

Miracles or Mirages?

by

James D. Bales, Ph. D.

BIBLE DEPARTMENT
HARDING COLLEGE
SEARCY, ARKANSAS

An Invitation

The author kindly invites modern healers to discuss publicly the issues raised in this book. If the faith healers have the Spirit as did the apostles, the Spirit in them will not fear to face the sword of the Spirit in our hands. Those who avoid public examination in the light of the word of God cannot be filled with the Spirit of God.

FIRM FOUNDATION PUBLISHING HOUSE
AUSTIN, TEXAS



DEDICATION

To G. C. Brewer, in appreciation for his
friendship and for the many battles which
he has fought in behalf of the truth.

WHY THIS BOOK

Since we doubt neither the sincerity nor the good intention of the majority of the people whose doctrines we examine in this book, why should we write such a book? The following considerations make it evident that their claims and efforts must be examined. *First*, Christians are under a divine commandment to prove all things and to hold fast to that which is good (1 Thess. 5:21). If what these religious people teach and practice is good, members of the body of Christ ought to know it and take hold of it. *Second*, if the "healing groups" are right in their contention the church is in serious error in these matters. Therefore a duty is placed on our shoulders of either examining and refuting their claims, or failing to do this, to admit and accept their doctrines. *Third*, it is wrong to promise what God has not promised. When the "healing groups" promise, supposedly in the name of God, healing to the sick, and when they fail to heal the sick, the sick are apt to lose faith in the promises of God.¹ Such need to recognize that it was man that made the promise to them and that man, not God, failed to carry out the promise. *Fourth*, these groups cast reflection on the miracles of Jesus, for they maintain that they have the power to perform miracles, such as wrought by Jesus and the apostles, and then they have many miserable failures, and many cases where people get only a very little better. If Jesus did not do any better than they do, we have reason to doubt the reality of His power and the divinity of His mission. *Fifth*, "a greater despondency of the afflicted"² often follows their failures. *Sixth*, "hopeless insanity and in some cases death"³ have followed in their wake. *Seventh*, these healing groups sometimes cause unbelief. In speaking of the results of meetings by a "healer" named Price, R. P. Shuler wrote: "Scores of

¹Arno Clemens Gaebelin, "Preface" to Mrs. May Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, p. 6.

²*Ibid.*, p. 6.

³*Ibid.*, p. 6.

people, who went for healing, professed absolute faith, but were not healed, and are now bitterly antagonistic to the Christian religion. Indeed it was discovered that the campaign upset and overturned the faith of literally hundreds of Christian people, whose expectations for their poor mortal bodies were not met.”⁴

These reasons are sufficient to demand that we try those who profess to be apostles, or messengers, of Christ (Rev. 2:2).

It should be clearly understood that there is no personal antagonism in the attitude of the author toward the members of the various “healing groups.” Neither does the author assume that they are wrong in all of their beliefs, for they are not. Furthermore, the sincerity and zeal are commended, although it takes more than these to make one right (Acts 18:26; 23:1, 11; Rom. 10:1-4; Gal. 4:16). They give to their church work; they attend their services with a good deal of faithfulness; and they make an effort to reach the poor. All of these attitudes we commend. However, this does not mean that it is not scriptural and right to point out those places where we are convinced that they have departed from the Scriptures. So this we do with love in our hearts for them, and with the purpose of doing them spiritual and eternal good. They need to know that they are trying to claim promises which they think God has made, but which God has not made. When they try to avail themselves of this supposed privilege of healing, and are unable to obtain it they may conclude “either that God for some reason has forsaken them, or that they themselves have in some particular forsaken God.” It is our aim to help them see that they have misunderstood what God has taught on this subject, and that it has been an error which has led them into other errors.

There are some who assume that no religious movement, especially if it claims to do wonders, can be under the in-

⁴McPhersonism, p. 123.

fluence of the devil. They overlook the fact that the devil does not mind for one to be religious if he is not right in his faith and practice. The devil moves often as an angel of light, and not with horns and hoofs so that everyone could recognize him. Let us not forget that "As Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth." "And how did these two magicians withstand the man of God? By producing, by the power of Satan, the same results that Moses effected by the power of God. He, through the intermediary of Aaron, made serpents, blood, and frogs, and then we read thrice: 'And the magicians did so by their enchantments.' Satan's false Christs and false prophets of a later day 'shall show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, the very elect.' (Matt. 24:24)." (W. Hoste, *The Coming of the Comforter*, pp. 5-6).

But someone may object: How can these people be wrong since they do these things in the name of Christ? This overlooks the fact that a thing is not done in Christ's name unless it is done by His authority. And it takes more to do a thing by His authority than merely to *claim* that it is done in His name. Jesus clearly taught that some would claim to do wonders in His name, and that their claim did not make it so. It must be by the will of God, not by man's will, to be in His name (Matt. 7:21).

Perhaps another objects that: these individuals do some good in healing people. Our reply is twofold. First: "Suggestive therapeutics is a science, and as such is legitimate and true; but when unscrupulous religious teachers like those mentioned, employ it as a sign that they are sent from God to build up their respective religious systems, they become Satan's agents to deceive." (E. C. Fuqua, *Modern "Divine Healing,"* p. 22). Second, they claim far more than they are able to do and hurt many people physically who depend on them for healing, and reject doctors, and as a result encounter a far more serious illness.

Does someone say that these healers are popular and that shows that they are on the right track? To this we need only say: So was Simon Magnus (Acts 8:9-25).

Does another suggest that it seems as if there should be some divine help in time of sickness? Our reply is, First, that we believe in praying for the sick, but that is a different thing from claiming that we have the power to work miracles as did the apostles. Second, even in the days of miracles God did not heal all. Third, evidently God does not will that we be spared all illness. Fourth, one could use the same line of argument and argue that there should be no death, and that man can raise the dead here and now, since we would also so much like to do something when those we love pass on. Let us not reason as to how we might like it, but ask: What are the facts? What has God promised us in this life?

Cold formality and lifelessness on the part of some have led some into "Pentecostalism" in a reaction against lifelessness. Indifference to, or a denial of, what the Bible teaches about the relationship of the Spirit to believers today have led others to fall into the fallacies of Pentecostalism. One extreme begets another. So let us be on our guard and with the proper fever and zeal propagate and live by the true teaching of the Bible.

The author wishes to express appreciation, for help received, to Brother Hawley of Modesto, California; Brother R. N. Hogan; Brother W. Curtis Porter, and others.

To those who want to help people who are entangled in error, we request that they circulate this book, and works of a similar nature, among those who hold to those errors. Criticisms and suggestions will be welcomed by the author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Chapter I	
THE ISSUE STATED -----		1
	Chapter II	
MIRACLES RECORDED IN THE BIBLE -----		8
	Chapter III	
THE PURPOSE OF MIRACLES -----		12
	Chapter IV	
FAITH AND HEALTH -----		18
	Chapter V	
DID MIRACLES GIVE FIRST CENTURY CHRISTIANS AN ADVANTAGE OVER US? -----		27
	Chapter VI	
THE CONTRAST BETWEEN CLAIMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS -----		39
	Chapter VII	
THEIR MEETINGS AND MESSAGES UNSCRIPTURAL -----		69
	Chapter VIII	
SCRIPTURES FREQUENTLY USED BY HEALERS -----		79
	Chapter IX	
WAS THE HEALING OF THE BODY INCLUDED IN THE ATONEMENT? -----		103
	Chapter X	
SPEAKING IN TONGUES -----		113
	Chapter XI	
FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS -----		134
	Chapter XII	
WHAT DO THEY MORE THAN OTHERS? -----		144
	Chapter XIII	
THE SPIRIT GAVE DIFFERENT GIFTS TO MEN -----		151
	Chapter XIV	
A MORE EXCELLENT WAY -----		185
	Chapter XV	
DO THEY HAVE THE SAME SPIRIT? -----		211
	Chapter XVI	
MIRACLES ALONE WERE NOT SUFFICIENT -----		217
	Chapter XVII	
MIRACLES DID NOT SAVE MEN -----		221
	Chapter XVIII	
ONCE FOR ALL -----		227
APPENDIX -----		233

Chapter One

THE ISSUE STATED

The clear statement of the issue at stake is of fundamental importance. Unless people know what the issue is they will be unable to make an intelligent and scriptural decision. To fail to see the issue is to fail to know when an argument for or against a position has been made. Thus we shall endeavor in this chapter to place the issue clearly before the reader that he may know just what we are proving in this book, and just what it is that we are disproving.

The Bible teaches that miracles, when taken into consideration with some other things which we shall hereafter mention, were indications that God was working through the individual or individuals who performed the miracles. The New Testament refers to miracles as signs, tokens, wonders, powers, and mighty works.¹ As *wonders*, they excited astonishment in those who witnessed them. The people asked, concerning Christ, Who is He? Where does He get this power? They were amazed. As *signs*, they were to indicate that the Christ, and those who performed them as His disciples, were sent from God. They were to create and to encourage faith in Him as God's son. "They were the marks or indications of something beyond themselves and different from themselves. They were signals from Christ within the natural world, to call forth man's attention and faith to realities in the spiritual world." (W. D. Thomson, *The Christian Miracles and the Conclusions of*

¹Samuel W. Barnum, Editor, *Smith's Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible*. (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1868) p. 655. Scripture references to signs, wonders, and mighty works (Lk. 23:8; John 2:11; Matt. 12:38, 39; 16:1-; 6:13; 22:29; 11:20; 24:24; Mark 9:39; 2 Thess. 3:17; Rev. 12:1, 3; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11; 1 Cor. 12:10, 28, 29; Gal. 3:5; Heb. 2:4).

Science. Edinburgh: T & T Clark., p. 23). A miracle as a sign generally involved two things. First, a prediction, by means of words or gestures, that a miracle was to be performed. Second, a fulfillment of the prediction in the actual working of the miracle which was promised. As *powers*, miracles were a manifestation and a demonstration of the fact that in Christ and His work something new and great was at work. When we consider His person and teaching, it is not strange that the Bible should point out that He exercised marvelous powers, or forces.²

(1) *To keep the record clear*

We affirm that the church today does not have, and that it has not been promised, the power to work miracles as did the apostles and certain others in the early years of the church. However, in order to prevent misunderstanding the following must be clearly understood. *First*, we believe the miracles which are recorded in the New Testament.

Second, there is divine healing today in the sense that those people who move into harmony with God's laws of health are healed. The individual who has upset himself through worry may, if his condition has not gone too far, be cured of this upset condition through thinking sanely and cheerfully. He is blessed because he has obeyed God's law concerning sane and cheerful thinking. Then, too, God may work through medicines in healing people just as He works through sunshine and rain in feeding the world. This indicates that, in one sense, almost all healing is divine healing. Healing may be divine without being miraculous.

Third, we believe that God answers prayer and that it is right to pray for the sick. We also pray for our daily bread. However, that does not mean that God will answer that prayer in the miraculous manner in which He fed His

²For an extended discussion of these points see R. C. French, *Notes on the Miracles.*

people with manna from heaven; or as Jesus fed several thousand with a few loaves and fishes (Matt. 6:11; 15:32; John 6:31). It is one thing to believe that God answers prayer and it is another thing to maintain that we have the power which the apostles had (Acts 1:8) and that we can lay hands on the sick and bring about their immediate recovery; or that we can lay hands on another person and thus give to them the power to perform miracles. God will answer prayer as He sees fit, but *we* do not have miraculous power today so that we can perform miracles as did the apostles; neither do the "healers" today have such power.

As Brother S. H. Hall, of Nashville, Tennessee, has written in answer to the question "*Does Our Lord Heal His People Today?*", "I unhesitatingly answer the question above asked, *Yes*, most assuredly He does. But there is quite a difference with healing today and in the days of Christ and his apostles. The healing then was done instantly—that is, immediately, without delay. He touched blind eyes, and they at once saw. He spake the word, and the sick were made well. Certainly you can have no trouble in seeing the kind of miracles performed by Christ and his apostles. Any kind of disease, any kind of physical infirmity was healed at once—the lepers, the man without a leg or an arm, people blind from birth, one born a cripple and now forty years old.

Now, while such healing we have not now, for there is no reason for it, no new revelations to be confirmed, yet God blesses his people today in all of their troubles. He is with us all the time and causes every experience we have to bring a blessing to our souls. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are called according to his purpose." (Rom. 8: 28.) "The called according to his purpose," is his church. If

you are a member of his church you have this assurance. "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord." (Eph. 3:10, 11.) When God purposed to send Christ to save us, he then and there purposed that Christ should build for himself a church through which to operate and in which he blesses his people. (Matt. 16:18, 19.) And in this church he blesses us "exceeding abundantly above all we think or ask." "Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, to him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. (Eph. 3:20, 21). This is what the church of Christ believes, the church I am happy to represent. Our Lord goes beyond our thoughts and our asking—*exceeding abundantly so.*

But our Lord's making us well when we are sick is not now like it was when he and his apostles were working miracles to confirm their teaching. We are now under the reign of the law of love already referred to. In the days of the apostles, disciples were left sick here and there just because there was no reason or necessity to make them well in a miraculous way. Paul states that he left "Trophimus . . . at Miletum sick." (2 Tim. 4:20.) Epaphroditus was sick, nigh unto death, but he was not healed in a miraculous way. God spared him, made him well because he had a work for him to do. (Phil. 2:25-27). All known remedies for such sickness were used, and the matter was left with God to sanctify them to the saving of the sick if God so willed. Hezekiah was sick unto death and prayed most earnestly, and God added fifteen more years to his life. But he was not made well instantly. A poultice made of figs was laid on the boil by which he was afflicted, and he got well. (2 Kings 20:1-7.)

