

THE CHARISMATIC NIGHTMARE

David C.F. Wright, DD

The charismatic phenomenon has proved to be both the most influential and the most divisive force among Christians today. Its dissension has caused utter confusion, disturbed normal thought processes, perception and purpose. It has often made obscure and almost unbelievable the simple and vital Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Some charismatics call their churches 'Full Gospel'. The word 'full' in this context means complete. By this they assert that being a complete Christian must mean being charismatic. Charismatics insist that a complete Christian is one who has received the second blessing (the first being conversion) which second blessing is the Baptism of the Holy Spirit usually evidenced by the speaking in tongues or some other charismatic gift.

Charismatic, Pentecostal and Full Gospel meetings can lack order and sense; they are often confused, noisy and disorderly. And the New Testament states that God is not the author of confusion (1 Corinthians 14.33). His order for the church is peace. Indeed, the Greek word means quietness, rest and harmony. The apostle Paul specifically and emphatically warns against any local church behaving in any way that any unbeliever may consider to be mad (1 Corinthians 14.23). Again the Greek word for mad here is 'that which appears to be or could appear to be a disorder of the mind temporarily or otherwise or behaviour noted by sensationalism or emotionalism; that which lacks sense, restraint or reason; that which is irrational, incoherent, wildly enthusiastic, containing unrestrained, confusing and unclear speech'. Yet it remains a major trade mark of Pentecostal and charismatic groups, the majority of whom state definitely that the evidence of being a complete Christian and of having received the Holy Spirit is that you have, at least once, spoken in tongues. That is divisive for it puts Christians in to two camps – the hyper-spiritual on the one hand and, on the other, those who are so impoverished because they have not spoken in tongues!

Quite frankly, that is not only divisive but utter nonsense, as well as being serious mischief, and it is the New Testament that says so. Paul asked the question, "Do all speak in tongues?" (1 Corinthians 12.30). He did not say that all Christians did. He states emphatically that the Baptism in the Holy Spirit brings a person into the Body of Christ (1 Corinthians 12.13). Being in the Body of Christ is being a member of Christ, being a Christian. You cannot have a sort of probationary period of being a Christian and then, upon receipt of the alleged second blessing, become a complete or full Christian. The Bible says that you are complete in Christ. Let us take the case of a man converted on 1 January but, alas, he dies on 31 January and he did not speak in tongues. Poor man! He was never a complete Christian according to Pentecostal and charismatic doctrine. He did not speak in tongues so had not been baptised in the Spirit; he did not receive the Spirit if we believe charismatic dogma which is absolute nonsense. Forget what people say. Look at what the New Testament says in Romans 8.9, "If any man does not have the Spirit he does not belong to Christ." In other words you cannot be a Christian without receiving the Baptism in the Holy Spirit. This Baptism makes you a Christian; you cannot be one without it. The Bible says so!

Let me quote from a leading charismatic writer, Morton T. Kelsey, "Glossalalia is the technical term for speaking in tongues. It is a spontaneous utterance of uncomprehended and random speech sounds... it could be pigeon Latin or a Chinese dialect! It is speaking aloud in one of two ways – intelligibly or unintelligibly; tongues can be of men or of angels!"

Pause for a moment. Is God, the Lord Jesus, the Holy Spirit or Christian faith and worship something that is, or contains, what is incomprehensible or random? Random means haphazard, casual, without definite method or purpose – a matter of chance. That cannot possibly be attributed to the Holy God or anything associated with Him. And can any rational Christian agree with

Kelsey that angels may speak in unintelligible tongues or gibberish? They are intellectual beings so their speech must be intelligible.

Kelsey goes on to say, "Tongues are preceded by other psychic occurrences." So tongues are psychic are they? What is psychic relates to the human mind and refers to extraordinary things such as ESP and telepathy. It is not spiritual; it is not Divine. What is spiritual belongs to a Holy God, a God of order and design not chaos or confusion. Clairvoyance is the supposed power to see things that are not natural. Spirituality is the ability to understand spiritual things. God is not a clairvoyant. He does look into the future. He knows the future! As God is not a clairvoyant, nor should Christians be. Kelsey asserts, "Cornelius spoke with an angel and was terrified. He had a vision in which an angel brought him important clairvoyant information." What Cornelius experienced was not clairvoyance but a revelation of God. It was not psychic or human; it was spiritual and Divine.

