below. We are not aware of evidence that would be to the contrary, and neither are the Church historians we cite. And again, even most *glossaists* themselves admit the conspicuous absence of any tongues manifestations in the Church, including the modern, unbiblical version. Nonetheless, we believe we have seen a great deal of "grasping at straws" by *glossaists* to come up with evidence for the historical operation of tongues.

First, any allusions to the modern unbiblical version of an obscure private prayer language must be rejected just as they were by contemporary Church leaders. Secondly, we would agree with D. A. Carson who comments on "the rising number of historical studies by charismatics . . . to prove that the gift of tongues has always been operative" and says:

These works tend to ignore the major doctrinal [heresy] and other variations that frequently mar the witness of the relatively small numbers who have espoused "charismatic" positions and practices [in Church history]; they tend to milk what evidence there is without evenhanded weighing of the proportion, frequency, theology, and influence of the groups they examine.<sup>12</sup>

Indeed, the conclusion of John MacArthur will be demonstrated below:

All of those supposed manifestations of tongues were identified with groups that were heretical, fanatical, or otherwise unorthodox. The judgment of biblically orthodox believers who were their contemporaries was that all those groups were aberrations.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, it should be said that the vast majority of Church historians, whatever their opinion on the gift of tongues may be,

agree that there was at least a drastic, and relatively swift decrease in the manifestations of the NT gift of tongues after the Age of the Apostles.<sup>14</sup> Accordingly, very few *glossaists* who know their history would disagree with Dr. E. G. Hinson, a Professor of Church History, who after a thorough study of the tongues phenomena concluded:

Glossolalia has not enjoyed wide currency until recent times. The first sixteen centuries of its history were lean ones indeed. Although we find several references in the early Fathers, they leave us in little doubt about the apparent insignificance of tongues in their day. . . .

Then, if the first five centuries were lean, the next were starvation years for the practice in Western Christendom and doubtful ones in Eastern Christendom. The few scattered references to it are dubious in themselves and made even more dubious by the characteristic credulity [gullibility] of the Middle Ages.<sup>15</sup>

## **B) Early Church: Condemnation of Montanism**

Perhaps the earliest mention of miraculous spiritual gifts outside of the NT comes from Bishop Ignatius (c. 107) who describes the church in Smyrna as “endowed with every spiritual gift” suggesting the miraculous ones as well. Nonetheless, the absence of references to the gift of tongues in his relatively extensive writings is conspicuous and instructive, compared with its claimed purpose and emphasis in *glossaism* today.

Another early mention of the *Scripture* and *sign gifts* is in the writings of Justin Martyr (c. 150) in his apologetic piece to the Jewish unbeliever Trypho. Justin writes:

Some are becoming disciples in the name of Christ, and quitting the path of error; who are also receiving gifts, each as he is worthy, illumined through the name of this Christ. For one receives the spirit of understanding, another of counsel, another of power, another of healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of God.<sup>16</sup>

Here we can see several miraculous gifts listed in 1 Corinthians 12 such as knowledge and wisdom (1 Cor 12:8<sup>17</sup>), miracle working and healing (vs. 9-10), and prophecy (v. 10). However, in spite of this extensive traveling and teaching, Justin has nothing to say regarding the gift of tongues. Even though he is writing an apology to a Jew!

It would seem that the earliest mention of the gift of tongues outside of the NT in early Christian literature comes from Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, who writes (c. 180):

We do also hear many brethren in the church, who possess prophetic gifts, and who through the Spirit speak all kinds of languages, and bring to light for the general benefit the hidden things of men, and declare the mysteries of God. <sup>18</sup>

Notice that while Irenaeus acknowledges the operation of the gift of tongues into the second century, he does not describe it as an unintelligible and private prayer language, but as a source of divine revelation like prophecy.

Around the same period, the very influential early Church leader Tertullian (c. 160-225) wrote:

[L]et him [the heretic Marcion] produce a psalm, a vision, a prayer -- only let it be by the Spirit, in an ecstasy, that is, in a rapture, whenever an interpretation of tongues has occurred to him. <sup>19</sup>

Again, Tertullian believed the gift of tongues was a source of public divine revelation, not a private prayer language.

Likewise, the controversial Church leader in the East named Novation (c. 240) wrote:

This is He [Christ] who places prophets in the Church, instructs teachers, directs tongues, gives powers and healings, does wonderful works, offers discrimination of spirits, affords powers of government, suggests counsels, and orders and arranges whatever other gifts there are of charismata. . . <sup>20</sup>

Many have thought this is the last reference to the operation of the gift of tongues in early Christian literature, including the pro-*glossaist* Ronald Kydd.<sup>21</sup> However, as we will note below, Hilary of Poitiers (c. 315-367) would seem to imply their presence into the fourth century. Nonetheless, we can say that regarding the first 200 years after the Apostolic Age, references to the gift of tongues were very rare.

In fact, C. L. Rogers and G. W. Dollar have pointed out in their historical studies of the phenomenon, that some of the most prominent early Church leaders and writers such as Clement of Rome (c. 90), Ignatius of Antioch (died c. 107), Hermas (died c. 150), Polycarp (c. 70-156), Justin Martyr (c. 100-165), and the writers of the *Didache* (c. 70), *Epistle of Barnabas* (c. 70-130), and letter to Diognetus (c. 150-225) were completely silent on the gift.

<sup>22</sup> Although such evidence has its limitations, we would still suggest that if the gift was as valuable and prominent as *glossaists* claim,

we would expect more mention of it, particularly in Clement's epistle to Corinth, or in Justin's apologetic writing to a Jew in which he is arguing that the gifts of the Spirit have been transferred from the Jews to the Church. None of these men mention the gift of tongues in their rather prolific writings concerning the nature of the second century Church.

In the background of this history of the gift of tongues is the condemnation of the *Montanist* "prophets" who claimed the gift. Essentially, *Montanism* was a second century movement within the Church claiming the continuance of the *Scripture* and *sign gifts*. The movement was named after its founder, Montanus (c. 170) and accordingly, Dr. Allen Cabaness writes: "Montanus introduced the practice of ecstatic utterances into their gatherings."<sup>23</sup> Likewise, Church historian Kenneth Latourette says, "At his baptism [Montanus] spoke in tongues and began prophesying, declaring that the . . . Holy Spirit . . . was finding utterance through him."<sup>24</sup> Dr. Latourette adds:

The Montanist movement spread widely. . . . It prized the records of the teachings of Christ and his apostles, but it believed, although not contradicting what had been said there, that the Holy Spirit continued to speak through prophets. . . . The first . . . synod [gathering of early Church leaders] . . . was held to deal with Montanism. The movement was condemned as heretical and its adherents were expelled from the Church and debarred from communion.<sup>25</sup>

What is remarkable about *Montanism* is that its beliefs and practices were practically identical to modern *charismaticism*,<sup>26</sup> as discussed further elsewhere.<sup>27</sup> However, this is where the similarity ends. While those Christians less than a century after the Apostolic Age condemned and excommunicated the *Montanists* as dangerous heretics precisely because of their claim to the *Scripture* and *sign gifts* such as tongues, the Church today lauds similar claims as a movement of the Holy Spirit.