When sickness come to us or our loved ones, we should do all we know to do to meet the demands of the case. But we should never fail to put the case in the hands of our Lord and trust him, even more than we do our doctors, to make the loved one well if it is his will. We have a prayer list at Russell Street, including all of our sick, our aged, and our infirm. We know that in many instances cures have been made when all the doctors stated it could not be done. I could give example after example in my fifty-three years as minister, but it is needless. How far God intervened in these cases is not for us to say, for we do not know. All such cures are progressive, not affected immediately or instantly, but in the course of time the loved one gets well."

—*Gospel Advocate*, (Oct. 7, 1948).

Fourth, we are not discussing God's power. We are concerned with the question as to whether or not He has promised miraculous power to the church today. The question is not: Has God the power to work miracles? He has. The question is: Does God give to the church today the power which He manifested through the apostles in the first century. For example, no believer today questions God's power and argues that He could not create men and women today as He created Adam and made Eve. Although God is powerful enough to do it today, every believer recognizes that He has not promised to do it today and that He is doing it today. *There is no Scripture which says that He cannot do it or that He will not do it.*

However, the fact is that He is not doing it today. It is clear that when we deny that God creates men now as He did Adam, we are not denying that God has the power. We are simply affirming that He is not exercising His power in that manner today. Likewise when we affirm that God has not given us the power today which He gave to the apostles, we are not denying His power. *We are not trying*

to limit God, but we do intend to determine, from the Bible and from the efforts of modern healers, as to whether or not God has withdrawn *from His church the power to work miracles*. In fact, if there is anyone who is trying to limit God's power it is some of the modern healers; especially those who refuse to let God heal people through the use of good medicines. They use bread to sustain life. They do not leave it to God to do it directly and immediately without bread. And yet, they refuse to use, at least some of them do, medicines which are just as much made out of materials found on God's earth as is bread. They simply say that He must not heal them through medicines but that He must be limited in this work and do it only through miracles.

If the reader will keep the real issue before him he will not be confused by the assertions and arguments made by many healers. This issue, as to whether or not God has granted the church today the power which He granted the apostles and certain other individuals, *is the only issue before us*. When people see the real issue they will not be able to maintain with sincerity that the church of Christ, because it does not claim miraculous powers today, insults God's goodness; endeavors to limit his powers; or maintains that God does not answer prayer.

(2) *The issue before us*

The issue is whether or not God has granted to men today the power to perform miracles that He granted to certain men in the Bible. If He has, it is a case for demonstration—not verbal arguments—by those who claim to possess such power. We cannot imagine that Jesus claimed power and then never used it, never demonstrated it. If those who claim miraculous power today have it, they should be able to duplicate—or at least work wonders which are parallel with them—the miracles set forth in the Bible. If they are

unable to do so it is clear that God has not granted to them the power which they claim.

In stating the issue it is seen that there is no charge made against the sincerity of members of those denominations which claim miraculous power.

Chapter Two

MIRACLES RECORDED IN THE BIBLE

The miracles in the Bible should be *compared* with those of the modern "miracle" worker. A comparison will reveal, as we shall later point out in detail, that Bible miracles and modern miracles differ widely; that conflicting sectarian groups all perform the same type of miracles; that their miracles are generally within the realm of faith healing; and that in this realm they have been equaled by psychiatrists and hypnotists.

Here is a list of some of the miracles in the Bible. It clearly shows that *these miracles are in an entirely different class from the so-called miracles of modern faith healers*. (1) The creation of the heaven and the earth; creation of living creatures including man; and the formation of woman from man (Gen. 1, 2). Do these miracles have to be repeated each generation? Is God to be accused of favoritism because He does not bring things into existence in this manner today? (2) The miracles in Egypt which included the turning of a rod into a serpent; the turning of water into blood; the smiting of the country with a plague of frogs; the thick darkness; and the death of the first-born in Egypt while, at the same time, those who did what God commanded were spared (Ex. 3:20; 7:17). (3) Rain ceased (Rev. 11:6). (4) Lunatics healed (Matt. 17:14). (5) The blind were made to see (Luke 18:41). (6) Lepers were healed (Matt. 8:2-). (7) A dead man was raised when Elisha's bones touched him (2 Kings 13:21). (8) A woman was healed, when she touched Jesus' garment (Matt. 14:36; Luke 8:44). (9) People were healed by means of Paul's handkerchiefs (Acts 19:11-12). (10) The

clothes and the shoes of the children of Israel did not wax old in forty years (Deut. 8:4; Neh. 9:21). A repetition of this miracle would certainly come in handy in the days of rationing. (11) Miracles were performed in connection with animals in which their ferocity was controlled; they were made to speak; they were summoned by God; dust was turned into lice; and a big fish became the host of Jonah (Dan. 6:16-27; Num. 22:28, 29, 30; 2 Pet. 2:16; Psa. 105:40; 1 Kings 17:6; Ex. 8:16; Jonah 1:17-). (12) Sprinkled ashes caused boils (Ex. 9:8). (13) Men were smitten with blindness (Gen. 19:11; 2 Kings 6:18; Acts 13:11). (14) Miriam was smitten with leprosy (Num. 12:10). (15) A man was cured of leprosy, when he dipped seven times in the river Jordan (2 Kings 5:10-). (16) Jeroboam was smitten with a withered hand and then it was cured (1 Kings 13:4). (17) Zacharias was smitten with dumbness (Luke 1:20). (18) Plagues were miraculously stayed (Num. 16:50). (19) Poison was removed or made ineffective (2 Kings 4:39-41; Acts 28:3-6; Mark 16:17-20). (20) The lame were healed (John 5:5; Acts 3:6-; 9:32, 33, 34; 14:8-10). (21) Those sick with fever were cured (Matt. 8:14-). (22) The face of Moses shone after he had communed with God (Ex. 34:29-). (23) Christ was transfigured before three of His disciples and Moses and Elijah appeared unto them (Matt. 17:1). (24) Enoch was translated so that he did not see death (Gen. 5:24; Heb. 11:5). (25) Elijah was taken into heaven (2 Kings 2:1, 11-). (26) Philip was miraculously caught away so that the eunuch saw him no more (Acts 8:39-40). This took place right after Philip had assisted the eunuch in being buried and raised with Christ in baptism (Compare Rom. 6:2; Col. 2:12; Gal. 3:27). (27) Christ and His apostles raised the dead. One of the dead persons had passed away four days before (Mark 5:22; Luke 7:22; John 11:43; Acts 9:40; 20:9). (28) Demons were cast out of people (Matt. 8:16). Some

of them were cast into swine (Mark 5:10-). (29) People were fed with manna from heaven (Ex. 16:4-). (30) Meal and oil were miraculously increased (1 Kings 17:14-). (31) Christ fed thousands with a few loaves and fishes (Mark 6:37-44). (32) A woman was turned into a pillar of salt (Gen. 19:26). (33) A flood was sent and it destroyed most of the people on the earth (Gen. 7:11). Shall we take the approach that some people take and accuse God of changing because He has not, and He shall not, again destroy the earth by water? (Gen. 9:8-16). (34) The waters of the Red Sea and the waters of Jordan were miraculously divided so that the people walked through on dry land (Ex. 14:15-; Josh. 3:13-). (35) Water was brought forth from a rock (Ex. 17:6-). (36) Iron was caused to float (2 Kings 6:5-). (37) People were enabled to walk on water (Matt. 14:25-; Mark 6:48). (38) A pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night acted as a guide and as a protection to the children of Israel (Ex. 14:24-). (39) An altar was rent in twain (1 Kings 13:3). (40) Storms miraculously ceased (Mark 4:39-). (41) Fire came down from Heaven in a miraculous manner (Lev. 10:1-). (42) Three Hebrew children were not consumed by the fire in the furnace which had been heated to many times its normal temperature. And furthermore, although only three were cast into this furnace a fourth person appeared in it with them (Dan. 3:20-). (43) The sun and the moon stood still (Josh. 10:12-). (44) There was a cloud by day and a fire by night over the tabernacle during the journeyings of the children of Israel (Ex. 40:38). (45) Deliverance from prison (Acts 5:19; 12:7; 16:26). (46) Ear restored (Luke 22:51). (47) Halt and maimed—those with a limb missing or crippled—healed (cp. Matt. 18:8; 15:30-31).

These miracles are sufficient to indicate that *the workers of so-called modern miracles do not do the wonders which*

were done by God's messengers of old. Let them demonstrate their power by doing miracles of the above nature, most of them which are entirely out of the realm of faith healing.

Chapter Three

THE PURPOSE OF MIRACLES

(1) *Miracles were used to start things.*

Miracles played a part in the creation of the universe and of man; but God's providence and His natural laws have perpetuated them (Matt. 5:45; Acts 14:16-). Miracles played a part in the establishment of the church, God's new spiritual creation, but spiritual laws perpetuate it (Gen. 1:1-; Heb. 11:3; 2:1-4; Luke 8:11). There is no passage that says that God would not make other men as He did Adam; and yet we know that He does not so make men today for we see no example of it and He has ordained that the race be perpetuated by natural laws. Just so miracles were involved in bringing the seed, the word of God (Luke 8:11) to earth and the truth and church are now perpetuated by that seed.

(2) *Miracles confirmed the word of messengers and led people to believe that they brought a message from God.*

When Moses told the Lord that the people would not believe that God has appeared unto him, God gave him a sign "that *they* may believe that the Lord God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath appeared unto thee." (Ex. 4:1, 4-5). Elijah referred to this function of miracles when he told the prophets of Baal to "call ye on the name of your gods, and I will call on the name of the Lord; and the God that answereth by fire, let him be God." (1 Kings 18:24). Tongues were for a sign to unbelievers (1 Cor. 14:22). The miracles were to confirm the word of those who received the gospel from Christ (Heb. 2:2-4). Even the record of the miracles was for the purpose of creating faith in Jesus,

the one who performed them (John 20:30). However, it is well to notice that miracles alone were not enough to prove that an individual had a message from God. The message which he taught had also to be taken into consideration (Deut. 13:1-; Matt. 24:11, 24; Gal. 1:6-9).

We do not have the need which one existed for miracles. While the New Testament was being revealed, those who revealed it needed miracles to confirm the fact that they were inspired messengers of God. *We have no more revealers today and thus we have no more confirmers.* Paul said: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing *them* witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?" (Heb. 2:2-4).

Christ began to speak this great salvation but His apostles and other inspired men were the ones who carried the the work on and delivered the all truth to men (John 16:13). Christ did not finish speaking and revealing it while on earth, so he gave them the task of finishing that work. They delivered it fully unto men and thus *it was both spoken and confirmed in the first century.* Since miracles were to confirm it while it *was being* revealed, and since it *has been* revealed already, miracles are no longer necessary unless new revelations are necessary.

(a) *God born witness with them.*

The miracles which *they* wrought while *they* were delivering the truth were confirmation that *they* were messengers of God. We do not have with us today, in person, individuals who heard Christ, the Lord (Acts 10:36), while He was in the flesh, and thus we do not have that miraculous confirmation which was given *to those who heard Christ,* with the purpose of confirming what *they* had

heard. Since we were not with Him it is impossible for us today to confirm, as they did, what *they* heard. They heard it; they confirmed it. In court when testimony has been delivered and confirmed, and when those who gave the testimony have passed on, it is impossible to recall the witnesses. We may go to the record which they left, and believe what they wrote (John 20:30), but we do not and we cannot have them with us. It is just as impossible to get people today, who did not even live when the witnesses lived, to come in and give their witness on the matter. They cannot do so, for they did not hear and witness the things which happened before their existence. The only thing that we can do is to examine their credentials and their witness and decide whether or not their testimony is reliable. We cannot repeat the witness and thus we cannot repeat the confirmation of what they witnessed and confirmed. Miracles were not performed by the apostles to confirm revelations which had been given centuries before. They did not perform the miracles to prove that Moses was of God and that God had revealed, in times past, the ten commandments. *Later miracles were not used to confirm a revelation which had been made centuries before.* Miracles confirmed what *was being revealed* through those who were performing miracles. Miracles today, if they actually took place as they did in Paul's day, could be used in an effort to confirm a modern inspired person but they could not be used to confirm a revelation made centuries before. Of course, if the modern revelation sanctioned the revelations of the past centuries it would help substantiate them, *but only because it substantiated the person who worked the miracles as being a prophet of God.* And since miracles accompanied revelations the modern prophet would be under the necessity of revealing new and additional truths. *But* these modern miracle workers teach false doctrine sooner or later and thus discredit their claim of being sent by God.

(b) *If we must have the same confirmation each generation we must have in each generation individuals who have lived under the same circumstances.*

If we must have those *who can confirm* as the apostles confirmed we must have those *have heard* and have witnessed as the apostles heard and witnessed. However, not even those who claim to have the same confirmation today have individuals who have heard and witnessed the things which those did who were with Christ.