According to Kelsey the speaking in tongues is an ecstatic experience. An ecstatic experience is an intense emotion or a frenzy such as a sexual climax. You cannot equate anything inspired by God with a frenzy, for the very word ecstasy means violent excitement.

As with most Pentecostals and charismatics Kelsey explains that to get the gift of speaking in tongues you have to wait for it, ask for it and seek for it. In this the dogma of transcendental meditation is an obvious corollary. It is also akin to spiritualism and the occult.

W.G. Hathaway says that "the gift of tongues on the Day of Pentecost was not the gift of languages for if this were the case the gift of interpretation would be absolutely unnecessary." But that is a contradiction of Acts 2 where it is obvious that the languages were real and understood by the hearers who spoke those languages. There was no interpretation. Yet this same Pentecostal minister goes on to say, "The gift of tongues is the power of the Spirit for someone to utter in a language or languages unknown to the speaker." Another Pentecostal, Charles J.E. Kingston, states that "the Spirit of God came upon men to speak in the tongues or languages of the hearers, those being addressed." Kingston is right. The speaking in tongues were real languages, not ecstatic, frenzied gibberish, but a language that could be identified as being in use somewhere in the world.

Charles Francis Potter wrote that the speaking in tongues is rapid ecstatic speech usually unintelligible even to the speaker but sometimes explained by one who has another Pentecostal gift, that of interpretation. He goes on to say, "Evidence of the descent of the Holy Spirit is displayed in Pentecostals by their body rhythms." Here, as in Kelsey, there are sexual overtones; the charismatics employ pop and rock music and dance which is overtly sexual using body rhythms. The church of Christ is called the Body of Christ; charismatics talk of their bodies and how they speak and move in dance and worship is an indication that they have received the Holy Spirit!

Such demonstrations at their type of meetings sometimes border on hysteria, a condition characterised by suggestion, emotional instability and other mental aberrations. Often there is excessive or uncontrolled emotion – ecstasy and frenzy, for example. Hysteria is a neurosis affecting the mind or emotions involving abnormal behaviour. Such behavioural disturbances show as schizophrenia, a psychotic condition characterised by a withdrawal from reality. It is untenable that people who act so abnormally call their worship being at one with the Spirit of God.

Agnes Sandford, a pioneer charismatic author, states, "The speaking in tongues is the power latent in the unconscious mind... the person speaks in a language which the conscious mind does not know." Again this is nonsense. No God-given gift or experience has to do with the unconscious mind, for that means completely lacking in awareness as in a coma or deep sleep; what is involuntary or unintentional! Such power is not of God but resides in the unconscious mind of an individual. Sandford continues, "This dramatic gift (of tongues) is the power by which you become

sons of God.” What utter nonsense for that statement is saying that the only way to be a Christian, implicit in the expression sons of God, is to speak in tongues. Another

quote of hers (and these sayings are accepted by many charismatics), “To speak in tongues you have to fool your normal conscious!” Therefore this ‘gift’ is deception and self-deception at that. Self-deception is sin and the evidence that God’s truth is not in us (1 John 1.8). As it happens Aborigines, practitioners of voodoo, and other non-Christian groups speak in tongues and have done so for centuries. Pentecostals explain that “tongues are triggered by an emotional experience.” Indeed this is true for it is not generated by a spiritual experience. After all, it comes from the human mind. Dennis and Rita Bennett, leading charismatics from America, write, “You receive the Baptism in the Spirit by asking Jesus to do it and believe you have received it the moment you ask.” That seems to be ‘finger-crossed’ doctrine and also to be dictating to God. Bennett continues, “Now open your mouth and believe that the Lord has baptised you in the Holy Spirit by beginning to speak. Don’t speak English or any other language you know. Open your mouth... (it’s like going to the dentist isn’t it?)... speak syllables... you may experience involuntary tremblings, stammering lips and physical reactions!” Again, pause for a moment. Do you have to practise to receive a gift from God? Do you say that the way to get this from God is to practise (or pretend) that I have already got it? A gift is a gift, it is readily and willingly given. If the speaking in tongues is a gift, or was a gift, which is what the New Testament says, it does not require practise to receive it. Bennett also refers to Christians as Holy Spirit believers who can “sing in the spirit.” He writes, “An entire group may join in such harmony as the angelic choir itself.” As if Bennett knows anything about choirs of angels particularly as it should be remembered that nowhere in the Bible do you read of angels singing!