### **C) Fourth & Fifth Centuries: Augustine: "it passed away"**

Although the obscure, pagan, and illegitimate version of tongues among the *Montanists* had been universally condemned by the early Church c. 170, Novation mentions the biblical version c. 240, and even into the fourth century, Hilary of Poitiers (c. 315-367) wrote in his treatise *On the Trinity*:

The gift of the Spirit is manifest . . . where there is . . . the gift of healings . . . or by the working of miracles . . . or by

prophecy . . . or by discerning of spirits . . . or by kinds of tongues, that the speaking in tongues may be bestowed as a sign of the gift of the Holy Spirit; or by the interpretation of tongues. . . .

Verily how rare and hard to attain are such spiritual gifts! <sup>28</sup>

Therefore, while Hilary clearly rebukes modern *glossaism* by stating these gifts are very "rare and hard to attain," including "tongues," he does seem to be indicating that there are instances of them into the fourth century.

Nonetheless, very near contemporaries of Hilary such as Chrysostom (347-407) and Augustine (354-430) would write that the gift of tongues was a thing of the rather far past. One possible explanation for Hilary's rather late and uncommon testimony to the operation of the gifts into the fourth century is that he ministered in Western France which was on the relative fringe of Christianity at the time, and perhaps the NT documents were not as available there.

Apart from Hilary, the consistent testimony in both the East and West by 400 A. D. is that the gift of tongues had ceased long ago. Accordingly, John Chrysostom (347-407), the foremost leader of the early Eastern Church said in his teaching on 1 Corinthians 12 concerning the *Scripture* and *sign gifts*:

This whole place is very obscure; but the obscurity is produced by our ignorance of the facts referred to, and by their cessation, being such as then used to occur, but now no longer take place. <sup>29</sup>

Writing specifically regarding the Apostle's statement that: **"where there are prophecies, they will cease; where there are tongues, they will be stilled; where there is knowledge, it will pass away"** (1 Cor 13:8), Chrysostom wrote:

Now then after [Paul] in every way had shown her [the Church] to be very exceedingly great, he does so again from another most important head, by a fresh comparison exalting her dignity, and saying thus; "but whether there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease."

For if both these [gifts of prophecy and tongues] were brought in for the sake of the faith; when that is every where sown abroad, the use of these is henceforth superfluous. . . . It is no marvel that prophecies and tongues should be done away. <sup>30</sup>

Accordingly, Chrysostom confirms our own interpretation of 1 Corinthians 13:8-13 that the Apostle predicted the cessation of *Scripture* and *sign gifts* after the sufficient distribution of the NT revelation.

Sometime later, Bishop Theodoret (393-466), also in the East, would write in his *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*:

In former times those who accepted the divine preaching and who were baptized for their salvation were given visible signs of the grace of the Holy Spirit at work in them. Some spoke in tongues which they did not know and which nobody had taught them, while others performed miracles or prophesied. The Corinthians also did these things, but they did not use the gifts as they should have done. They were more interested in showing off than in using them for the edification of the church.<sup>31</sup>

At the same time, Augustine (354-430), the foremost leader of the Western Church confirmed both the biblical attributes of the gift of tongues and their God-ordained cessation. In his commentary on 1 John he wrote:

In the earliest time, "the Holy Ghost fell upon them that believed; and they spake with tongues," which they had not learned, "as the Spirit gave them utterance." These were the Sign adapted to the time. For there behoved to be that betokening of the Holy Spirit in all tongues, to show that the Gospel of God was to run through all tongues over the whole earth. That thing was done for a betokening, and it passed away.<sup>32</sup>

Here Augustine confirms the early Church's belief that the gift of tongues was a miraculous ability to speak foreign human languages, that its purpose was an authenticating "sign" for the Gospel, and that it was intended to be essentially temporary, operating "in the earliest time" of the Church, and having "passed away" by the fifth century when the authenticity and power of the Gospel had been well and widely established.

Also, contrary to the idea that unspiritual Church leaders like Augustine *made* the gift of tongues go away, Augustine himself wrote:

How then, brethren, because he that is baptized in Christ, and believes on Him, does not speak now in the tongues of all nations, are we not to believe that he has received the Holy Ghost? God forbid that our heart should be tempted by this faithlessness. . . . Since, therefore, the Holy Ghost is even

now received by men, some one may say, why is it that no man speaks in the tongues of all nations? Because the Church itself now speaks in the tongues of all nations. <sup>33</sup>

The early Church did not suppress the real gift of tongues when it operated (cf. 1 Cor 14:39), but it did condemn the pagan counterfeit of meaningless gibberish like that practiced by the *Montanists* and *glossaists* today. <sup>34</sup> Accordingly, the highly regarded *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* relates that:

Symptoms of what was then looked upon as an evil showed themselves in the 4th century at Constantinople in wild, inarticulate cries, words passionate but of little meaning, almost convulsive gestures and were met by Chrysostom with the sternest possible reproof. <sup>35</sup>

We would wish the same was true today.

The testimony of Augustine and Chrysostom concerning specifically the *sign gift* of tongues is important, as Christopher Forbes notes:

From the end of the fourth century onwards I have been able to find no clear suggestion of the continued practice of glossolalia within the church. Chrysostom's view, which is also Augustine's, becomes the standard. <sup>36</sup>

Professor Judisch adds:

The testimony of Augustine and Chrysostom on this matter is extremely significant. For although rightly considered doctors of the church, they were no ivory-tower seminary professors. They were, on the contrary, active bishops and popular preachers on the front lines of the Lord's armies, in close contact with the current thought and practice of clergy and laity. So here we may rely on the authority of Chrysostom as far as the Eastern church is concerned and of Augustine with respect to the Western church. <sup>37</sup>

The historical record of the first 300 years of the Church regarding the gift of speaking in tongues is clear. It operated very rarely after the Apostolic Age, and was believed to be the miraculous ability to speak a human foreign language for the purpose of authenticating the Gospel. By about 400 A. D. it was believed to have ceased altogether. In the meantime, counterfeit versions of it in *Montanism* and Constantinople, the latter of which operated much like it does in modern glossaism, were condemned as heretical.