(c) *If we must have the confirmation as did those who heard Christ we must have in each generation Him who so spake so that men today can see and hear as did those who saw and heard in the first century.*

Those who argue for apostles, witnesses and miraculous confirmation in each generation are also under the logical necessity of arguing for a personal appearance of Christ each generation; so that the great salvation may be spoken anew each generation by Him in order that those who hear in each generation may have the message, which they have heard from Him, to confirm by miracles. If the apostles and witnesses could not reveal and confirm, once and for all, the great salvation; Christ Himself could not do His work once and for all on earth. If the work and confirmation of the witnesses must be repeated each generation, His work, which is that which they witnessed, must be repeated each generation. We should all see that the modern "miracle" workers are inconsistent in arguing for the perpetuation of a ministry with miraculous powers of confirmation, when they do not argue for a repetition in each generation of the birth, life, death, resurrection and ascension of Him who first spoke the great salvation. However, if Christ could do (*and He did*) His speaking once and for all, those who heard Him and who delivered His message could make the delivery and the confirmation once and for all. *If the con-*

firmation could not be made once and for all the revelation could not be made once and for all. If the confirmation must be repeated each generation, it must first begin to be spoken by the Lord in the flesh on this earth (Heb. 2:2-4).

(d) *Beloved, the faith has been delivered unto the saints, the church, once and for all.*

Jude said that "I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." (Jude 3, American Standard Version). Jude did not say that the faith had to be re-delivered and re-confirmed in each generation. He simply stated that it was to be contended for earnestly. The faith is here and what we need to do is neither to reveal it anew by inspiration, or confirm it anew by miracles, but to contend for it earnestly and protest against all traditions of men which tend to corrupt the faith. *We* cannot reveal and confirm it as did the inspired men of old but *we* can and we must contend for the gospel which they revealed by inspiration and confirmed by miracles.

The faith was once and for all delivered when the last inspired apostle, in the first century, revealed and wrote the final word of inspired truth, which God had seen fit to reveal to man. Thus was fulfilled Jesus' promise that the apostles would be guided into all truth. (John 16:13). Since *they* finally died the all truth had to be delivered by the time that *they* passed on. While they were revealing it they confirmed with miracles. We did not, we cannot, reveal it and we cannot confirm it as they did. The revelation was completed by them and the miraculous confirmation was also completed by them. That which they revealed is sufficient to guide us to the eternal home, so let us be content with that with which God has been content to reveal and to perform.

- (3) *An element of compassion for the afflicted was also present.*

“And Jesus went forth, and saw a great multitude, and was moved with compassion toward them, and He healed their sick.” (Matt. 14:14). However, the primary purpose of miracles was not to heal the sick for their sake alone. The following considerations make this evident. *First*, the Bible teaches that miracles were wrought not for the purpose of just relieving the sick, but rather to produce faith (Mark 16:20; John 20:30-31; Heb. 2:2-4). *Second*, all were not healed, but all would have been healed if miracles had been wrought primarily to relieve people of their sickness (2 Tim. 4:20). *Third*, God has not promised to spare mankind through miraculous means, the ills to which the flesh is heir. There is no promise that our bodies shall be entirely free from sickness while we are on this earth. *Fourth*, Lazarus was raised from the dead, but the sentence of death was not removed from him or from the rest of mankind (Heb. 9:27). And yet, death is the most destructive thing which happens to the human body. It is not to be compared with sickness in its destructive power, for one may recover from sickness, but not from death. So if miracles had had as their purpose the removal of human suffering, all would have been healed and none would have died.

Thus we must conclude that miracles had the purpose of starting things, of revealing, and of confirming the word of God. Once the revelation and confirmation was completed—as it was when the fullness of God’s revelation for man on earth blossomed forth in Christ who is the supreme and final revelation of God to us—miracles ceased for they had fulfilled their purpose.

Chapter Four

FAITH AND HEALTH

The tremendous impact on one's body of what one believes and of his attitudes are often overlooked. In this chapter it will be shown that cases of healing through the mind—or what may be called "faith healing"—are abundant. This explains how it is that healers sometimes have success. It also emphasizes to the Christian that he ought not to overlook the fact that as Christians we have a right to peace of mind. And flowing from that peace of mind will be some health benefits. As we consider how attitudes arouse emotions and how they influence the body, let us remember that a part of Christian growth is evidenced in the putting away of fear, rage, hate, jealousy, and such like. Christians, of course, are emotionally moved but they should not be consumed by care and worry, envy and wrath. Love is their strongest motivation as they grow. Fear enters in with reference to a fear of sin, and this, too, moves us to forsake sin. Love leads us to forsake sin, and as we grow love more and more becomes the dominating emotional drive. But let us notice how emotions may bring about bodily changes.

(1) *Imaginary ills*

"On one occasion Sir Andrew Clark informed me that he had known of some fifty cases of pulsating tumour of the abdomen that had been sent in for operation, none of which really existed—being what are known as 'phantom tumours' . . . the peculiar character of it being that a whiff of chloroform will cause it to absolutely disappear. The secret was that in thin women, the beating of the great artery can easily be felt in the abdomen, and, haunted with the fear

of abdominal tumor, the mind so dwelt upon it that eventually the muscles of the side contracted involuntarily to a hard ball, and the 'tumour' was formed." (Dr. Schofield, *Behind the Brass Plate*, p. 100).

(2) *Emotions and digestion*

The flow of gastric juice, and other juices that are involved in digestion, can be seriously influenced by one's emotional condition. "The conditions favorable to proper digestion are wholly abolished when unpleasant feelings such as vexation and worry and anxiety, or great emotions such as anger and fear, are allowed to prevail." (Dr. Walter B. Cannon, Professor of Physiology in Harvard University, *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear and Rage* (New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1936, p. 8). Bickering at the table; constant fear; rage; hate; envy; and jealousy can keep one so upset that he cannot properly digest his food, and as a result the entire body is influenced.

(3) *A feeling of power which comes with some types of excitement*

Since our emotional state influences the secretions of our glands, there are some emotional states which influence those glands which pour into our system, ready for use, those secretions which give us additional strength. Thus a man filled with fear in a fire (though some people are paralyzed by extreme fear) has been able to lift and carry out of the burning building a safe which, after the emotion had died away, he could not even lift. A person in anger may in some cases be far stronger than otherwise, although the anger may becloud his judgment.

(4) *The heart can be stimulated by psychic and emotional influences*

"The cardiovascular system, like the digestive system, is under the influence of the sympathetic nerves, but instead of being depressed or inhibited, it is stimulated by them."

(Cannon, *Bodily Changes in Pain, Hunger, Fear, and Rage*, p. 254). He cited some cases wherein the slightest excitement sends the heart pounding. A cardiac disorder was brought on in one woman who saw her husband out with another woman. Since she had seen them while out walking she feared to go walking. When she tried it her heart thumped hard, she had a choking sensation, and a feeling of oppression in her chest. "There was no organic disease of the heart, and yet slight effort as she moved from her home brought on acute distress." (Ibid., p. 255)

(5) *The blood pressure may be affected by some emotional experiences.*

Dr. Dunbar, (*Emotions and Bodily Changes*, p. 231) pointed out that if a strong emotion is persisted in over long periods of time "hypertension may lead to a lasting alteration of the cardiovascular system. . ." This may result, as in one case reported on the same page, from a wrong which one does another and over which he broods without seeking relief in acknowledgement of the wrong, forgiveness, and then a casting away of the burden.

Under some conditions it seems that mental conditions may help set in operation the mechanism or mechanisms which are involved in apoplexy (Ibid., p. 234).

(6) *Child birth*

"It is well known that the difficulties of labor are increased by the unwillingness to have a child." (Ibid., p. 344)

(7) *Growths of psychogenic origin*

"In a woman for whom a cancer specialist had made the diagnosis of cancer, psycho-analysis revealed a growth of psychogenic origin which disappeared under treatment. In a woman, one of whose breasts had been retarded in development for fifteen years, psychoanalysis brought about its development to normal size." (Ibid., p. 348) Two things

are evident in the "cancer" case. First, doctors may sometimes give the wrong diagnosis. This is not a slam against the medical profession for they have done wonders. It only indicates that our knowledge is not perfect, and that symptoms may sometimes be misinterpreted. Second, that growths may sometimes be the result of mental conditions and may disappear under mental treatment. This is likely the type of thing that has taken place wherein some claim that the healing cults have cured them of cancer—wherein there is any basis at all for their claim, for sometimes they make the claim and later die of the cancer.

(8) *Vomiting brought about by mental suggestion*

A physician once had patients given a sugar solution as a medicament to patients in a ward. Then he rushed in, looking disturbed, and stated that by mistake they had been given a harmful drug and that unless they could vomit they would have to have their stomachs pumped out—which would be painful. "Almost every patient vomited immediately." (Dunbar, op. cit., p. 313)

(9) *Blisters produced and prevented by suggestion*

"Focachon produced blisters by sticking a postage stamp to the skin of the subject, giving at the same time the suggestion that this was a mustard plaster. He produced the opposite phenomenon also: the blister-producing effect of an actual mustard plaster was prevented by hypnotic suggestion." (Ibid., p. 380) In one patient blisters could be produced, through suggestion, within a designated time.

(10) *Bleeding prevented*

"In deep hypnosis the subject was given the suggestion that the index finger of his left hand would be analgetic to a deep prick with a pin, and that there would be no bleeding. The experiment was entirely successful, even when a member of the audience (Sir Victor Horsley) did

the pricking. The index finger of the right hand, for which normal conditions had been suggested, bled in the usual manner." (Ibid., p. 386)

(11) *Sweat*

One patient had such control that he could perspire at a designated spot on command (Ibid., p. 301)

(12) *Urticaria*

One physician was reported who could develop urticaria in response to a very slight stimuli. "This physician had been able from childhood to produce urticaria on his arms and trunk 'by the strength of his will.'" (Ibid., p. 390)

(13) *Cure of eczema*

An atheistic Russian professor was cured of eczema by the prayers of a woman. She had a reputation of curing eczema by prayer, and his friends finally persuaded him to go to her. "She took him to the church and asked him to wait at the door. After the first prayer, the pruritus ceased, and after the next day's prayers the eczema was cured, which proves, says Bonjour, that the infection was secondary and that the eczema was of nervous origin." (Ibid., p. 395)

(14) *Basedow's disease*

In some cases Basedow's disease has been found to be, in part at least, of psychic origin. "As long as the enlargement is essentially on a functional basis, it may subside entirely" as the result of mental treatment.

C. D. Camp reported, in 1929, that "I am convinced that in some cases that I have seen with all the symptoms of Graves' disease, including increased basal metabolism and other laboratory findings, the condition has been completely and permanently relieved by the relief of some repressed mental conflict." (Dunbar, op. cit., pp. 156-157)

"H. Rahm, 1930, notes that the psychic influencing of thyroid function is the most clear cut in the case of

Schreckbasedow. A sudden fright is capable of producing a full-blown picture of Basedow within a few hours. Simultaneously with the development of an acute exophthalmos, an enlargement of the thyroid appears. Thrills over the whole thyroid, together with pulsation, may be present after a few hours. However, Rahm continues, acute fright does not play the same role in the pathogenesis of the disease as long-continued sorrow, torturing worries, annoyance, great disappointment, or continuous anxiety." (Ibid., p. 157).

(15) *The deaf hear*

F. Mohr treated a patient who had been almost completely deaf for years in the right ear. The patient was "completely and permanently cured" by psychic treatment within two or three months (Ibid., p. 369).

(16) *The blind see*

Concerning one patient, E. C. Ebert reported in 1931 that "The following day his condition was unchanged, and I decided to try some psychotherapy on him. He was very easily placed in a hypnotic state and then told that at the count of ten he would be able to see. At the count of ten he did not fail me, and he has enjoyed normal vision since that moment. This form of therapy, which fills the entire bag of tricks of the Christian Scientists and chiropractor and other cultists, might well be put to more frequent use by ourselves, and would be if we recognized more fully the psychogenic nature of many conditions." (Ibid., pp. 360-361).

(17) *Ulcers in the stomach*

"Worry, fear, and anxiety, Dr. Goldstein believes, are the real causes of (stomach) ulcers." (*American Weekly*, May 26, 1940, p. 4).

(18) *Christian, live the abundant life*

"Christ came that we might have life and have it more

abundantly. Men are often robbed of the abundant life through fear and worry, from a feeling of the futility of life, and from the dark and dismal dread of mocking death. Christ brings us the faith and way of life which leads to life eternal.

Although many Christians fail to avail themselves of their privileges, they are offered a release from worry. Christ's words to the disciples should be laden with meaning for us also.

'Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am (there) ye may be also.' (John 14:1-3)

'These things I have spoken unto you, that in me ye may have peace. In the world ye have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.' (John 14:33).

There is a connection between the troubled heart and unbelief and between the heart filled with peace and faith in God and in Christ.

The burdens and anxieties of the world crush multitudes but the Christian is invited to cast all of his anxieties 'upon Him, because he careth for you.' (1 Pet. 5:7).

'For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.' (Rom. 15:4).

What greater compensation could we ask for than the one which is extended to us in Christ and in which multitudes have found joy? The burden of the guilt of unforgiven sin is removed when we obey the gospel. The burden of worry and fear is cast out when we cling to him. Why not accept the invitation which the Spirit extended through Paul?

'Rejoice in the Lord always; again I will say, Rejoice. Let your forbearance be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. In nothing be anxious; but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your request be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus.' (Phil. 4:4-7).