Paul makes it clear that the gift of tongues and the gift of interpreting them were in use at the time of his writing the first epistle to the Corinthians who, as we shall see, were a wayward and unruly lot. It is so easily forgotten that in the early churches there were peoples of different languages and interpreters were required if everyone was to understand what was said. On the Day of Pentecost known languages were spoken but no interpretations were necessary as the message was given direct to groups of hearers in the open air. When it comes to public worship it is obviously desirable that everyone present understand all that is said. The fact that Paul says, “Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels...” does not mean that he is saying that there are heavenly languages. He is employing a verbal device such as one might say, “If I had a million pounds...” Indeed Paul goes on to say that if his faith were complete and faultless he could remove mountains (1 Corinthians 13.1-3). Mountains here literally means mountains. Paul also says, “Though I give my body to be burned...” but he was not going to. The tongues of angels are not admitted by Paul to exist; when angels did speak to men and women the hearers understood.

If the speaking in tongues are not real languages, why is it that missionaries today have painstakingly to learn the language of the country they are to work in? Here is a missionary called by God to work in Tokyo. Why does God not give him instantly the gift of speaking Japanese? And, for that matter, the ability to write it! For the simple reason that the New Testament states that tongues shall cease (1 Corinthians 13.8). It is a definite statement. Paul wrote, “Forbid not to speak in tongues!” (1 Corinthians 14.39) but this was in AD 57. Later epistles do not even mention the speaking in tongues or their interpretation but they list other gifts. Only the first epistle to the Corinthians mentions them in a long epistle that deals with serious sin and bad behaviour in this church. The second epistle has a different tone altogether. Paul admits that he is sorry that he had to write such a corrective (2 Corinthians 2 etc.) but the purpose was that the Corinthians should be obedient to God (2 Corinthians 2.9) and in all things. The indication is clear. The Corinthians had taken Paul’s rebuke to heart and changed!

In all the writings of Paul about tongues he states that women are to be silent in the churches; they are not to speak (1 Corinthians 14.34). Yet in charismatic circles this is blatantly ignored and

women do speak. The charismatics argue that the word 'speak' here means 'to chatter'. The Greek word used is *laleo* which means to preach, to talk, to tell, to lay forth as in a discourse. It is the word used to describe the preaching and ministry of Christ Himself. We do not read that Christ chattered to the people about the kingdom of God. Charismatics clutch at straws rather than admit they are wrong.

As Alexander Seibel, and others, point out, the Corinthian church was full of worldly wisdom (1 Corinthians 3.18 ff). Its members preferred speech, the use of the tongue, language and words rather than the message and preaching of the Cross (1 Corinthians 2.1) which is the Gospel. They were very immature, indeed carnal and infantile (1 Corinthians 3.1), being ignorant of spiritual things. No fewer than ten times in the first epistle Paul has to say to them, "Know ye not...?" Paul had to speak sharply to them as, for example, in 1 Corinthians 15.34. They were 'puffed up' that is to say arrogant and conceited. Their pride caused them to think that they were superior spiritually. In 1 Corinthians 5.13 - 18 we read of serious sin being committed by church members and such was the strife in the assembly that some were bringing legal action against fellow members and before secular judges. In chapter eight they were still eating 'things offered unto false gods' and this was proving disastrous to others (verse 11). They mixed freely with the ungodly. In chapter nine these charismatics who believed they were highly gifted accused Paul of being 'not free'. Today some Christians are still being accused by some charismatics as 'not being free in the Spirit', not 'open to the Spirit'. These charismatics sat in judgement upon Paul because they objected to Paul proving them wrong. Today, people who show from the New Testament that Pentecostal and charismatic teaching is wrong are subject to the same abuse.