It becomes obvious then why modern *glossaists* would like to claim that this history is unclear and biased. However, it is neither. Nonetheless, notice how the *glossaist* Max Turner softens and even distorts the historical record regarding tongues when he writes: "The only claim that can be made with confidence is that [the miraculous] gifts gradually became marginalized" and tongues "became peripheral."<sup>38</sup> Why doesn't he just say they stopped cold? And why does he suggest their cessation occurred because of something the Church did instead of what God did? And why would such gifts become "marginalized" and "peripheral" if they accomplish what modern *glossaists* claim? They simply have no good answers to such questions.

## **D) Middle Ages & Reformation: Condemnation of Jansenists**

Claims to the gift of tongues from 500 to 1700 were extremely rare and not very trustworthy. Even the pro-*glossaists* Richard Quebedeaux writes:

Biographies of the great missionary saints such as Vincent Ferrer (1350-1419) and Francis Xavier (1506-1552) have long perpetuated the notion that these persons possessed the gift of tongues-in the sense that they could speak existing foreign languages previously unknown to them (some people define glossolalia in this way). But careful study of the facts indicates that the biographies in question were subject to the power of myth.<sup>39</sup>

Concerning Saint Xavier, there is an admission elsewhere that he "had difficulty speaking to diverse foreign groups."<sup>40</sup> Accordingly, the same reasons that we suspect the authenticity of Roman Catholic claims to miracles in general,<sup>41</sup> apply with claims to speaking in tongues. Professor Anthony Hoekema writes:

When we see how the process of embellishing the history of saints with fantastic legends was operative in the case of Xavier, we learn to take with more than a grain of salt other medieval claims for the miraculous gift of tongues.<sup>42</sup>

Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that all of the Roman Catholic claims to the gift of speaking in tongues involve the ability to speak in an actual human, although foreign, language. For example, Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) wrote in his commentary on 1 Corinthians:

But the faculty of speaking persuasively consists in being able to speak intelligibly to others. This can be prevented in two ways: in one way by a diversity of dialects. Against this is applied the remedy signified by what he says: "to another is given various kinds of tongues," namely, in order that he be able to speak in diverse languages, so that he will be understood by all, as it says of the apostles in Ac (2:4) that they spoke in various languages.<sup>43</sup>

Therefore, *glossaist* theologians cannot use Roman Catholic evidence to support their modern version of tongues today.

In fact, when groups claimed the modern, incoherent version of tongues they were rejected as heretics. For example, a French group called the *Jansenists*, after their leader, Cornelius Jansen (1585-1638), claimed that the incoherent gibberish spoken in their meetings was the gift of tongues. However, the *Jansenists* were not Christians, as they, "rejected justification by faith as the Protestants understood it and held that the full Christian life was possible only through the Roman Catholic Church."<sup>44</sup> Convulsive fits, trances, prophetic utterances, and "speaking in tongues" were all characteristics of this group that was eventually rejected by both the Protestants and Roman Catholics of their day.

The Protestant Reformation is one of many examples of the greatest moves of the Holy Spirit, but in which *glossaism* played absolutely no part and was denounced as a demonic distraction. There was an ardent desire to return to authentic biblical Christianity, but a universal belief that the gift of tongues had no contemporary purpose. When incoherent gibberish was claimed as the biblical gift, particularly among the Anabaptists, it was never accepted as a return of the real gift. Accordingly, Dr. Dollar writes:

Actually, speaking in tongues played no part in the Reformation movement. This should give us cause to pause and reflect. Thousands of earnest Christians all over Europe sought to re-establish earnestly and completely New Testament doctrine and holy living . . . and men set themselves to discover again the full-orbed teaching of the New Testament. Not one of these even intimated that the doctrine of speaking in tongues had a part in the continuing stream of God's work.<sup>45</sup>

**E) 1700-1800's:** *Condemnation of French Prophets, Irvingites, Shakers, & Mormons*

The next greatest move of the Holy Spirit on Earth after the Reformation was the Great Awakening in the 1700's primarily led by George Whitefield, John Wesley, and Jonathan Edwards. All of these men publicly denounced the modern version of tongues whenever they encountered it.

For example, the French Prophets were a heretical sect of the French Reformation in the early eighteenth century who spread to England and then to America. They were known for their claims to the gifts of prophecy and tongues and were universally rejected as heretics by both the Protestant and Roman Catholic branches of Christianity. George Whitefield's disdain for them is illustrative of this.<sup>46</sup> Church historian Arnold Dallimore explains:

[The French Prophets] carried their occult practices to their new homes in England. [There] they attracted wide attention by exhibitions which included bodily contortions and unintelligible sounds, all of which they claimed were miraculous. . . . Following Whitefield's ministry, the Prophets, aware of the new enthusiasm in [Whitefield's converts] decided that here was a people among whom they might easily make proselytes. . . .

Some leading men [among the early Methodists] were led to believe that the convulsive fits and unintelligible sounds of the Prophets—since they knew not how to explain them otherwise—must be supernatural. . . . Several [early Methodists] were strongly influenced by the French Prophets . . . and in their lack of Biblical understanding were beginning to copy the Prophets' emotional practices and prophetic speculations. . . . The Prophets interjected the element of fanaticism and posed the threat which pseudo-supernaturalism always constitutes for earnest but unthinking Christian people.<sup>47</sup>

Dr. Barry Chant writes concerning the French Prophets:

According to [John] Knox [founder of Presbyterianism], when their preacher shouted, people often fell on their backs . . . It was 'a mark of reprobation if you did not fall when you were told to.' Some . . . spoke in tongues.<sup>48</sup>

Many phenomena of modern *charismaticism* including *glossaism* were characteristic of the French Prophets, but none of it would seem to be authentically Christian, which is why the leaders of the Great Awakening viewed the French Prophets as heretics and threats to the progress of the revival.<sup>49</sup> Accordingly, John Wesley described manifestations of *glossaism* in his meetings as the devil's

work to "mimic the work of God in order to discredit the whole work." <sup>50</sup>

Accordingly, writing of this time, Dr. Dollar notes:

In the development of Christianity in America, speaking in tongues had no place at all. Our Pilgrim fathers, Puritan leaders, Baptist preachers, Presbyterian divines, and Methodist laymen did not at all indulge in this practice. Even in the times of great revival that periodically swept the country. <sup>51</sup>