Through prayer, faith, Christian living, and through thinking upon the love and power of God let us cast out the termites of sorrow and fear. We do not have to harbour them. Why do so?" (*You Are A Christian Now*, James D. Bales, pp. 97-99).

(19) *God is interested in our health*

Our body and our spirit belong to God (1 Cor. 6:19-20). Our body members are to be offered to Him as instruments of righteousness and our body as a living sacrifice unto Him (Rom. 6:12-13; 12:1-2). It is important, therefore, that we keep our body as healthy as possible that we may be able to put as much energy and activity as possible into His service. This does not mean, of course, that one who is not healthy cannot serve God. We know that they can and have. In fact, the patient, cheerful, helpful attitude that some sick people have bears eloquent testimony to faith in Christ and the peace of God in their hearts. Through such an attitude, even in the midst of pain, they have had a greater influence for good than some very healthy people.

In the Old Testament God manifested concern for the health of His people by giving them certain laws which work for their physical good if they observed them. Some of these laws were: (1) Sanitation (Exod. 29:14; Deut. 23:12-14). (2) Sterilization (Lev. 11:32, 39, 40; Num. 19:11; 31:22, 23). (3) Quarantine (Num. 5:14; Lev. 13:14). (4) Hygiene and dietetics (Lev. 11). (5) Physi-

cal culture or exercise. Outdoor occupation was provided for, even for the priests (Joshua 21:13-19; Lk. 1:8, 23; Deut. 16:16). (6) Recuperation or rest. Every seventh day was a rest day. "The seventh week and the seventh month were likewise marked off for physical and spiritual rest, having embodied in their feasts sabbatic conditions." (Rowland V. Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, p. 35. The entire chapter deals with these laws of health). Christians need to obey the laws of health and thus avoid, as much as possible, the loss of time, energy, money, and health which comes when we violate those laws.

(20) *The danger of the unforgiving spirit*

The great danger of an unforgiven spirit is that God will not forgive those who are unforgiving. Incidentally, however, those who harbor hate and vengeance in their hearts cultivate a bitterness of heart and blindness of mind which hurts their bodies as well as their souls. Christians exercise the forgiving spirit and are those spared the upsetting effects of the spirit of hate and vengeance. The spirit vanishes when we realize how much Christ has forgiven us. We are then content to leave vengeance to God (Rom. 12:17-), and to overcome evil with good.

(21) *Christians are taught to be moderate, temperate, in all things.*

One of the sources of ill health is intemperance—intemperance with reference to eating, a lack of sleep, and many other things. Christian temperance spares our body from the ravages of intemperance.

Christian, have you realized that Christianity benefits your body as well as your soul? As the writer of Proverbs said: "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine: but a broken spirit drieth up the bones." (Prov. 17:22). What a peaceful and merry heart children of God should have!

Chapter V

DID MIRACLES GIVE FIRST CENTURY CHRISTIANS
AN ADVANTAGE OVER US?

Modern "miracle" workers have complained and argued that unless we today have the power to work miracles God has played favorite with the church of the first century. He gave them the power and if He has not given it to us He is guilty of favoritism. Furthermore, if they had the power to work miracles, and we do not, they had the advantage over us for God, through the miracles, made it easier for them to believe than He has made it for us. We present briefly the following observations in reply to this type of argument.

(1) *Do we have an abundant basis for faith?*

First, Christ and faith in Christ are the main thing. Miracles never were considered to be the primary thing. The question is: *Is there a sufficient basis for faith in Christ today without people today having the power to work miracles?* We shall not notice here all of the various arguments for the deity of Christ. We simply suggest that if a consideration of the present arguments for Christ will not convince an unbeliever, that a miracle will not convince him. Faith not only involves evidence, but also of the condition of one's heart. If one is too lazy, or otherwise unwilling, to examine the claims and credentials of Christ it is hardly likely that a miracle would have much effect on him. Abraham said that miracles were not the primary thing in begetting faith for if the rich man's brothers did not hear "Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." (Lk. 16:31). Where is there lack, we ask, in the

credentials of Christ today which necessitate the performance of miracles to bolster His claims?

Second, Jesus Himself indicated that a blessedness is attached to that person who believes although he has not seen (John 20:29). Modern "miracle" workers seem to think that their demand for signs is an indication of their great faith *but it is an indication of a lack of faith*. This will be enlarged on later in this chapter.

Third, John taught that the record of signs done by Jesus furnishes a basis for faith (John 20:30-31). If the present working of miracles is necessary for faith, and if the *record* of miracles has no power to produce faith, *John erred*.

Fourth, the people who advance this argument are discontented with their having been born today instead of during the days of miracles. As one put it to me: Well, I guess, according to your theory, that I was born 2000 years too late. In other words, he was saying that the providence of God which placed him in this century, instead of the first century, was cruel if they had miracles and we cannot work miracles but have only a record of those miracles. They might as well complain because they were not born during the period of time that Jesus was in the flesh. An infidel could take their line of argument and say: According to you I was born 2000 years too late to see Jesus and to witness His resurrection. We should rather be content with the place in time which we occupy without moaning that we should have been born in the situation in which certain ones of the first century were born.

Fifth, these people are dictating to God and telling Him what He must do in order to escape the charge of "favoritism." If God worked miracles then He must do it now or He is guilty of favoritism, is the way they argue. They

might as well argue that He was playing favorites, with those of the first century, unless each generation and each nation has Jesus in the flesh to preach to them. Let us accept what He has done, and not argue as to what we think that He must do in order to meet requirements which WE have laid down.

Sixth, if we can make certain that the records, the New Testament, which set forth the miracles, are genuine then we have as much benefit from the evidence from miracles as those had who witnessed the miracles. And if we cannot ascertain the genuineness of the New Testament records, all of the miracles that one could work today would not necessarily guarantee the message of the preachers, of two thousand years ago, which is set forth in the New Testament. In fact, if the New Testament records are discredited by various avenues of investigation, no amount of miracles by miracle workers of today can make those New Testament records credible. This, too, will be returned to in this chapter.

Seventh, even if it was granted that the proof from miracles does not *appear* to be strong to some people today, as it did to people then (due to the fact that they saw the miracles and that we see only the written testimony to the miracles) we, however, deny that they had the advantage over us with reference to the basis for faith in Christ. If that line of proof was stronger for them due to the fact they saw them, than for us because we only read about them, we still are not at a disadvantage. Why? Because we have some lines of proof which are stronger today than they were in the days of the first converts to Christianity. Some of those lines of proof are: (a) The argument from the spread of Christianity under the conditions and by the means by which it was propagated. (b) The argument from the influence of Christ as testified to by about 2000 years of history and experience. We have

seen Him work changes which those of the first century did not live to see worked. (c) The argument from the fulfilment of certain prophecies and statements which were not fulfilled as completely and definitely in their day as in ours. Some examples of this are: *First*, two thousand years have borne eloquent testimony, much of which the first century did not witness, to the fact that Jesus is indeed the light and life of the *world* (John 8:12). We see its demonstration, its proof, on a scale on which they did not see it. We see its proof over a longer period of time than they were able to see it since they could see only a part of their century while we can see both their century's testimony and the testimony of numerous other centuries. *Second*, the development of the fulfilment of the prophecies of the apostasy has been demonstrated to us, in the realm of history, while to them it was a matter of prophecy. We see both the prophecy and the fulfilment. Before its fulfilment the prophecy could not be offered as a proof; but we can offer it as a proof today for we have the fulfilment to point to as proof the inspired prophetic powers of the apostles. *Third*, certain prophecies of Jesus have been fulfilled since the time of the first converts to the faith, and we today can use them as proof for His claims, while they could not do it. They had just the prophecy. We have both the prophecy and the fulfilment. (d) As knowledge concerning the nature of man increases, it is being discovered that the Bible correctly understands man's nature and that its message probes to the very heart of man's nature and needs. This is a confirmation of the gospel which they did not have formulated as we can formulate it. They may have experienced it in that the gospel did know their nature and meet their needs, but they did not have the accumulation of scientific investigation which enables us to work this evidence into an argument for the Christian faith. (e) We have the argument of the

fact that 2000 years of thought and of action has still left His teaching and life unsurpassed. That Man and His Message is still so far ahead of most men that they have not even started really to understand Him or to even begin to approach Him in life and teaching. The early Christians could claim, and rightfully so, that He would never be surpassed; but they could not point to two thousand years of history, since He lived, and challenge the world to produce one man and his message which surpasses Jesus of Nazareth. If Jesus were mere man, why is it that though our generation has outstripped in countless fields the generation of Jesus, yet none have outstripped Jesus.

We are thus seen to have avenues of faith which they did not have. So we are not at a disadvantage. If their seeing miracles gave them an advantage over us because we only read about them; then our seeing the fulfilment of these things, many of them of which they only read as predictions without seeing their fulfilment; our seeing these things, we say, gives us an advantage over them. So it sort of balances the scales. Some lines of proof were strong for them which some do not think are as strong for us and some lines of proof are strong for us which they did not have available.

Let us, however, elaborate on the fact that the New Testament miracles are also a confirmation of the word for us, as John stated (John 20:30-31).

(2) *How New Testament miracles contribute to our faith*

Robert Hall, in his review of Olinthus Gregory's *Evidences, Doctrines and Duties of the Christian Religion*, emphasized that the value of the miracles of Christ, as proof of His divine mission, does not diminish the farther away we get from the time when they were wrought. "He closes this part of his disquisition with an elaborate con-

futation of the notion too generally admitted by the advocates of revelation, that the evidence of miraculous facts necessarily grows weaker in proportion to the distance of the time at which they were performed; and in no part does the vigour of his understanding appear to more advantage than in his reasonings on this point, where, among many excellent, we meet with the following profound remark: 'It is only with regard to the facts recorded in the Bible, that men ever talk of the daily diminution of creditability. Who complains of a decay of evidence in relation to the actions of Alexander, Hannibal, Pompey, or Caesar? How many fewer of the events recorded by Plutarch, or Polybius, or Livy, are believed now, (on account of a diminution of evidence) that were believed by Mr. Addison, or Lord Clarendon, or Geoffrey Chaucer? We never hear persons wishing they had lived ages earlier, that they might have had better proofs that Cyrus was the conqueror of Babylon, that Darius was beaten in several battles by Alexander, that Titus destroyed Jerusalem, that Hannibal was entirely routed by Scipio, or Pompey by Julius Caesar; though we sometimes find men of excellent and enterprising minds exclaiming, "O that I had lived and been present, when such splendid events occurred; how lively an interest should I have taken in such scenes, how much concern in their termination!" And indeed it is the frequent hearing of such exclamation that causes men to *confound weight of evidence with warmth or depth of feeling: and to lose sight of the essential difference between real evidence, or the true basis of belief in history, and the sensible impression or influence which such history may make upon the mind.*' We have only to remark, before we dismiss this subject, that, whereas the evidence of facts which occurred at a distant period is usually placed under the head of *successive* evidence, this distinction, as applicable to the miracles of the gospel, must

either be rejected altogether, or admitted with a caution against being misled by the ambiguous use of words. The evidence, in this case, is not to be confounded for a moment with that of a report transmitted through successive ages to the present time, since the record which contains the miraculous facts carries us back to the apostolic age; so that, admitting its antiquity to be what it pretends, of which there is the most satisfactory evidence, the only link in the succession is that which separates the performers or spectators of the miracles from their narrators, who in the case before us, however, are frequently the same person."¹ And even when they were not the same persons they were recorded by persons who had seen apostles (who had been with Christ when He worked His miracles) work miracles.

This is in agreement with the inspired declaration of the apostle John for he wrote: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but *these are written, that ye might believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John 20:30-31). We did not see the miracles wrought by Jesus, and neither shall He repeat them for us in this generation by returning to earth and repeating His personal ministry. But John taught that a *record* of the miracles could furnish an adequate basis for faith, and thus he furnished us with such a record. Since the historical integrity of the New Testament writings are established even beyond that of any other documents of antiquity, we are brought face to face, by this written testimony, with those who saw Jesus work miracles. If we are unwilling to receive this testimony which John has written down, we would be unwilling to receive it if we had seen John in

¹Robert Hall, *Reviews*, 2nd Edition (London: Published by B. H. Holdsworth, 1825), pp. 170-171.

person, and he had told us in *spoken words* what he has told us in *written words*. Certainly those who claim to have the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, and thus of the guidance of the Spirit, discredit their own claims when they maintain that the miracles of the New Testament record can have little value, as proofs of the truth of Christianity, unless men today can work miracles. They discredit their claims for the Spirit in John expressly stated that a record of the miracles was made to produce faith, that it could produce faith; and those who deny it are certainly not under the direct guidance of the same Spirit who guided John, for the Spirit would not while in them contradict what He revealed through John.

(3) *A blessing pronounced on those who believe without seeing miracles performed*

The people who contend for a perpetuation of miraculous gifts forget that Jesus pronounced a blessing on those who believed although they did not see any visible miracle wrought right before their eyes. The person who does believe in this manner is much more mature than the person who continually demands a sign to create or to bolster up his faith. They do not realize that the church has passed the stage of infancy, of beginning, of childhood. It now thinks as a man does and it does not have to depend on the presence of miracle workers as it did when it was in its infancy.