The Corinthian church had been influenced by Gnosticism which, at that time, included the teaching that salvation was by human reasoning and self-improvement rather than through obedience to the Word of God. And in their country, Greece, the cult of Dionysius, the god of life, gaiety, wine and fertility was widespread. Those who drank from the cup of this god became drunk (1 Corinthians 11.21), indulged in unlawful sexual activity (1 Corinthians 5.6) and often went into ecstatic states. And these were charismatics who were 'superior' particularly in the possession of the gifts! Today they want the 'right mood' which is achieved through worldly actions and techniques (rhythm, body language, rock and pop music, clapping, dancing, drama and tongues), to prove that there is 'life' in the church. Such misleading appeals and emotional excitement is confused with the work of the Holy Spirit. When these charismatics in Corinth came to meetings it was not to remember the Lord (1 Corinthians 11.20) but to indulge their own pride. Hans Brandenburg writes, "Beware lest we seek gifts in order to be admired or because we are looking for the unusual in order to have a greater influence." The speaking in tongues was bad behaviour since it attracted from unbelievers the verdict of madness. Paul says this explicitly and also states that tongues were originally designed for the benefit of unbelievers (1 Corinthians 14.22 - 3).

As in Paul's day, the charismatics emphasise the speaking in tongues as the gift, the proof of being baptised in and receiving the Spirit. As Seibel explains one is almost able to bring proof from the point of view of cybernetics that language means order (for which the word is *logos*), – whereas babbling, gibberish, ecstatic speech means darkness and confusion. God is not the author of confusion so He cannot possibly have a part in this tongue speaking. The charismatic scene is not authorised by God. All gifts were given to 'profit withal' and not for any self-interest. Paul points out that the only reason for charismata is the edification, the building up of the church, which is achieved by the increase of converts (1 Corinthians 14.5 ff). If it is of no benefit to the unbeliever or of other benefit to the church it has no value and is potentially divisive. And Paul says so!

Nowhere in the Bible are we told to seek for, pray for or wait for the Baptism in the Spirit which Baptism will be evidenced by speaking in tongues. Believers do not ask for or wait for the Spirit since they already have it. If they had not been baptised in the Spirit they would not be Christians (Romans 8.9). Therefore, to want what you have already got shows a fundamental and serious

misconception of the truth. Many believers become intoxicated with a desire for power. Power struggles and empire- building go on within local churches. Many a pastor has witnessed visitors to his church speaking in tongues and concluded that they “were possessed with a counterfeit, a fake. They were living on an ego trip, a manufactured religious high.” (Christianity Today, 28 February 1975).

William MacDonald writes, “Some claim that tongues are for private use and personal self-edification. But the fact that the word ‘church’ appears eight times in 1 Corinthians 14 surely is the convincing proof that Paul is not talking of the individual’s fellowship with God but of the local church as a body

of people. Paul certainly does not recommend the speaking in tongues for such self-edification and, in fact, condemns the use of this gift if it does not help others.” As Seibel points out, the Pentecostal, charismatic and Full Gospel adherents practise a ‘special form of worship’ which is inexorably involved with tongues and with entertainment. If this were in keeping with the Will of God, then God would not only be guilty as the author of confusion but of favouritism as well!

(See the article Christian frauds on this site. 98.5% of such frauds in the evangelical churches are Pentecostals and charismatics; that is a very worrying statistic)

The Lord Jesus never spoke in tongues. Never mentioned it. He sent His disciples out to the lost sheep of Israel (Matthew 10.5 ff) and the Jews required a sign (1 Corinthians 1.22). On the Day of Pentecost Joel’s prophecy was fulfilled and Jews witnessed the speaking in tongues (Acts 2). But what is clearly indisputable from the New Testament itself, as we have already seen, is that the speaking in tongues was a temporary gift. 1 Corinthians 13.8 says so. This epistle was written about AD 57. The Roman and Ephesian epistles were written some two and six years later respectively and in these epistles there are lists of charismata but the gifts of tongues and interpretation are left out. When Paul wrote, “Tongues shall cease,” he was not referring to people never speaking again but the cessation of this temporary gift. The use of ‘shall’ makes it definite. ‘Cease’ means to stop, to come to a complete end. And the context, as well as history itself, proves this. One cannot assert that Paul is saying the speaking in tongues will continue beyond his generation. Paul had the gift of raising the dead. Like tongues it was a temporary gift. The charismatics of today can fool us with all their bogus speaking in tongues for it is a very easy means to deceive; raising the dead is a different matter. Let us challenge the charismatics to visit the death beds of loved ones and see what they can do!

So it is clear that some gifts were foundation gifts, temporary gifts to establish the church. The church is built on the foundations of the prophets and apostles (Ephesians 2.20) of whom the chief cornerstone is neither the Holy Spirit nor the gifts, but Jesus Christ Himself. The work of the Holy Spirit is self- effacing, and to draw attention to Jesus Christ (John 14.26; John 16.13). It is true to say that the Holy Spirit is the humble Spirit. The foundations of a house are not seen when the superstructure is built; the foundational age of the church ended with the death of John, the last surviving apostle.