The next group to exhibit *glossaism* was the Shakers. They were called such because of their convulsive style of worship including "the shakes" while worshipping, in which they exhibited "drunken behavior in worship, and speaking in their unknown tongues." <sup>52</sup> In the mid 1700's they were led by Mother Ann Lee (1736-1784) who taught many heretical things which concerned not only the Person of Christ, but that "the sin of our first parents [Adam and Eve] was in sexual intercourse." <sup>53</sup> Donald Bloesch writes:

In the early years of the Shaker communities spiritual gifts abounded, including prophecies, visions, tongues and healings. One of their distinctive beliefs linking them to Gnosticism was that God is both male and female. The female principle was manifested in Mother Ann Lee, who was seen as the second appearance of Christ. In their view the millennium began with the founding of the Shaker church. In the 1840s twice-yearly love feasts were held during which believers were visited by American Indian spirits and the spirit of Mother Ann. <sup>54</sup>

Although the Shakers also obviously exhibited many phenomena of modern *charismaticism* including *glossaism*, there was one practice no Christian group would claim and that was "the practice of men and women dancing together naked while they spoke in tongues." <sup>55</sup>

Another group at this time that manifested *glossaism* was the Irvingites. Their meetings were marked, as well, by "swoons, bedlam, laughing, and groaning." <sup>56</sup> They encouraged tongues speaking and established both prophets and apostles in their churches. Although many of those involved in the movement might have been Christians, it becomes obvious that the group was heavily infiltrated by the evil one. "The prophets contradicted their own statements [and Scripture as well]. . . . One of the leading prophets admitted that he was deluded and had spoken by an evil spirit." <sup>57</sup>

Their founder, Edward Irving (1792-1834), "adopted a strange Christology, an extraordinarily subjective understanding of the leading of the Lord . . . [had] false views on healing," <sup>58</sup> and "was

ejected from the Presbyterian Church for heresy.”<sup>59</sup> Once again, the Irvingites obviously did exhibit many contemporary practices and beliefs of *charismaticism*, including *glossaism*, however, they were just as obviously another fringe heretical group.<sup>60</sup>

NT scholar Thomas Edgar, Professor of NT at Capital Seminary, would seem to sum up the remainder of historical evidence during this time when he writes:

[H. B.] Sweet refers to frontier revivals in America where “sinners” or unbelievers jerked and became involved in convulsive movements and where there were sobs, shrieks, shouts, and spasms, dashing scores to the ground. However, we have no evidence that these were spiritual gifts or that tongues speaking occurred or that believers were involved in such actions.

In his study of the Holiness-Pentecostal movement, Synan refers to falling, jerking, barking, trances, holy laughs, and wild dances . . . [some would] crawl on all fours and bark like dogs. Even unbelieving students at the University of Georgia fell, jerked, shouted, and talked in tongues. These manifestations were not restricted to believers and therefore were not spiritual gifts. Some were so ridiculous that it is blasphemous to associate them with the Spirit of God.<sup>61</sup>

So while it would seem *glossaist* phenomena certainly occurred in the past, it is consistently attached to unbelievers or groups that were heavily influenced by heretical doctrines and considered outside the Christian faith as a whole.

This would certainly include the *glossaism* that occurred in early Mormonism. Alexander Mackie, a historian of early American spirituality, writes of the beginnings of the Mormon revivals:

During the fall and winter of 1830 and 1831, Kirtland [OH] was continually crowded with visitors, who came from all quarters to inquire after the 'New Religion.' About this time, as we are informed by credible historians and eyewitnesses, 'many in the church became very visionary and had divers [various] operations of the Spirit.' They saw wonderful lights in the air and on the ground and had many miraculous visions and experiences. . . .

Indeed, it is reported by an eye-witness, that at first the laying hands on the heads of their converts to confer the gift of the Holy Spirit, generally produced an instantaneous prostration of both the body and mind, often followed by a wonderful gift of tongues, as was supposed, in Indian dialects; which, indeed, none could understand except by direct inspiration. . . .

Scenes like this were numerous. The preachers were fervent, the people "eager for the supernatural," and the message definite and dogmatic. . . . The expectations of the Latter Day Saints ran at this time very high. . . .

A description of one of the Kirtland meetings [by E. D. Howe] will convey some idea of the manner in which Mormon worship in the inner circle was conducted. There were some fifteen or twenty Elders and High Priests present. The meeting was held in a small room.

"After sundry exhortations by the priests, the Prophet [Joseph Smith, 1805-1844] himself arose and with much seeming earnestness, warned his followers to be zealous, faithful in their duties . . . They then concluded to spend the day in fasting and prayer. . . .

Joseph next passed round the room, and laid his hand upon each one, and spoke as follows, as near as the narrator can recollect: [obscure gibberish]. . . . After administering the sacrament several of the brethren were called upon to arise and speak in tongues. . . . This gibberish for several months was practiced almost daily."<sup>62</sup>

Accordingly, in contrast to any real Christian group in his day, the founder of Mormonism, Joseph Smith, said:

We believe in the gift of the Holy Ghost being enjoyed now, as much as it was in the Apostles' days. . . . we also believe in prophecy, in tongues, in visions, and in revelations, in gifts, and in healings.<sup>63</sup>

satan even tried to use the *glossaism* of early Mormonism to hinder genuine Christian revival. Accordingly, the Methodist preacher Peter Cartwright (1785-1872) wrote:

The camp meeting was numerously attended, and we had a good and gracious work of religion going on among the people. On Saturday there came some twenty or thirty Mormons to the meeting. . . . At length, an old lady Mormon began to shout, and after shouting a while she swooned away and fell into the arms of her husband. The old man proclaimed that his wife had gone into a trance, and that when she came to she would speak in an unknown tongue, and that he would interpret.

This proclamation produced considerable excitement, and the multitude crowded thick around. Presently the old lady arose and began to speak in an unknown tongue, sure enough. Just then my attention was called to the matter. I saw in one moment that the whole maneuver was intended to

bring the Mormons into notice, and break up the good of our meeting. I advanced instantly toward the crowd, and asked the people to give way and let me in to this old lady, who was then being held in the arms of her husband.

I came right up to them, and took hold of her arm, and ordered her peremptorily to hush that gibberish; that I would have no more of it; that it was presumptuous and blasphemous nonsense. I stopped very suddenly her unknown tongue. She opened her eyes, took me by the hand, and said: 'My dear friend, I have a message directly from God to you.' I stopped her short and said, 'I will have none of your messages. If God can speak through no better medium than an old, hypocritical, lying woman, I will hear nothing of it.'<sup>64</sup>

We would wish the modern Church would respond with the same discernment as Cartwright did in the midst of the revival he was leading.