Thomas said that he would not believe that Christ had been raised from the tomb unless "I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, *I will not believe.*" (John 20:25). He was somewhat like some people today who profess to believe in Christ and yet demand that He work miracles to establish their faith and that if He does not do it He has shown partiality and favoritism

to those of the first century. *Like Thomas, they demand a sign.*

Christ appeared to them and said "to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God." (John 20:27-28). Christ presented to Thomas proof of the resurrection by appearing before him in the flesh and inviting the actual touching of His wounds. If those who contend for miracles today were consistent they would study this passage and then say: The Lord is the same today, yesterday and forever. The Lord appeared to Thomas in this manner after Thomas had said he would not believe without a demonstration. Therefore, the risen Lord with the nail prints in His hand will appear unto all doubters today. And since our faith needs sustaining at times He must appear unto all of us also. And if He does not then He has changed. Furthermore, Christ appeared to Thomas and if He does not so appear to me He is a respecter of persons and guilty of favoritism. In addition to this, if Christ does not do this today to convince doubters then we might as well cut this particular portion of the Bible out for no one follows it today. The arguments of this nature which people today make to prove that miraculous powers have been, and must be, perpetuated in every generation are of equal force when applied to this particular incident. This shows how foolish they become through failing to realize God's method of creating and establishing through miracle and perpetuation through law—both "natural" and spiritual.

When Thomas professed his faith, Jesus said? "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: *blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*" (20:29). "Christ assigns a higher place to those who are led to

faith, without such visible proofs, by his spiritual self-manifestation in the preaching of the Gospel—a faith arising inwardly from impressions made upon a willing mind.” “His words implied that, in all after time faith would be impossible, if there were no other way of passing from unbelief to belief except by sensible signs of assurance. The passage is strikingly illustrative of the process by which faith is developed. It contains the ground and reason why the gospel history had to be handed down precisely in a form which could not but give occasion for manifold doubts to the human understanding, when it conducts its inquiries apart from the religious consciousness and religious wants.” (Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 433). Christ indicated that many would believe without having had the opportunity to see the resurrected Christ.

Faith today comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17). The word of God is the seed of the kingdom and it carries conviction and life to the heart which is prepared for it (Lk. 8:11-). The written word carries such conviction. Immediately after recording Jesus' blessings on those who believed *without seeing the signs*, such as Thomas demanded, John wrote: “And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: *but these are written*, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through His name.” (20: 30-31). “If people will not believe in Jesus because of the signs *written*, they need not ask to see signs *wrought*.” When John wrote the days of miracles, of signs to confirm the word, were passing and John taught that the testimony of the written word—of the record of the signs—could produce faith which leads to eternal life. He had more confidence in the power of the written and confirmed word, with its record of the signs wrought, than many of our religious friends today. *This is another proof that*

they do not have the same Spirit which guided John or they would see the sufficiency of the written word, and record of the signs, to create the faith which Jesus blessed by saying "blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

(4) *There is abundant testimony to Christ*

Some feel that without the power to work miracles that we are left without proof of Christ's divinity. Not so. Notice some of the lines of proof.

First, that presented by John when he wrote that a record of the signs furnishes a basis for faith (John 17:20; 20:30-31). We have reason to believe in the truthfulness of the New Testament documents and thus in what is recorded in them.

Second, Christ is the fulfilment of prophecy.

Third, Christ is the author of prophecy.

Fourth, it is impossible to account for Him and His New Testament portrait on a purely natural basis.

Fifth, His teachings testify for Him.

Sixth, His works bear Him witnesses.

Seventh, the resurrection bears witness to His divinity (Rom. 1:4).

Eighth, His effect on the individual and on society bears testimony.

Ninth, the witness of personal experience which comes when we test His teaching with the logic of life (John 7:17). Christ meets our needs and develops our potentialities.

When we examine the credentials of Christ we are led to faith and we are blessed for, although we have not seen Him, we trust Him.

(5) *Their argument promotes infidelity*

It is also well to point out, in connection with their argument, that it helps make infidels. They claim if the early Christians had such power that they also have it.

In other words, if we cannot work miracles they could not have worked miracles. Thus some people who see their failures will think that Paul and the other miracle workers in his day were also failures. And certainly they were if they did not do any better than the modern miracle workers! So people who see their failures regard these failures as evidence of the failures of the apostles.

Conclusion

The conclusion to which the facts have forced us is that those who lived in the first century did not have a real advantage over us. Let us use what God has given us, and be satisfied therewith. A failure to be satisfied with God's arrangement will lead us to forsake His way for man's way. As Farrar wrote:

"It seems no exaggeration to say that our evidence for the truth of Christianity is at least as strong (is it not stronger? J. D. B.) as that of the earliest disciples. To minds not yet familiar with the methods of God's working, the fearful apparent disproportion between the short period of our Lord's ministry, and the apparent insignificance of its immediate visible results when compared with His Divine claims, would have gone far to outweigh a faith founded on His miracles in an age when miracles were comparatively disregarded." (F. W. Farrar, *The Witness of History to Christ*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1883, New Edition, p. 4, footnote). And thus although we do not *feel* the force of His miracles as much as did those who saw them performed, yet it is not true that our basis for faith in Christ is weaker than theirs since we did not see the miracles. We have the testimony to the miracles, and we have the advantage of looking back over the centuries and seeing how permanent is the Christian faith, and how beneficent are its influences on civilization. We can know these as historical facts, while Christians in the first century could only believe that such would be the case.

Chapter VI

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN CLAIMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Modern healers maintain that they possess the powers which certain men in the Bible possessed. They advance numerous arguments in an effort to prove that it is scriptural that we today possess such powers. Claiming to possess such powers they also claim to work as mighty miracles as miracle workers in the Bible wrought. In order to decide whether or not they are right in this claim let us consider some of the characteristics of the New Testament miracles and see how they are in striking contrast with those of modern "healers."

Recently I checked up, in company with a friend, on what some people in Oakland, California, claimed to be a miracle. We saw a crippled boy "healed." In spite of the boy's own claim to be healed, and that of his parents, the following facts are clear after seeing the "miracle" and talking with the boy and his parents. *First*, the boy had had a similar operation in times past and, after a period of time, had been able to walk without crutches. *Second*, the doctor, who was treating the boy, said that the boy would have been able to walk without his crutches the last time he had seen him. The doctor made this statement over the telephone to W. Curtis Porter, before he knew that claims had been made that the boy was healed. *Third*, although the boy laid aside his crutches, the night he was healed, he limped off the stage. *Fourth*, about two weeks after the healing the boy still limped. *Fifth*, his leg had not returned to its normal size. *Sixth*, the place the doctor had cut open in the operation had not yet com-

pletely healed. *Seventh*, the boy still kept a dressing on the leg and also vaseline, or some such preparation, in order to keep cloth from sticking to the wound. We do not doubt the sincerity of the boy and his parents. It may even be that the boy received, in the "healing service," such a psychological stimulus that his recovery has been somewhat hastened (although the doctor expressed the fear that the boy might break his leg); *but* the point which we emphasize is that *it was not a healing like those performed by the apostles of Christ.*¹ The following characteristics of the miracles in the New Testament make this clear and certain.

I. *The Healings Performed in the Bible Were Instantaneous*

The centurion's servant was healed of palsy the self-same hour in which Jesus spoke the word (Matt. 8:1). The leper was immediately cleansed of his leprosy (Matt. 8:3). Peter's mother-in-law was healed of a fever as soon as Jesus touched her hand (Matt. 8:15). Two blind men had their eyes opened immediately (Matt. 9:27-30). A man's withered hand was restored whole immediately. It became like the other hand (Matt. 12:13). The blind and dumb both spake and saw just after he was brought to Jesus (Matt. 12:22). There is a distinct difference between the slow, gradual healings of today and the instantaneous healings in Christ's day. (For other examples see Matt. 14:36; Mk. 5:1-; Lk. 22:51; John 5:8, 9).

There has been an attempt to prove that Christ healed some people gradually. Reference has been made to the nobleman who asked Jesus to come to his place ere his child died. The nobleman asked his servant when the

¹This "miracle" was performed at a healing service of Dr. (Mrs.) Bebe Patton, at the City Club Theatre, Oakland, Calif., February, 1944, which I attended with W. Curtis Porter, R. C. Cannon, and Edward Moore. The boy was Howard Ray Baker, 5115 E. 14th Street, Oakland, Calif. W. Curtis Porter and I visited the boy and his parents, at the above address about three weeks or so after the healing.

child began to amend. However, although he, an uninspired man, asked that question, we must not overlook the answer. "And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at the same hour, in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth": (John 4:49-54). This, too, was instantaneous.

One "healer" maintained that there was a difference between healing and miracles and that healings could be gradual whereas it would be instantaneous if healings were miracles. He cited John 4:50-52 with its reference to the question of the nobleman as to when the child began to amend. We have already shown the abuse to which "healers" subject this passage, but in connection with the present distinction between healings and miracles, we make the following observations. *First*, if the healings are gradual how can they be a sign that something special is being done? Millions of sick people get well gradually without going to "healers." *Second*, the very case cited was a miracle and is so labeled in John 4:54 where it is called "the second miracle that Jesus did, when He was come out of Judea into Galilee."

Luke 17:12-14 is claimed as another case of gradual healing. It is pointed out that as they went away the lepers were cleansed. However, when the fifteenth verse is read we discover that when one of them "saw that he was healed, turned back, with a loud voice glorifying God; and he fell upon his face at his feet, giving him thanks; and he was a Samaritan. And Jesus answering said, Were not the ten cleansed? but where are the nine? Were there none found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger?" All of them were instantaneously healed as they started to obey Jesus' command to show themselves unto the priests. All were close enough, in point of dis-

tance, to turn back and thank God and Jesus, but only one did it.

In Mark 8:23-25 we find that Jesus laid hands twice on a blind man. Why He did so we do not know. He did not always follow the same procedure in working one miracle that He did in working another. And yet in this case we find that the man did not have to wait for a long time before his sight was restored. After Jesus laid his hands on his eyes the second time "he looked stedfastly, and was restored, and saw all things clearly." (Mark 8:25 A. S. V.) If this case is used to excuse their failures today let them further use this case and immediately lay hands a second time on a blind person's eyes and enable him right then and there to see all things clearly!

There are some who claim that they were healed instantaneously, but that the *symptoms* did not go away immediately. As one put it: She was healed, but the symptoms did not go away for ten days. The following observations are in order. *First*, the symptoms of the disease are a manifestation of the presence of the disease. Without the disease there would be no symptoms. One may be mistaken as to what is wrong, but symptoms prove that *something* is wrong. If the symptoms do not go away, what assurance does one have that he has been healed? If he still feels bad, if all the other symptoms are present, how does he know that he has been healed? *Second*, an individual in such a condition does not have any advantage over the person who does not claim that he has been miraculously healed, but whose symptoms also go away within a period of ten days. There are multitudes of people who get well, whose symptoms disappear in ten days or less from the time that they get sick, or from the time that they visit a doctor. What is the difference between the two? What advantage did the one who was healed have over the other one? The one realizes that he was sick and

that it took him ten days to get over it. The other claims that he was healed, but it took him ten days before he felt like it! *Third*, one might as well be sick as long as he has all of the symptoms. *Fourth*, when God healed people in the New Testament He did not leave them with the symptoms of that of which he had healed them. God can do away with the symptoms as surely as He can do away with the disease. If one argued from their logic, one could argue that they do not believe in the power of God because the symptoms remain. They say that we do not believe in the power of God, because we maintain that God does not give His children today the power to work miracles. We can turn their own logic against them and maintain that, on their own logic, they do not believe in the power of God, for they claimed that He healed them and yet He did not remove the symptoms. *Fifth*, these people are like the Christian Scientists who deny the fact of sin, sickness, and death. Even if one has all of the appearances of sickness, or of death, they still maintain that such does not exist. Those people who are "healed," but who do not get rid of the symptoms for some time, are just as deluded for although the symptoms continue to testify to the fact of the disease, they maintain that the disease is not there. They deny evidence as surely as do the Christian Scientists. *Sixth*, not only is it just as bad to be sick as to have the symptoms of sickness, but even if one has only the symptoms he is still sick. One of the symptoms of a headache is that one aches. The ache is a symptom, and as long as the symptom remains, I still hurt. And that was exactly what I did when I had both the disease and the symptom. *Seventh*, if one has the symptoms, how can other people tell that you have been healed? Since healing, in the New Testament, was to furnish signs so that people could see that the healer had power from God, how can the healing serve as such a sign unless the symptoms go away also?

Eighth, the sister of Lazarus said, when Jesus said to take away the stone from Lazarus' tomb, "Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he hath been dead four days." (John 11:39) What if Lazarus, after Christ raised him, had all the symptoms of death? What if, among other things, the odor of the dead remained with him? Surely all these considerations enable us to see that these poor souls deceive themselves, when they claim that they have been healed, but that the symptoms remain for a period of time. Although they may deceive themselves into thinking that they have been healed, we cannot be deceived by such statements and conditions.

There are others who have been convinced that to doubt that they have been healed is to manifest unbelief in God and to give way to the power of the devil. There was one who was assured by a healer, although the *results* of the healer's efforts were not assuring, that she was healed. She had his word for it, but that was all the proof that she had, for she still had all the symptoms of the illness. The healer told her that if she denied that she was healed, she would manifest a lack of faith. Furthermore, he said that these symptoms were just the efforts of the devil to persuade her that she had not been healed. If she believed the symptoms she would lose the healing! Thus, she was not to pay any attention to those things which indicated that she was not healed. The spell, however, was finally broken and she had to admit the testimony of the symptoms that she was not really healed.