The greatest rift in Christianity since the Reformation is the charismatic divide. It has caused and continues to cause utter confusion and loss of faith, and to wreck lives, yet it will be contended that it has brought joy to the church which is consequently not so stuffy. But there is a difference between joy and frivolity and true doctrine and stuffiness. Paul wrote to Timothy of the last days, where there would be those who apparently loved God but loved pleasure more; such have a type of godliness but it is false, and from such the true believer will turn away. These people are ever seeking and learning and striving but never coming to the knowledge of the truth (2 Timothy 3.4 - 7). He also said that in these last days some will depart from the true faith, being seduced by false doctrine which is the doctrine of devils, and putting a emphasis on the exercise of the body and fitness programmes

rather than the pursuit of godliness (1 Timothy 4.1 - 8). In these days there will be teachers of their own doctrines. These days are upon us. And we Christians are too lily-livered to speak out. We want to be popular. We have wishbones instead of backbones!

Dr. J. Sidlow-Baxter was once asked if he had spoken in tongues. "The Lord gave me one tongue," he chuckled in reply, "and I have enough trouble with that one!"

If being a Christian means you have the Holy Spirit (which the New Testament teaches) and the charismatics insist that the proof of being baptised in the Spirit (by which you become a Christian) is that you speak in tongues, then no deaf mute could ever become a Christian!

One of the doctrines of the Pentecostal, Full Gospel and other charismatic organisations is that "healing for all sickness and illness is included in the atonement and every believer can claim healing." The atonement is the means of our being reconciled to God through our personal acceptance of the sacrificial death of Christ. The idea that healing is included in the atonement presumably comes from Isaiah 53.4- 5 as it is compared with Matthew 8.16 - 17. The gospel, in fact, quotes the passage in Isaiah in the context that the Lord healed sickness while He was here in fulfilment of that prophecy. In His 33 years here the Lord fulfilled Isaiah 53. In fact, the Jews expected the Messiah to come and fulfil the scriptures, including healing. Had He not done so, He would have been a fraud.

If the Lord on the Cross died not only for our sins but for our illnesses as well, then no believer ever ought to be ill. For them there would be no colds or cancer; no headache or arthritis; no nervous disability or heart disease. Christians would be immune and a source of inflammatory jealousy. It is in the eternal state that sickness for all believers is abolished (Revelations 21.4). In fact, to take the charismatic argument to the limit, no Christian would die from illness. Spectacles, dentures and walking sticks would not be needed either.

Faith healing, or healing by faith, presents a problem. If my faith is the means of my healing then my faith is superior to God and His Sovereignty. Healing would be dependent on me and not on God. But you will say that there were occasions when the Lord said to those He had healed, "Thy faith hath made thee whole." It was faith in God's Will and Power as seen in Christ in Person. This is proved by the leper, "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me whole." Put simply, "Lord, if it is Thy Will, Thou canst make me whole." (Matthew 8.2).

Charismatics hold healing meetings; sometimes they are lavish crusades. Is this in accordance with the Will and example of Christ? While it is true that, on occasions, crowds thronged Him for healing it is also true that people were more interested in Christ for what they could acquire for bodily comforts rather than for spiritual benefit. Yet we never read of the Lord about to perform a miracle and waiting for a crowd, a choir, a compere and someone to take up a collection! Miracles of the Lord were often conducted privately and quietly. Such examples include the raising of Jarius's daughter when Christ put out the crowd. Christian healing is not a spectator sport.

James 5 states the Christian way of dealing with the sick. Notice, first, the sick person invited the elders of his church to visit him. He was not taken to church or another venue for a healing meeting. The elders came to him and, remember, an elder was a spiritual man; he had to be the husband of one wife so a woman could not be an elder. The elders prayed over the sick person who was anointed with oil. Oil here is not symbolic or ritualistic; it is a soothing remedy. For example, the Good Samaritan in Luke 10 dealt with the victim's wounds by pouring in oil and wine. Paul tells Timothy to drink wine not only for his stomach's sake but for his other infirmities. Oil and wine are remedial. The laying on of hands probably means that the oil was administered by hands. But, notice, secondly, that oil and prayer were used together and, in our day and age, we pray to God and call the doctor.