This is the essence of the history of *glossaism* in the early decades of America. Accordingly, John MacArthur's conclusion concerning the gift of tongues is squarely based on the historical facts:

All of those supposed manifestations of tongues were identified with groups that were heretical, fanatical, or otherwise unorthodox. The judgment of biblically orthodox believers who were their contemporaries was that all those groups were aberrations.<sup>65</sup>

Such was the prevailing view throughout the Church regarding *glossaism* in the 1800's. Accordingly, Philip Schaff, considered the dean of Church history at the time, wrote:

It is the prevailing view that the charisms, some of them at least, as those of miracles and tongues, belong not essentially and permanently to the Church, but were merely a temporary adventitious efflorescence of the apostolic period, an ornamental appendage, like the wedding-dress of a youthful bride, and afterwards disappeared from history, giving place to the regular and natural kind of moral and religious activity.<sup>66</sup>

Likewise, the foremost Christian theologian of the day, Charles Hodge (1797-1978) wrote in his commentary on 1 Corinthians 12:

[T]he fact that any office existed in the apostolic church is no evidence that it was intended to be permanent. In that age there was a plenitude of spiritual manifestations and endowments demanded for the organization and propagation

of the church, which is no longer required. We have no longer prophets, nor workers of miracles, nor gifts of tongues.<sup>67</sup>

## F) Early 1900's: *Condemnation of Pentecostals*

Thus far, we see that the Christian Church for at least 1600 years did not believe that the gift of tongues was operating. Then on January 1, 1900, the beginning of modern *glossaism* was launched. *Glossaist* Bible teacher Hank Hanegraaff, in his well researched book, *Counterfeit Revival*, relates the event that sparked the movement:

Endtime restorationism [the belief that the first century gifts have been restored to the twentieth century Church] had its genesis [remarkably] in the early morning hours of the first day of the twentieth century. A twenty-seven-year-old preacher from Topeka, Kansas, named Charles Parham placed his hands on the head of his young student, Agnes Ozman [at her request to receive the "baptism of the Holy Spirit" so she could speak in tongues]. Suddenly, a "halo seemed to surround her head and face" and Agnes began to speak in Chinese.

For three solid days [according to Parham's followers] she was utterly incapable of speaking a single word in English. Even more incredibly, when she tried to write, only Chinese characters would emerge from her pen. Ozman's experience became the catalyst for other students in Parham's class to seek the gift of tongues. It wasn't long before many of them, like Agnes, began to speak in languages they had never studied.<sup>68</sup>

Several things can be noted from this event. First, Charles Parham is considered a "true spiritual father . . . of the modern Pentecostal Movement,"<sup>69</sup> by contemporary leaders of *glossaism*. Secondly, Parham, the original *glossaists*, believed the gift of tongues was the miraculous ability to speak in real human languages. Accordingly, he sent missionaries supposedly with the gift to India to preach the Gospel, which ended in failure.<sup>70</sup> Nonetheless, Charles Parham, the man most responsible for the beginning of modern *glossaism* would denounce the modern version as a fraud.

Thirdly, the miraculous ability to speak in foreign human languages that Parham's followers claimed, in the context of a heretical teaching, has demonstrated itself in clearly demonic environments, and especially Ms. Ozman's ability to supernaturally

write Chinese is a demonic phenomena, all of which is discussed in the next chapter.<sup>71</sup>

When evaluating the roots of a movement such as *glossaism*, it is important to look at the doctrine and life of its founders. Here, Charles Parham is typical of all the foremost founders of *charismaticism* in exhibiting grossly unbiblical doctrine and behavior. Pentecostal historian Vinson Synan reveals that Parham spent "the later years of his life as an avid supporter of the Ku Klux Klan."<sup>72</sup> Synan admits that Parham taught that Anglo-Saxons (whites) were God's chosen race and therefore, blacks were not allowed to sit in his classes but were forced to sit in a hallway.<sup>73</sup>

Finally, pursued by charges of sexual infraction, Parham was rejected by a large percentage of his followers in Texas and increasingly ministered on the peripheries of mainstream Pentecostalism.<sup>74</sup> Nonetheless, he had fulfilled his role of introducing the unbiblical teaching that the baptism of the Spirit is demonstrated today by speaking in tongues. Overall, the life and doctrine of Charles Parham would not seem to be a good foundation for a practice that has since swept the Christian world.

It is a well-known fact that early 20<sup>th</sup> century *glossaism* was universally condemned as a fraud by all branches of Christianity apart from early Pentecostals. The books of such authors as Dillow, Gromacki, Hoekema, Judisch, Lloyd-Jones,<sup>75</sup> Mackie, and Unger are examples.<sup>76</sup> None of the biblical and historical arguments of these authors has been refuted. *Glossaism* simply became more popular.

Accordingly, anyone knowledgeable of the issue of the gift of tongues throughout the history of the Church will notice most of what is written in *KOG* on this topic is nothing new. Many men, especially the best Bible teachers of the mid 1900's, wrote careful and biblical critiques of the modern tongues movement. What is needed today is not new studies, but new men who are willing to sincerely evaluate both Scripture and history regarding modern *glossaism*, regardless of how popular it has become.

## **G) 1980's to Present:** *Gaining political popularity*

Thus far we have seen that the second century Church repelled the intrusion of *glossaism* through the *Montanists*. The 17<sup>th</sup> century Church repelled its intrusion through the *Jansenists* and *Anabaptists*. The 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century Church repelled the *glossaism* of the French Prophets, Shakers, Irvingites, and Mormons. And while the 20<sup>th</sup> century Church initially repelled the *glossaism* of early Pentecostalism, it simply has not had the doctrinal back bone to withstand the flood of *charismaticism*.

This branch of modern *glossaism* dropped the offensive Pentecostal requirement that tongues was the necessary sign of spiritual baptism, and emphasized the private variety of *glossaism* instead of the public one, which was more open to criticism and evaluation. The numerical success of modern *charismaticism* has resulted in *glossaism* itself becoming a wide spread phenomenon.<sup>77</sup>

Accordingly, starting particularly in the 1980's, there was a marked change in the literature being produced regarding *glossaism*. We have discussed this elsewhere in *KOG* as it relates to *charismaticism* in general.<sup>78</sup> Without wanting to be unnecessarily presumptuous or condemning, it would seem there was at least a growing desire at this time to give *some* biblical and theological support for the tongues phenomenon in order to avoid the need to confront millions of *glossaists* in the Church on the issue.