The observations which we offered concerning those who claim that they are healed, although the symptoms may remain for a time, may also be offered in a case like the one just mentioned. If she had enough faith to be healed, why didn't she have enough faith to cast out the power of the devil and thus get rid of the symptoms? Could not God take away the symptoms, as well as the disease? For

all practical purposes and in so far as her health was concerned, she was just as bothered by the symptoms, and they hurt just as much, as when she had both the symptoms and the disease! The facts are, she had both the symptoms and the disease.

II. *Christ Did Not Always Require Faith*

Faith healers generally excuse their many failures by saying that the person, who was not healed, did not have sufficient faith. This is done in spite of the evident sincerity of some of the poor, suffering people who seek healing at the hands of modern healers, but who go away still distressed in body and mind. Christ did not always require faith. What faith did Lazarus have when in the darkness of the tomb (John 11:43)? What faith did the man exercise who was both blind and dumb (Matt. 12:22)? Thus, although faith was mentioned in connection with some healings, faith was neither required nor possible in some other cases.

Some modern faith healers, in an effort to cover up their own failure to do what they claim God uses them to do, have tried to bring the power that Jesus exercised to the same feeble level of the power which they exercise. And thus, when they fail to heal some people, some of the healers will justify their failure by saying: Jesus could not heal all of the people because some of them did not believe in Him. They refer to Jesus' experience when in His own country, Nazareth, where He did not many mighty works because of their unbelief (Matt. 13:58). Several observations are in order. *First*, Christ did not try to work some miracles, fail in the attempt, and then explain His failure by referring to their unbelief. *Second*, modern healers use the unbelief of others as an excuse to justify their failure to work miracles even when they are not in their own country (Compare Matt. 13:54-58). *Third*, Jesus sometimes refused to work a miracle because some of the seek-

ers after the miracles were people who were hardened in unbelief and steeped in sin (Matt. 12:38). However, in such a case, He did not try, fail, and then complain that the ones on whom He failed to work a miracle were unbelievers or sinful. He knew what was in their hearts before He even started to work a miracle. And thus sometimes He refused to work one. We can all see the difference between a *refusal* and a *failure*. *Fourth*, Jesus never failed to heal a person whom He tried to heal. He did not create expectation on the part of the sick person, that he would be healed, and then disappoint him by a failure to heal him. *Fifth*, Jesus never failed to heal a sick person, who came to Him for healing, and then, to justify His failure, insult that sick person and deny him his sincerity by saying that He could not heal him because of his unbelief. And yet, modern faith healers will tell sincere people that they cannot heal them because of their unbelief. Is this fair? *Sixth*, Jesus did not work many miracles in His own country, at this time, because even if He had worked them, they would have failed in their purpose. And since they would not have accomplished their purpose, there was no use to perform them. The purpose of miracles was to produce faith. Where the heart of the people was such that miracles would not produce faith, it was useless to perform them. And Jesus did not give His time and talent to doing useless things. These people knew of Jesus' wisdom and mighty works, and they were astonished at Him (Matt. 13:54). They knew that He had been brought up in their midst; that He had not learned those things from some teacher in Nazareth; and thus they said, "Whence then hath this man all these things." Instead of being logical and concluding that since He could not have gotten these things from man, He must have gotten them from God, they were offended in Him (Matt. 13:55-57). They had an evil heart of unbelief.

"Their invincible prejudice against him rendered them inattentive to his doctrine and stirred their prejudice against him. Miracles were wrought as evidence that his teachings were true; he did not wish to work miracles before men who stubbornly refused to see a prophet in their townsmen. These same Nazarenes sought to take his life (Lk. 4:29). They blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts; they refused to accept Jesus; hence, it would be a waste of divine power to perform miracles that would be disregarded and condemned—Jesus would not do a useless and unsuitable deed. The light that they had and what they might have had became their heaviest curse, so that ultimately Nazareth fell under more fearful woes than did Sodom." (H. Leo Boles, *Commentary on Matthew*. Nashville, Tenn.; The Gospel Advocate Company, 1936, p. 308).

Seventh. Jesus did perform some miracles in their midst. Matthew implied this when he said that Jesus "did not *many* mighty works there." He at least did *a few* mighty works. Mark said that "*he laid* his hands on a few sick folk, and healed them" (Mk. 6:5). Thus, it is evident that although the reason He did not do many mighty works was because of their unbelief; yet this reason is "not to be understood as though their unbelief limited his power, or that he did no mighty works except among those who fully acknowledged him to be the Messiah, which is contrary to the fact; but that the general and entire unbelief of the inhabitants of Nazareth, their utter contempt of his claims influenced, both the sick themselves, who, with few exceptions, had no desire to make application to him, and also their friends, who had no inclination even to make trial of his power, and therefore did not bring them out to him that he might relieve them. The few sick folk who were actually brought to him he healed "by laying his hands upon them." (Richard Watson, *Commen-*

tary on Matthew and Mark, p. 207, London; Published by John Mason, 1833).

Any faith healers who are informed as to the actual teaching of this passage, can not conscientiously use it to justify their failure to heal some individual after they have tried to heal him.

Some healers have used this passage to prove that unbelief on the part of some in the audience can prevent the healing of the sick. *First*, if this be true then why do they not have enough consideration for the sick that they will not invite outsiders and unbelievers to their meetings. And if outsiders get in, the "healers," who claim miraculous powers, should have the gift of discerning the spirits (as some did in Paul's day, 1 Cor. 12:10) and point out such unbelievers and ask them to leave the room. Some "healers" have special rooms for seekers after salvation, why not for the sick? *Second*, Jesus healed people in the very example to which they point (Mk. 6:5). *Third*, he performed many healings when skeptics were in the crowds which gathered around Him. *Fourth*, if healing is included in the atonement, and if miraculous power is with men today, and if God desires to so heal men today, on what basis can one say that He will withhold His mercy just because unbelievers are present? *Fifth*, it would be just as scriptural (if healing is included in the atonement) for God to withhold *salvation* from a seeker, because there were unbelievers present, as to withhold *healing*. *Sixth*, since miracles were to serve as signs to unbelievers that the messenger had a message from God, and thus to help lead the unbeliever to faith in the message, the fact that there were unbelievers in the audience would indicate that miracles ought to be performed at such times. What manner of men are those who claim that we must have miracles today to help spread the gospel and convince men of the truth of the gospel, and then claim that they can-

not work certain miracles because unbelievers (for whose benefit miracles were chiefly wrought) are present!

III. *The New Testament Cures Were Also Cures of Organic Diseases and Not Merely of Functional Disorders*

Christ restored the severed ear (Matt. 26:51; Mk. 14:47; Lk. 22:50-51). Peter healed the man who was lame from his mother's womb (Acts 3). Christ and the apostles raised the dead. They dealt with diseases which were not simply functional in their nature; that is, they were of more than mental or nervous origin but involved such organic disturbances as a severed member, an ear, of the body. "The limitations of present-day healers, however, is tragic to witness. Of 1400 modern cases of healings that were investigated, not one of an organic character was discovered; all supposedly cured were of a neurotic nature." (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, p. 46).

IV. *The New Testament Cures Were Signs Which Helped Certify the Word of the Preachers as the Word of God*

"God also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will." (Heb. 2:4, A. S. V.). Modern "healers" use their so-called miracles to substantiate their message which embodies, among other things, some of the traditions and doctrines of men. Elsewhere in this book we have shown that these "healers" teach doctrines which are contrary to the word of God, the Bible. So not only do these "healers" fail to work the miracles that the apostles did, but the cures that they do perform are used to substantiate some false doctrines.

V. *The New Testament Cures Did Not Require An Atmosphere*

"What a calm, quiet dignity there is about the healings

of the Gospels! No excitement! Nothing conspicuously spectacular! No surging crowds brought and held together by the mass-sense and fascinating personality of a preacher, strong in psychic power." Christ did not have to use the various means which are used in modern "healing" meetings in an effort to whip up the emotions of the crowd to a high state of excitement. They have to work up the proper "atmosphere" before they feel that it is safe to try their "healing" power. Why do they do this when Christ did not? *Christ did not have to do what they do because He had power they do not have.* They have to do what Christ did not do (try to create an "atmosphere") because they do not have the power that Christ had or that His apostles had. The reason they try to create an atmosphere is found in the following quotation. "Here is what two medical men, who are also eminent psychological authorities namely, Drs. Hadfield and Browne, have to say about this matter: 'In mass movements of healing, the number of people, the atmosphere of expectancy produced exactly the emotional conditions necessary to suggestibility; for, in such soil, both faith and credulity flourish, and cures are consequently performed.' And here is what the Doctors have to say about functional diseases: 'These diseases can be produced by suggestion. This was first demonstrated by Charcot; and we have, personally, produced paralysis, blindness, sickness, and other physical conditions, besides such abnormalities as hallucination, anaesthesia and headache by suggestion.' Such a scientific fact means that these medico-psychologists can perform the so-called modern miracles backward." (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, p. 47). This simply illustrates, what we have pointed out elsewhere, that these healers operate in the same realm of mind-cures that psychiatrists operate in. This need for an "atmosphere" is the reason that the "healers"

“appear to do very little, if any at all, house or hospital visitation, where sick and afflicted ones are to be found, and in such centres of need perform their miracles of healing. Sufferers must come or be borne, sometimes from distances, to a centre of healing, seeing that the healings can only be performed within a certain atmosphere. Our Lord and His apostles, however, carried their atmosphere with them.” (*Ibid.*, p. 48).

The noise and fanfare which characterize “healing” meetings cannot be found in the New Testament. The preachers, and the musicians, deliberately work the audience up to a state of emotional excitement. They get them to shouting, and under the influence of mass hysteria and hypnotism they are able to move the audience according to their will. It also makes it easier for them to seemingly affect cures with the emotional, who under the spell of the moment may do some things that they could not do otherwise. Strong emotions can work wonders, although in multitudes of cases they return to their former condition as soon as the emotional excitement has worn off.

V. *The Inspired Apostle Taught That Miracles Were Not the Most Excellent Way, But Some Healers Today Write and Talk as if They Were.*

This demonstrates that they are not guided by the same Spirit who guided Paul. He said: “yet I shew unto you a more excellent way.” (1 Cor. 12:31). And that more excellent way was the way of love (1 Cor. 13).

VII. *Miracles Wrought Over the Protest of Some*

In the New Testament *miracles were wrought on some people over their protest*. Thus, it is evident that the miracle was performed not only when they did not believe in it, but when their will was set against it. Demons were cast out against their will (Matt. 8:28-; Mk. 5:6-10; 1:24; Lk. 4:33). God caused Ananias and Sapphira to give up the ghost; and another man to be blind for a sea-

son. We can be certain that these things were against their will and not because of their faith (Acts 5:1-; 13:11).

VIII. *The Dead Did Not Exercise Faith*

Christ raised the dead, *who could not exercise faith* (John 11:43).

IX. *Healed Because of the Faith of Others*

Christ healed some *because of the faith of others*. The centurion's servant was healed, although he himself did not go to Christ, because of the faith of the centurion (Matt. 8:8, 19, 13). Some people brought a man "sick of palsy, lying on a bed; and Jesus seeing *their* faith said unto the sick of the palsy: Son, be of good cheer, thy sins be forgiven thee." To those who criticized this statement, Jesus said: "For whether is easier, to say, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house. And he arose, and departed to his house." (Matt. 9:2, 5-7). Christ cast the dumb spirit out of a boy because of the faith of the boy's father (Mk. 9:17-27). When the ruler of the synagogue was told that his daughter was dead, Jesus said: "Fear not: believe only, and she shall be made whole." (Lk. 8:49-50). A certain nobleman believed that Jesus could heal his son, and Jesus did heal his son (John 4:50-53).

X. *Jesus Did Not Always Require Faith In His Messiahship*

The man who was blind from birth was healed by Jesus. He had enough faith to obey Jesus, but he did not at the time know or believe that Jesus was the Messiah. He knew Jesus only as "The man that is called Jesus" (John 9:11). Sometime after Jesus had healed him, Jesus asked: "Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, And who is he, Lord, that I may believe on him? Jesus

said unto him, Thou hast both seen him, and he it is that speaketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe." (John 9:35-38).

XI. The Completeness of the Healings Recorded in the Bible Are in Striking Contrast with the Partial Recovery of Some of the Afflicted under the Hand of Modern Miracle Workers.

A woman, who was diseased with an issue of blood twelve years, was made whole from the very hour in which she touched the garment of Jesus and He told her that her faith had made her whole (Matt. 9:21-22). The man with the withered hand, stretched it forth at Jesus' command and "it was restored whole, like as the other" (Matt. 12:13). Peter and John, through the power of God, healed a man who had been lame from his mother's womb (Acts 3:2, 6-7, 12). He was given "this perfect soundness in the presence of you all" (Acts 3:16). The impotent man was made whole (Acts 4:9). Peter said to Eneas, who had been sick of palsy and confined to his bed for eight years, "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole: arise, and make thy bed. And he arose immediately." (Acts 9:33-34). When Christ or the apostles set out to heal a man, they healed him; they healed him immediately; and they gave him perfect soundness. They did not work on a sick person, at so much money per visit, and partially cure him after a long period of time. They healed instantaneously and completely.