Timothy knew recurring illness. Trophimus in 2 Timothy 4.20 was ill and Epaphroditus in Philippians 2 nearly died through overwork. Paul travelled with a doctor, Luke, the beloved physician. These were men of faith but they did not have 'healing for all illness because it is included in the atonement', because it is not. God could have healed these men.

If healing were included as a provision of Christ's death why has it not been effective throughout the Christian centuries to combat the various plagues, or are we to assume that only non-Christians perished? If healing is always available, as it is allegedly included in the atonement, why were not the New Testament worthies healed?

Of course God can heal. He has not lost His Power. But healing is dependent on His Will, not faith or a charismatic teacher. It is God who heals, not a man!

It is evident that, as with the charismatic teaching on tongues, their teaching on healing is a gross distortion of Scripture in an attempt to exalt themselves as hyper-spiritual.

Healings are often referred to by charismatics as being "slain in the spirit" or 'under the Power'. Often this is when a healer touches a believer and they fall back upon the ground which act denotes the power that heals. If you are a sister and wearing a skirt or dress, that can be very embarrassing with everyone looking on. It flies in the face of decency and the modesty of women.

As Dr Peter S. Ruckman writes, "When pushed to the wall the charismatics will produce six verses in a vain attempt to prove their 'slain in the Spirit' teaching. Acts 22.7 is a quote from Acts 9.4 where Saul of Tarsus was on his way to murder Christians when he fell to the earth. Are we to gather that those 'slain in the Spirit' in charismatic meetings are, like Saul at the time, unsaved killers? Nothing could be more ridiculous or blasphemous. In Matthew 28.4 those 'slain in the Spirit' were unsaved guards at the tomb who saw an angel. And they did not fall down. In Revelation 1.17 John saw Christ and fell at His feet as dead. No hand touched John at first. In fact when Christ touched him he got up! John was not in a charismatic healing line. In John 18.6 the unsaved soldiers coming to arrest Christ fell to the ground. The leader of the group is possessed by the devil (John 6.70 - 71, John 18.5). The final reference is 2 Chronicles 5.14, equally obscure, but no one falls over. In fact 'slain in the Spirit' does not appear anywhere in the Bible. This is Donald Duck doctrine! It gives Christianity and, indeed, Christ Himself, a bad name. It ridicules Him and those of us who endeavour to be true to Him.

During 1994 the latest charismatic phenomenon hit us, namely the 'Toronto laugh' in which people laugh and even writhe on the floor in laughter and for up to twenty minutes. Those who believe this is of God refer to it as the 'Toronto blessing'. People crashing to the ground weeping, sobbing or laughing is bizarre. But although it is medically true that laughter is good for you since it reduces tension and stress, creates a sense of well-being and alters the levels of stress hormones, the charismatics' claim that 'joy in the Lord' is manifested in 'holy laughter', a gift from God, is stretching credibility. Those of us who question this are accused of inhibition but then such temperance is part of the fruit of the Spirit (Galatians 5.22 ff).

Those who have seen this phenomenon, whether in the flesh or on the television, have concluded that it is madness; it is lunacy. Whether or not you will agree with this, what is indisputable is that it does not further the Gospel of Christ but hinders it. Remember the words of the Lord Jesus, "Whosoever shall offend one who believes in Me, it were better that a millstone were hanged around his neck and that he were drowned in the deepest sea." (Matthew 18.6). As F.B. Hole writes, "Those who receive Christ as Saviour become as 'a little child'." If a new convert is offended by being misled or damaged by false doctrine or bad behaviour then the offender might be better off dead. Searing words indeed but the words of the Master Himself!

In the early days of the Pentecostal and Holiness Churches some maintained certain New Testament standards. They rejected evolution; they rejected Calvinism's theory of predestination; they condemned worldly and immodest dress in women, unnecessary jewels and mixed bathing. Sadly their teaching on the Baptism of the Spirit, speaking in tongues and healing is clearly a distortion of Scripture. Some early Pentecostals even believed in these sacraments in addition to baptism and the Lord's Supper they practised washing the saints' feet.

(5376)

© Copyright - David C.F. Wright, DD 1996 . No part of this article, however small, may be reproduced or stored in any system whatsoever. It must not be copied, altered or downloaded. Failure to comply is illegal being theft and contrary to International Copyright law and will render any offender liable to action at law.