Accordingly, and in amazing contrast to at least 1600 years of Church history right up to the 1970's, *glossaism* seems to have become particularly difficult for Christian leaders to condemn. This is not to suggest that the ones cited here are merely succumbing to the popularity of it today and do not really believe what they are teaching. Nonetheless, there would seem to be evidence that something "political" is occurring especially in regards to this topic.

For example, Dr. Edgar points out regarding the approach of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* to *glossolalia* that:

It is interesting to note that recent editions of this encyclopedia, possibly out of deference to our present historical context, play down the fact that glossolalia occur in non-Christian circles, although this was pointed out in earlier editions.<sup>79</sup>

Likewise, several years ago Billy Graham was asked if he spoke in tongues. He replied in his characteristically prudent and diplomatic way: "No, I never have, but I understand it to be a helpful experience for those who do."<sup>80</sup> In Graham's book, *The Holy Spirit*, he says, "I personally cannot find any biblical justification for saying the gift of tongues was meant exclusively for New Testament times."<sup>81</sup>

Likewise, although the venerable J. I. Packer is convinced that the modern versions of miraculous gifts have nothing to do with those described in the NT, including tongues, and he does not allow for a "private prayer language" to define the biblical gift of tongues, he comes to the following conclusion: "for some people, at any rate, glossolalia is a good gift of God, just as for all of us power to express thought in language is a good gift of God."<sup>82</sup>

D. A. Carson, a man known for his careful exegesis, rejects Dr. Packer's view and replies, "I cannot think of a better way of displeasing both sides of the current debate."<sup>83</sup> That is probably true, yet Dr. Carson's opinion would seem no better as it would seem to completely ignore the biblical data. His explanation of the modern tongues phenomena is:

speech patterns sufficiently complex that they may bear all kinds of cognitive information in some coded array, even though linguistically these patterns are not identifiable as human language . . . [This view is] logically possible, even though it is regularly overlooked; and it meets the constraints of both the first century biblical documents and some of the contemporary phenomena. I do not see how it can be dismissed.<sup>84</sup>

Is it possible that the reason his view *has* been "regularly overlooked" is that it is so obviously wrong?<sup>85</sup> Contrary to Dr. Carson, we have provided biblical evidence elsewhere that would deny his claim that the biblical gift of tongues need not involved real human languages.<sup>86</sup> It certainly did a Pentecost. Accordingly, Professor Forbes rightly points out that:

[Dr. Carson's view] demands rather more linguistic sophistication of Paul than is reasonable. Carson's view is a very reasonable twentieth century speculation [sic], but I doubt that Paul, without the benefit of a training in modern linguistics, can be expected to conceive of something analogous to language, possessing cognitive content, but of no recognizable linguistic structure. Such concepts were simply not available to him. If this is what glossolalia actually *was*, Paul would almost certainly simply assumed that it was just a (real) [human] language he did not know.<sup>87</sup>

Nonetheless, the conclusion of Dr. Carson's 229 page book specifically dedicated to "*A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14*" is that he accepts the view that there are now two wholly different, but legitimate forms of the NT gift of tongues operating today: 1) a public gift where a tongues utterance will be miraculously interpreted, and 2) a private gift for prayer purposes.<sup>88</sup> And he encourages pastors to allow not only private tongues speaking, but the public variety in a church service as well.<sup>89</sup>

## H) A Summary of the History of Tongues

These would seem to be the historical facts regarding the issue of tongues in the Church. Up until about 350 A. D. the legitimate version of the miraculous ability to speak in human foreign languages was attested by early Church leaders. However, even at this time, it was described as very rare. By Augustine and Chrysostom's day it was considered extinct.

An important historical event was the universal condemnation of the *Montanists* for their unbiblical claims to miraculous gifts such as tongues c. 170. This was partly because their version of the gift of tongues was not miraculous at all, and was precisely the same incoherent babble practiced today. In the ensuing centuries, various other heretical groups spoke in the same incoherent gibberish, claiming the gift as well, and were likewise universally condemned by their Christian contemporaries for their fraud.

The virtual universal position of Christians from c. 350 to c. 1960 was that the gift of tongues was the miraculous ability to speak in a real human language and that it no longer operated. Nonetheless, in a span of about 20 years, the modern, obscure, unmiraculous private prayer language version was widely practiced and accepted for the first time in all of Church history. There has rarely been in all the history of the Church, such a dramatic change on a doctrinal issue, and if the forces propelling it are not divine, because its attributes are not biblical, then the following legitimate explanations for its growth and popularity need to be considered in the next chapter.

### **Pastoral Practices**

- Pastors who are truly going to serve the King in the age of *glossaism* must heed the Apostle's words:

**In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus, Who will judge the living and the dead, and in view of His appearing and His kingdom, I give you this charge: Preach the Word; be prepared in season and out of season; correct, rebuke and encourage—with great patience and careful instruction. For the time will come when men will not put up with sound doctrine. Instead, to suit their own desires, they will gather around them a great number of teachers to say what their itching ears want to hear. They will turn their ears away from the truth and turn aside to myths. (2 Tim 4:1-4)**

The day will come when our teaching and practice will be evaluated, including on this issue of tongues. Have you studied

and taught sufficiently on this topic to please Him regardless if a majority is being led astray? The Apostle anticipated that the day would come when preaching some of the truth of Scripture would be “**out of season**” and unpopular even within the Church, and the modern tongues movement seems to be an example of just such a test. Will you pass it?

---

## **Extras & Endnotes**

---

### **A Devotion to Dad**

*Our Father, we thank you for giving us your written Word by which we may navigate through all the deception and false teaching that has infiltrated Your people. Give us humility, grace, and courage to understand your Word, and teach it with love on even topics as difficult as “tongues.” And we pray for our brothers and sisters in Christ who have been deceived, disillusioned, and spiritually damaged because of unbiblical teaching and practice on this issue. May you restore them and renew them in their understanding of what intimate prayer with You is really like, and what the ministry, gifts, and power of the Holy Spirit really are. Amen.*

### **Gauging Your Grasp**

- 1) Why is the history of claims to the gift of tongues in the Church important to understand?
- 2) Why do *glossaists* claim the gift of tongues ceased in the early Church? What is our explanation? Do you agree or disagree and why?
- 3) At what general date do we claim the gift of tongues ceased in the Church and why?
- 4) What is the significance of the *Montanists* for understanding modern *glossaism*?
- 5) What did Augustine and Chrysostom claim about the gift of tongues in their day and why is this important?