XII. Christ Healed All Who Were Brought to Him, But Modern "Healers" Partially Succeed With Only a Part of Their Candidates

Christ healed "all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatics, and those that had the palsy" (Matt. 4:24). "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with

devils; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick;" (Matt. 8:16). "Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing every sickness and every disease among the people." (Matt. 9:35). "They came into the land of Genesaret. And when the men of that place had knowledge of him, they sent out into all that country round about, and brought unto him all that were diseased; and besought him that they might only touch the hem of his garment; and as many as touched were made perfectly whole." (Matt. 14:34-36). "Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto him; and he laid his hands on every one of them and healed them." (Lk. 4:40; see also 6:17-19). "Them that had need of healing He cured." (Lk. 9:11, A. S. V.). Do the modern "healers" heal all those that come to them in need? The apostles "healed every one." (Acts 5:16).

Of the lack of success of modern "healers," the following quotation bears abundant evidence. Dr. Bingham, in writing of a "healing" mission in Toronto, said: "One who actively participated in the anointing told us that he thought that in some meetings ten per cent were healed, and twenty-five per cent received help, but in other meetings nothing was accomplished. This was a testimony of a friend, not an opposer. What of the ninety per cent in the best of meetings and the hundred per cent in other meetings, who were encouraged to come up and take healing, as it was as free as grace—who came and tried to take, but went away disappointed? A godly pastor whom we know said sadly to a friend, in speaking of this great percentage of disappointments: "Those are the people I have to deal with, now that the meetings are over." Expectation, based on the teaching, went so far that many claimed to be healed that were not. The one widely ad-

certised case of healing that died before the meetings were over is a picture of multitudes where the results are not so tragic in the physical realm, but where the results in other directions are more serious. Cripples were lifted on their feet and urged and helped to stagger a few steps while people cheered, only to return to their helplessness, be carried out as they came in—we wish even that could be said. But they did not go out as they came in.” (Dr. Rowland V. Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, p. vi, See p. 115 also).

Of the “healing” work of Dr. Price, Bingham wrote: “A representative committee of Christian men, ministers and physicians that examined 350 cases that passed under his hands, found only five that were cured, and in each case these were susceptible to cure by hypnotic suggestion. Thirty-nine died within six months of the meetings, five became insane and four other cases of insanity were traced to family disappointment in healing expectancy through his ministry. Surely such results are not to be linked up with ‘Divine Healing.’ When these damaging facts are produced, his followers invariably answer that he preached the Gospel. But these deceptions combined with the Gospel are the more dangerous than if proclaimed without it.” (*Ibid.*, p. 23).

Of the “healing” work of Mr. Hickson, Bingham wrote: “We have sought to get unbiased testimony concerning his mission at home and abroad; and while we have no doubt that there have been some remarkable healings, the results, as a whole, considered in the light of expectations encouraged, are exceedingly disappointing. Of the 7,000 cases prayed for and anointed in Toronto, as far as we could ascertain by inquiry, there was not a single outstanding case of healing, although he received thousands of dollars for the two or three days’ ministry here; and in less than a week’s ministry in Washington with results

similarly disappointing, he took in just about ten thousand dollars in offerings from the multitudes of sick for whom he did not procure the healing." (*Ibid.*, p. 24, see more cases on pages 95-104). If the sick were as sure of getting the "healing" as the "healers" are of getting the money both the "healer" and the sick could be happy!

Mrs. May Wyburn Fitch wrote that she had "attended fourteen healing campaigns, ranging from two to nine weeks in length, and was a member of the party in nine. I have attended between three hundred and three hundred and fifty meetings, in most of them being on the platform where I could observe all that was taking place. I have dealt with hundreds of sufferers before and after they were anointed and prayed for, and I have assisted the evangelists as they anointed and prayed for the sick. I have seen people in all sorts of conditions—some suffering from cancer, diabetes, Bright's disease, tuberculosis, and in fact almost everything except contagious diseases. I have seen hundreds upon hundreds of cripples, some so badly crippled they could not even use crutches, but had to be carried in and out of the meetings and up on the platform to be anointed, and *they had to be carried down again.*"¹

Why did she stay with the movement as long as she did? "When questions would come up in mind because of what I heard or saw in some of the meetings, and which I could not reconcile with what the Bible said, I would dismiss it and censure myself for *my* lack of faith. The time came, however, when I could no longer deny the fact, even to myself, that the doctrine proclaimed was a false one, Scripture was misquoted, results were misrepresented, and Christ's own ministry of healing belittled

¹The Healing Delusion, pp. 12-13.

in order to account for the failure on the part of these evangelists to heal people.²

XIII. *Why Some Testify That They Are Healed
When They Are Not*

There have been some sincere people who were not healed but who have testified that they were healed. Why have they done so? It has been because of their confidence in the word of "healers." They have been told that they were healed, but that the devil troubled them with the symptoms of the disease in order to get them to doubt their healing. Others have been told that they are to believe that they are healed, even though they cannot see any change, for to doubt will keep them from being healed. All doubts are to be banished even though they do not see any results or feel like they have been healed. These people need to study the Bible and to recognize that if God healed them they would know it. When did Jesus Christ ever instruct people to believe that they were healed even though they could not see any results? Christ's miracles of healing were such that others could see that the person was healed and that the person himself could feel, see, and know that he was healed. But the "healing groups" have leaders who endeavor to deceive the people by blinding them so that they will say that they are healed although they have no evidence that they are healed. They are called on to have more "faith" so that they will not be disturbed by or recognize the absolute failure of the "healer."

XIV. *How Some Healers Excuse Their Failures*

Modern "healers" attempt to excuse their repeated failures in at least two ways. *First*, some endeavor to shift the responsibility to the persons whom they fail to heal. They claim that they have not met the conditions or that they do not have enough faith. As we have shown else-

²Ibid., pp. 15-16.

where in this book, Christ did not always require faith on the part of those whom He healed. Furthermore, He *never* did try to heal a person, fail, and then try to shift the responsibility to the person by saying that the person did not have enough faith. The people who seek out the "healers" and do all that they are requested to do certainly cannot be accused of lacking faith in what the "healer" preaches. What must we think of that person who, to avoid confessing his own failure and error, thus insults the sincere seekers who come to him with all confidence in his message.

Second, some "healers" are so arrogant that they blame their failures on God and maintain that their responsibility is simply to preach the message and that then the responsibility for healing rests with God. In this way they may deceive the people, and in some cases themselves, but they do not deceive God or those who know the Scriptures. These "healers" who claim that they do not have the power to heal, but must leave it to God, show their ignorance of the Scriptures. If, as they claim, they have the power that the apostles had, they themselves have power from God to heal. In Mark 16:15-18 we find that the believers, who had miraculous powers, were to "lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." This mentions no conditions to be met by those who were to be healed and it placed the responsibility on the person who healed. In James 5:14 the elders were to pray and "the prayer of faith shall save the sick." "Where, then, is the authority for reversing the order, and insisting that the sick shall come to the 'elders' or evangelists and be publicly exhibited, and that the faith shall be on the part of the sick? This passage says that *the elders shall pray the prayer of faith*, and, "The prayer of faith shall save the sick," and the one praying the prayer of faith shall *go to* the one who is sick. One rule which all the healing evangelists I have had any-

thing to do with adhere to strictly is, that the afflicted ones must come to the meetings regardless of their condition. Wheel-chairs, cots, stretchers, ambulances, and all sorts of means are employed to get them there, but come they must. If a sufferer is unable to get to the meetings, then he is denied the opportunity of 'hearing' which is supposed to create faith for healing."¹ Other passages also show that the apostles had power, and so must modern "healers" if they claim the power that was manifested in the church in the first century (Matt. 10:1, 7, 8; Lk. 9:1, 2). Although the apostles recognized Christ as the source of their power (Acts 3:12-13), they themselves had the power given to them. Jesus himself said: "But ye shall receive *power*, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." (Acts 1:8, A. S. V.). In Matt. 17:14-21 when the disciples failed to heal a certain child the Lord told the disciples that the cause of the failure was *their* unbelief; not one word did He say that would even hint that the fault was with the one who was not healed. This same case shows, furthermore, how wrong those healers are who try to justify their failure to heal children by insulting parents by saying that the parents lack faith or that something else is lacking in the lives of the parents.

There are some "healers" who maintain that one interferes with healing if he merely believes that God is able to heal them, or that they will be healed if it is His will. They claim that one *must* believe that it is God's will and that they must believe not merely that He is able but that He will heal them. Such a doctrine dictates to God and tells Him that He must heal them. It overlooks the fact that the leper said: "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." Jesus' answer: "I will, be thou clean." Since

¹May W. Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, pp. 36-37.

no man is wise enough to know always just what is best he must pray in such a way as to indicate that he is willing to accept God's will in the matter, whatever that may be. It may be, as in the case of Paul, God will not remove the thorn in the flesh (Gal. 4:13-15; See also 2 Tim. 4:20). In Matt. 9:27-29 Jesus asked the blind man if they believed that He was *able* to heal them and they said yes. "Then touched He their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you." So He sanctioned the very thing that some modern "healers" do not sanction, thereby indicating that they do not have the doctrine which He had.¹

XV. *Jesus Was Not Inconsistent*

He did not advocate divine healing, try to heal others, and then go around with a physical defect in His own body which needed healing but which He did not heal. Modern "healers" do this, however. W. H. Griffith Thomas wrote that "Many who believe in 'Divine Healing' continue to wear eyeglasses, and it is well-known that Dr. A. B. Simpson wore spectacles to the day of his death (See p. 97-98, J.D.B.). In a conversation with a friend, he frankly admitted that he could not understand why the Lord had withheld this element of healing. Yet to many this fact is proof positive of the utter impossibility of harmonizing 'Divine Healing' with the obvious facts of life considered in the light of Scripture. Moreover, many of those who advocate 'Divine Healing' go to a dentist and not a few utilize the services of a surgeon. This would seem to indicate, as a writer recently said in *The Canadian Baptist*, a belief that God is a good physician but not a surgeon. It is now known that missionaries connected with a certain society are given quinine to be taken as a food, a simple, but significant proof of the untenableness of the position taken on the subject of healing without

¹For reference to a "healer" who takes the positions dealt with in the above paragraph see May W. Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, pp. 48-51.

means." W. H. Griffith Thomas, "Introduction" to Rowland V. Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, p. vii, see pp. 101-103 also.)

It may be answered that the apostle Paul healed people, but that he himself carried a thorn in the flesh which the Lord did not take away from him. Also he did not heal Timothy of his stomach ailment. Our answer to this is twofold: *First*, Paul did not teach that it was the Lord's will that everyone be healed, and then fail to heal people. It is not taught in the New Testament that healing was for everyone, or that healing was in the atonement. *Second*, there is no indication that Paul attempted to heal Timothy and failed to do so. He did not try and fail. He did beseech the Lord to take away the thorn in the flesh, but the Lord told him that His grace was sufficient for him. But there is no indication that Paul tried to use miraculous power to expel the thorn in the flesh—whatever it was—and that he failed in the attempt.

XVI. *Christ Healed People Without Having a Preliminary Investigation by Means of Which Certain Ones Were Selected to be Healed.*

Those who conduct healing services only after investigations and the selection of the ones to be healed, are simply trying to cull out those cases which they believe they cannot heal and to include only those with whom they think they can have some sort of psychological success in their healing service.

XVII. *Conditions Required by Some Healers*

These "healers" lay down conditions that the seekers must meet. Both their conditions and their failures show that they are not following the Bible.¹

"Let us condense these requirements fully expressed by Dr. Henry Frost in his magnificent chapter of 'Christ's

¹For some conditions laid down by some "healers" see May W. Fitch, *Healing Delusion*, pp. 27-.

Sovereignty.' First, one must be a Christian—Christ did not require that a man should be a disciple in order to be healed, as the case of the blind man attests, and the cases of the unevangelized multitudes who thronged upon Him suggest. Second, one, if need be, must confess sin—Christ did not always demand that a man should confess his sin before he could be healed, there being no such intimation in His general acts of healing. Third, one must be anointed with oil—Christ, so far as we know, never anointed with oil, yet He healed." We know that it would have been out of the question to have done so in such cases as where he healed the people without even being where they were. "Fourth, one must be more or less holy in life—Christ did not hold back healing until men had attained to holiness of life, but healed multitudes just as they were, in their spiritual ignorance and common-level living. Fifth, one must believe, not in general, but in particular, by putting one's faith in Christ as the Healer—Christ seldom laid down the rule of a peculiar attainment of faith before healing was granted, but often responded to the simplest and most ignorant appeals. Other conditions laid down are—One must accept healing; and then, one must act as if healed, believing that one is healed as one so acts. If all these conditions are required, certainly healing will remain restricted to the few, for the many will not be capable of fulfilling them. In addition, if all of these conditions are required, it will always be easy to say that this or that person was not healed because he was not sufficiently holy or did not exercise the proper degree of faith, etc." (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, pp. 61-62). *The "healers" always have some excuse to save their face and their reputation although they do not always save the sick; in fact they generally do not help the vast majority of the sick.*

XVIII. *The Cures of the New Testament
Were God-Glorifying*

“Ever and anon we are told that God was magnified as healing was displayed by those He used. Modern healing movements, however, revolving as they do around strong and forceful personalities, are man-glorifying. The Healing-Missioner may try to restrain the crowd from clapping him or waving their hymn sheets as he enters the building, but the fact remains that much of the work is of a fleshly nature. The glaring advertisements with a huge photograph of the Preacher and conspicuous healing facts attached—the constant singing of choruses, exciting as it does emotional people—the emptiness of vain repetitions—flash light photographs—girls walking amid the crowd sell hymn sheets, booklets, books and magazines—the creation of a fleshly atmosphere, thick, confused, and sometimes oppressive, are surely alien to the mind of the Lord. Scenes, witnessed at some Healing Missions, savour more of frantic enthusiasts in a political meeting, than that of reverent souls worshipping the Lord in a place where His honour dwelleth.” (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, p. 50).