- 6) How would you summarize the history of claims to the gift of tongues through the Middle Ages and into the 1800's?
- 7) What is the significance of the fact that every group claiming the gift of tongues during this time was universally considered heretical by the Church?
- 8) Describe how, when, and through whom modern *glossaism* began?
- 9) In your opinion, why have the numerous and excellent biblical studies of modern *glossaism* particularly during the 1960's been rather completely ignored since the 1980's, allowing the wide acceptance of *glossaism* into the Church for the first time in its history?

### **Publications & Particulars**

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Regarding the historical cessation of the gifts of miracle working and healing see chapter 11.7. Regarding prophecy see chapter 9.13. For general historical perspectives of *charismaticism* see chapters 10.13-14.
  - <sup>2</sup> *Glossaists* refer to those who practice and promote the idea that the biblical gift of tongues is a obscure, private prayer language. The word is based on the Greek for "tongues" *glossais*.
  - <sup>3</sup> Millard Erickson, *Christian Theology* 2nd ed., (Baker, 1998), 896.
  - <sup>4</sup> For further discussion of the erroneous reasons given by *charismaticism* for the cessation of *Scripture* and *sign gifts* in the early Church see section 11.7.C.
  - <sup>5</sup> Douglas Judisch, *An Evaluation of Claims to the Charismatic Gifts* (Baker Book House, 1978), 81.
  - <sup>6</sup> For a defense of our definition of the gift of tongues see chapters 12.2-5..
  - <sup>7</sup> For further discussion of the reason for the cessation of *Scripture* and *sign gifts* c. 350 see section 11.7.D. For further discussion of the cessation of Apostles and Prophets see chapters 8.5-7 and 9.13 respectively.
  - <sup>8</sup> For arguments that Paul was predicting the cessation of the *Scripture* and *sign gifts* with the completion of the NT revelation in 1 Corinthians 13:8-13 see chapter 8.6
  - <sup>9</sup> For example, we may be willing to accept the very few scattered testimonies of some Christian missionaries miraculously speaking a foreign human language they did not know. These very well may be miracles, but to our knowledge have always occurred on the cutting edges of introducing people to the Gospel where miraculous

authentication may be needed. In addition, these testimonies always describe the phenomenon as a miracle of language as the gift of tongues operated in Acts, and as a “**sign to unbelievers**” as the Apostle described in 1 Corinthians 14:22. Therefore, rather than supporting modern *glossaism*, these testimonies rather argue against their private prayer language version of the gift.

- <sup>10</sup> For further discussion of the biblical attributes of the gift of tongues and how the modern version lacks all of them see chapters 12.2-5.
- <sup>11</sup> For further discussion of the “Latter Rain” theory in *charismaticism* see section 11.3.E.
- <sup>12</sup> D. A. Carson, *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Baker, 1987), 165. Dr. Carson does, however, cite what he thinks are “some remarkably careful and evenhanded studies now available,” but we would still disagree that any believable evidence has been found to suggest that the NT gift of tongues has been returned to the Church.
- <sup>13</sup> John MacArthur, *Charismatic Chaos* (Zondervan, 1992), 286.
- <sup>14</sup> It may be helpful at this point to note that *glossaist* theologians can be placed in one of two camps: 1) Continuationists, and 2) Restorationists. Continuationists insist that the miraculous gifts never ceased at all in the history of the Church, while Restorationists admit that they became virtually non-existent at times in the Church, but have now been “restored” to the Church to the same, or even greater, level as they were in the first century. This differentiation between Continuationists and Restorationists should not be taken too far however, because *glossaists* arguments are often too blurred to really categorize them as one or the other.
- <sup>15</sup> E. G. Hinson, 57.
- <sup>16</sup> Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, chapter XXXIX; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>17</sup> For further discussion of the *Scripture gift* of knowledge possessed by the Apostles see chapter 8.2
- <sup>18</sup> Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, II.23, V.6.1; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>19</sup> Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, Book V, Chapter VIII; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>20</sup> Novation, *Treatise Concerning the Trinity*, 29; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>21</sup> Ronald Kydd, *Charismatic Gifts in the Early Church*, (Hendrickson, 1984), 81.

The suggestion by some cessationists that Novation’s use of present tense verbs does not mean he meant the present seems very unlikely when we notice that Novation mentions other things that Christ was certainly doing in his day including, “affords powers of government,

suggests counsels, and orders and arranges whatever other gifts there are of charismata”.

Neither Kydd, Dollar, or Rogers mention Hilary of Poitiers’ testimony.

- <sup>22</sup> For summaries of the history of tongues see George W. Dollar, “Church History and the Tongues Movement” *Bib Sac*, 120 (1963): 317 and Cleon Rogers, “The Gift of Tongues in the Post-Apostolic Church” *Bib Sac* 122 (1965): 141-2.
- <sup>23</sup> *Who’s Who in Christian History*, J. D. Douglas and Philip Comfort eds. (Tyndale House, n.d.).
- <sup>24</sup> Kenneth S. Latourette, *A History of Christianity* (Hendricksen, 1975) 128.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 129, 132.
- <sup>26</sup> For a definition of *charismaticism* see endnote in chapter 12.1.
- <sup>27</sup> For further discussion of the condemnation of *Montanism* and its striking similarities to modern *charismaticism* see sections 9.13.D.
- <sup>28</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, *On the Trinity*, viii.30, 34; cf. 33; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>29</sup> Chrysostom, *Homily on 1 Cor 29*; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>30</sup> Chrysostom, 1 Cor Homily 34.2; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org)
- <sup>31</sup> Bishop Theodoret, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2.40; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>32</sup> Augustine, *Ten Homilies on the First Epistle of John*, Vol. VII of *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Philip Schaff, (The Christian Literature Corp. 1888), VI. 10., (Underlining added for emphasis).
- <sup>33</sup> Augustine, *On the Gospel of St. John*, 32.7; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>34</sup> The author of the Wikipedia entry would seem to suggest that Augustine believed the gift of tongues was operating and approved of it when we read:  
 Augustine of Hippo, in an exposition on Psalm 32, discusses a phenomenon contemporary to his time of those who “sing in jubilation”, singing the praises of God not in their own language, but in a manner that “may not be confined by the limits of syllables.”  
 There is nothing like this in Augustine’s exposition of Psalm 32. See <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf108.ii.XXXII.html>.
- <sup>35</sup> *Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, John McClintock and James Strong eds., CD-ROM (Ages Software, 2000), 10:297.
- <sup>36</sup> Christopher Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity And Its Hellenistic Environment*, (J. C. B. Mohr, 1995), 84.
- <sup>37</sup> Judisch, 78-79.

- 
- <sup>38</sup> Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, (Hendrickson, 1998), 301-2.
- <sup>39</sup> Richard Quebedeaux, *The New Charismatics: The Origins, Development, and Significance of Neo-Pentecostalism* (Doubleday, 1976), 21.
- <sup>40</sup> Hinson, 57.
- <sup>41</sup> For further discussion of the questionable claims to miraculous gifts by the medieval Roman Church see section 11.7.B.5.
- <sup>42</sup> Anthony Hoekema, *What About Tongue Speaking?* (Eerdmans, 1966), 19.
- <sup>43</sup> Thomas Aquinas, *1 Corinthians*, para. 729; online at <http://www.aquinas.avemaria.edu/Aquinas-Corinthians.pd>
- <sup>44</sup> Latourette, 879.
- <sup>45</sup> Dollar, 318.
- <sup>46</sup> For further discussion of how the leaders of the Great Awakening viewed the French Prophets and "Charismatic" phenomena see Arnold Dallimore, *George Whitefield*, 2 vols. (The Banner of Truth Trust, 1970), 1:177, 316 n. 1, 327, 348, 505.
- <sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:174-5.
- <sup>48</sup> Barry Chant, online at [www.renewaljournal.com](http://www.renewaljournal.com).
- <sup>49</sup> Dallimore, 316 n. 1, 177, 327, 348, 505.
- <sup>50</sup> John Wesley, *The Journal of John Wesley*, (Moody, n.d.), 239.
- <sup>51</sup> Dollar, 319.
- <sup>52</sup> Alexander Mackie, *The Gift of Tongues: A Study in the Pathological Aspects of Christianity* (Doran, 1921), 83, 89, 90, 94, 95.
- <sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 105.
- <sup>54</sup> Donald Bloesch, *The Holy Spirit: Works and Gifts* (Intervarsity, 2000), 150.
- <sup>55</sup> Smith, 17-18
- <sup>56</sup> Thomas Edgar, "The Cessation of the Sign Gifts," *Bsac* 145 (1988), 214.
- <sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>58</sup> Carson, 167.
- <sup>59</sup> Latourette, 1185.
- <sup>60</sup> Carson, 166.
- <sup>61</sup> Edgar, 217.
- <sup>62</sup> Mackie, 9-10.

- 
- <sup>63</sup> *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith* (Confirm Book, 1977), 243.
- <sup>64</sup> Quoted in Mackie, 231.
- <sup>65</sup> MacArthur, 286.
- <sup>66</sup> Philip Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, II:117ff; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org).
- <sup>67</sup> Charles Hodge, *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1 Cor 12:28; online at [www.ccel.org](http://www.ccel.org)
- <sup>68</sup> Hank Hanegraaff, *Counterfeit Revival* (Word, 1997), 125.
- <sup>69</sup> Rick Joyner, "Azusa Street, The Fire That Could Not Die," *Morning Star Journal*, 6, 4 (1996) 63.
- <sup>70</sup> For further discussion of Charles Parham and his beliefs see section 10.14.C.1 and 12.2.B.
- <sup>71</sup> For demonic explanations of the modern tongues phenomenon see section 12.14.D in the next chapter.
- <sup>72</sup> Vinson Synan, *The Holiness-Pentecostal Movement in the United States* (Eerdmans, 1971), 109.
- <sup>73</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.
- <sup>74</sup> Edith L. Blumhofer, "The Christian Catholic Apostolic Church and the Apostolic Faith: A Study in the 1906 Pentecostal Revival," in *Charismatic Experiences in History*, Cecil M. Robeck Jr. ed. (Hendrickson, 1985), 145.
- <sup>75</sup> While the highly respected British Bible teacher D. M. Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981) was certainly open to the occurrence of *Scripture* and *sign gifts*, he wrote one of the most scathing rebukes of modern *charismaticism* (*The Sovereign Spirit: Discerning the Gifts* [Harold Shaw, 1985]), and it is not surprising that the movement does not mention his openness to their practices.
- <sup>76</sup> The other trend in literature concerning tongues was that it increased exponentially "under the impetus of the 'charismatic movement' or 'pentecostal movement'" (Luke T. Johnson, *Religious Experience in Earliest Christianity : A Missing Dimension in New Testament Studies* [Augsburg Fortress, 1998], 106, n. 8). W. E. Mills provides a 35 page list of such studies in his *Speaking in Tongues: A Guide to Research in Glossolalia* (Eerdmans, 1986).
- <sup>77</sup> For a critique of the supposed revival of Christianity in *Charismaticism* see section 10.15.A.
- <sup>78</sup> For further discussion of the increasing effect of *glossaism* on contemporary theology see section 10.14.D.
- <sup>79</sup> Edgar, 219.
- <sup>80</sup> Robert Gromacki, *The Modern Tongues Movement* (Presbyterian & Reformed, 1967), 271.

- 
- <sup>81</sup> Billy Graham, *The Holy Spirit*, (Word, 1978), 172.
- <sup>82</sup> J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step With the Spirit* (Revell, 1984), 211.
- <sup>83</sup> Carson, 84.
- <sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.
- <sup>85</sup> Dr. Carson's unfortunate pro-*glossaist* bias is revealed in his comments on John MacArthur's commentary on 1 Corinthians when he writes: "Despite excellent moments, there is too little grasp of the background and such a firm "anti-charismatic" interpretation of chapters 12-14 that the exegesis goes a little awry." (*New Testament Commentary Survey*, 5<sup>th</sup> ed., (IVP, 2001), p. 83). We might suggest instead, that a similar critique may be more applicable to himself.
- <sup>86</sup> For further discussion of the fact that the biblical gift of tongues always involved real human languages see chapter 12.2.
- <sup>87</sup> Forbes, 57.
- <sup>88</sup> Here we will note that the rightly respected theologian W. A. Elwell goes further than this and claims in his influential *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (Walter Elwell, ed., [Baker, 1984]) that there was only one variety of the gift of tongues in the early Church and it did not at all involve foreign languages, and it was specifically meant to edify the speaker (1045). We are a little surprised then that just a few paragraphs later, Dr. Elwell explains:
- The Spirit bestows his *charismata* for the edification of the church . . . .  
The reception of a spiritual gift, therefore, brought serious responsibility since it was essentially an opportunity for self-giving in sacrificial service to others. (*Ibid.*)
- What then was the gift of tongues really for then Dr. Elwell?
- <sup>89</sup> Carson, 187.