XIX. *The Cures of the New Testament Were
Not Used To Start Denominational Organizations*

The New Testament writers, who worked miracles, condemned the building up of a party around their person and work (1 Cor. 1:10-12). They did not establish denominational organizations, instead they called on people to obey the gospel and that made them Christians, members of the one church, the church which is the body of Christ. The apostles condemned religious division (1 Cor. 3:3; Eph. 4:3-4). It was “utterly foreign to the New Testament to build a church around a gift” and yet we find that denominations are being built around gifts. “Now the gift of Healing (and Tongues, J.D.B.) is singled out

and exalted and churches established around its exercise." (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, 52). Joseph Smith claimed miraculous gifts and established a denominational organization called The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Mrs. McPherson established the Four Square Gospel denomination. Dowie established a denomination; Mrs. Eddy the Christian Science denomination; and so with many other healers. These denominations, in the majority of cases, do not work together and use their so-called miracles to glorify their own group. If God was working through all of them they would at least work a little closer together. Furthermore, they build up their own denominations and fail to glorify Christ's own body, the church which is set forth in the New Testament. The majority of them are known by designations other than the designation the Spirit, in the New Testament, used to designate Christ's body, the church. (Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18).

XX. *The Cures Recorded in the New Testament
Were Sometimes Worked by Proxy*

People were healed by touching handkerchiefs and aprons which had been brought from Paul (Acts 19:12). "Modern Healers cannot exercise this power. It has been tried, we know, with financial profits to the Healer, but without physical benefit to sufferers whose handkerchiefs were submitted. And yet, if only the range of healing extended thus far, it would save many from coming great distances, as they do, in order to be healed at some given place." (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, pp. 48-49).

XXI. *The New Testament Records Cases of
"Shadow-Healing."*

There is something shady about the work of some modern "healers" but there is not "shadow-healing." "They even carried out the sick into the streets, and laid them

on beds and couches, that, as Peter came by, at the least his shadow might overshadow some one of them. And there also came together the multitude from the cities round about Jerusalem, bringing sick folk, and them that were vexed with unclean spirits: and they were healed every one." (Acts 5:15-16, A. S. V.).

XXII. *Christ Did Not Have To Be Present in Order to Heal a Person*

The Nobleman's son was healed although he was several miles away (Matt. 8:5-13; Lk. 7:1-10; John 4:46-53). "Jesus, then, could heal at any time, at any place, at any distance. But if He is the same today in respect of His healing, why is it necessary for sick and diseased ones to travel miles to a Tent or a Hall . . . Localised mass-healing, such as we witness it today, is utterly foreign to New Testament Healing." "Why! O Why! is it necessary for the sick-stricken to crawl with great difficulty to some advertised centre to be healed—for people to wait all night in a queue to secure a healing seat for a suffering friend --for the sufferers when present to wait all through the first two hours of a meeting as the atmosphere is being created in order to be healed?" (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, p. 49).

XXIII. *Christ's Healing Were "Never An Exhibition"*

"No healing service was announced." No special time was set aside in which people were to be healed. "One's heart aches today to see sick folks being dragged out to a healing service," and see the serious cases come back without being made whole. In fact, Christ did not seek the publicity as it is sought by modern "healers."¹ Healing was not the outstanding feature of His ministry. The drawing power which the church must utilize is the gospel, which embraces the cross, John 12:32, 33, and not

¹(Matt. 9:30; 12:16; 9:6; s:4; Mark 1:44; 7:36; 8:26; Lk. 8:56).

“healing” campaigns. The apostles actually healed the sick but they never preached healing as do the modern cults.”

Miracles in the Bible were not, of course, just miracles of healing. Therefore, if these modern healers who claim miraculous power really have such power some of them should be able to work miracles other than those which deal with healing. They claim to match the miracles of the Bible but the following are not attempted by them.

XXIV. *Miracles Which Converted One Thing Into Another*

Aaron’s rod was changed into a serpent. None of these modern miracle workers, so-called, parallel this type of miracle.

XXV. *The Resurrection of the Dead*

A dead man was raised when Elisha’s bones touched him (2 Kings 13:21); Jesus raised Lazarus (John 11:43); and the apostles also raised dead people (Acts 9:40-; 20:9-).

XXVI. *The Miraculous Preservation of Clothes and Shoes* (Deut. 8:4; Neh. 9:21)

Where, with reference to these healing groups, have such wonders been wrought by the Lord for their benefit?

XXVII. *The Multiplication of Food*
(Matt. 14:17; Mk. 6:37-44; 1 Kings 17:14-)

Is it not strange that with all their boast of powers equal to that of Christ and the apostles—in so far as working miracles is concerned—that these “miracle workers” do not even attempt to duplicate such a miracle?

We could continue with some of the other Bible miracles which we have listed in a previous chapter (such as walking on the water), but these are sufficient to indicate that the place where these “miracle workers” endeavor to sustain their claims to miraculous powers is in the realm of healing of the sick. Even in this realm there is an

unbridgeable gap between their efforts and the miracles in the Bible. There is also a gap, which they do not even endeavor to span between the type of miracles which they endeavor to work and the various types of miracles in the Bible which include miracles wrought on nature as well as on men.

XXVIII. *The New Testament Miracles Were Wrought to Confirm the Word of God that Was Being Revealed from Heaven at that Time.*

"How shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation? which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard; God also bearing witness with *them*, both by signs and wonders, and manifold powers." (Heb. 2:3-4, A. S. V.). The miracles wrought by Paul, for example, were demonstrations that God was with him in the message which he was revealing to the people (1 Cor. 2:5; 1 Thess. 1:5). When they went forth preaching there was no written New Testament, so the Spirit inspired them (John 14:26; 16:7-14; Gal. 1:11-12), in order that they might know what to preach; and enabled them to work miracles as one of the signs to the people, to whom they delivered this message, that the message which they were revealing was from God. The message was revealed and confirmed in the first century. "When testimony is confirmed, additional evidence is of no use. When a divine purpose is accomplished; signs cease to be given. A seal that authenticates does not need to be attached again and again. Thus, having given proof and substantiated their claim, Christ and His Apostles concluded the miracle-working ministry. With them, the special need of working miracles, including those of healing, passed away." (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, p. 42). When the apostles started there was no written New Testament, when they got through the written New Testament existed. Modern

“healers” generally do not claim that they are revealing new things. They generally do not claim to be inspired as were the apostles. They insist that they have the same Bible which we have and that they are not writing “more Bible.” But the apostles did, they wrote more Bible in that their written word, the New Testament, was placed along side of the Old Testament as equally inspired and as being the word of the new covenant which took the place of the authority of the old covenant (Deut. 18:15-18; Acts 3:22-23; Jer. 31:31; Heb. 8:6-). Why, if these “healers” have the power the apostles had, do they not use it for the same purpose that the apostles used it, i.e., to reveal and to confirm new revelations. They do not so use it and thus we see that both their “miracles” and the purpose of their “miracles” differ from apostolic miracles and their purpose.

Surely enough has been presented in this chapter to prove that the power which these “miracles workers” today possess is not at all like the power which enabled the people in the Bible to work real miracles. These men make great claims but when it comes to a demonstration it is clear, to all those who have eyes to see, that they do not possess at all the power which miracle workers in the Bible possessed.

Chapter VII

THEIR MEETINGS AND MESSAGES
UNSCRIPTURAL

The contrasts, given in the last chapter, between the New Testament and the modern healers prove that they do not have what they claim to have. In this chapter further evidence will be given which shows that their meetings and messages are unscriptural.

(1) *The meetings of the "healers" and "tongues" preachers are not characterized by a sound mind.*

It "is not 'the spirit of a sound mind' (2 Tim. 1:7), which is one of the characteristics of the Holy Spirit of God." (H. A. Ironside, "*Apostolic Faith Missions and the so-called Second Pentecost*," p. 11). Some become mentally unbalanced through "Holiness" meetings. Ironside gives the following description of two of the meetings which he attended.

(a) *Violation of Scripture in their meetings*

"At the close the leader came straight to us, and we withstood her to the face by meeting her declaration that she was living without sin with the counter declaration that we could give her chapter and verse for a direct command of Scripture she had been disobeying all through the meeting. She challenged its production, and we referred her to 1 Cor. 14:34. As we read it she raved in anger, till I felt justified in asking the ironical question, 'Are you not afraid you will lost your sanctification altogether if you get angrier?' She cried out, 'You are possessed with a devil,' and left us." (H. A. Ironside, "*Apostolic Faith Missions and the So-called Second Pentecost*, pp. 8-9).

(b) *Scene at a "Holiness" Meeting*

The following was viewed by H. A. Ironside while visiting a meeting at the Burnside Street Mission, Portland, Ore.

"Almost at our feet a man fell over on his back, writhing and foaming as in an epileptic fit. I suggested getting him out of the close, hot room, or at least getting water, or calling for a doctor, or a policeman. 'Keep your hands off God's ark,' someone shouted: 'This is the Holy Ghost.' For forty minutes, by the clock, he writhed there on the floor, and at last fell back limp, and lay as though dead. Then a 'worker' jumped on his breast, put his mouth to the unconscious man's nose, and cried, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost!' and blew powerfully into the nostrils. This was repeated over and over—a most disgusting spectacle. Finally the man opened his eyes, rose, and sat quietly on a chair, weary, and with no apparent result." *"Apostolic Faith Missions and the So-called Second Pentecost,"* p. 10).

The present writer has witnessed scenes in such meetings which gave evidence of minds which were, temporarily at least, unbalanced. And that the reader may fully realize that such things take place we quote from a member of such a movement who described scenes in their own meetings, meetings in which they contended the Spirit of God was being manifested. Mrs. Annie McPherson in *This is That* gives the following account, which to the Bible-trained reader proves that regardless of what spirit may be at work in such meetings it is not the spirit of God. Whether it be the spirit of man or of the devil we shall not attempt to judge, but we know that it is not the Spirit of God.

"Two young ladies who came to mock, and said it was a shame to keep people lying under the power as we did, suddenly began to weep, crying loudly for salvation, and inside of fifteen minutes were on their backs under the

power, speaking in tongues and praising God. Another young lady came to mock, and after the altar call had been given some time, she was deeply under conviction and approached the front. This power struck her suddenly and left her prostrate on the straw in front of the altar. She was saved, and in a very short time began to speak in such a clear flow of tongues that many remarked about it, and then she gave the interpretation and was filled with the glory of God." (Aimee Semple McPherson, *This is That*, (The Bridal Call Publishing House, Los Angeles, Calif., 1921, p. 155).

"I had just turned to go into the big tent for my Bible, preparatory to leaving for my own tent, when something fell with a thud and a shout to the ground behind me, and all the people began to run and shout. Hastening back to see what it was, I found this same Methodist class leader laying on his back under the power—no, I should hardly say on his back, either, for he was really just on his head and his heels, his body raised up from the ground by the power and his feet going round and round.

"Before we could reach him he was shouting in tongues and praising the Lord as the Spirit gave utterance. After a time he bounded to his feet and went around the tent leaping and praising God." (p. 159).

"Was ever such a scene, in heaven or on earth? In the kitchen, hall, dining-room and parlor they were swept down beneath the mighty power of God. Outside, the crowds were standing, repeatedly sending in word that they were still waiting, and that as soon as those inside had received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, they did wish that they would come out so that they could enter and get their portion.

"Was ever a house so filled to overflowing at a prayer meeting as that parsonage! Even the stairs were filled with kneeling people, calling upon the Lord. One man fell under

the power and came rolling down the steps. The others gave him but a brief glance and went right on with their own praying." (p. 213).

(2) *The miracle workers in the New Testament did not drive some people insane, as do some modern "miracle" workers*

E. G. Fuqua wrote thus of Mrs. McPherson: "Quoting from Mr. C. A. German in *The Fresno Morning Republican* of March 6, 1922, we read: 'Ordinarily a matter of this sort would not attract our attention, but when there are such great numbers coming from under the spell of the meeting breaking down mentally, it gives cause for serious consideration. The deputy in charge of the insane patients at the Fresno county jail is authority for the following: "I have never noticed so many insane patients coming from one source Eight or ten persons afflicted with mental derangement on the subject of religion, and the subject of the McPherson meetings, have been cared for at the county jail. Many of these have been taken to Stockton, where I learn from the superintendent of the hospital for the insane that 'I had no idea how many had been taken to private sanitariums resultant from this same cause.' " " " (E. C. Fuqua, *Modern "Divine Healing,"* p. 17). Such results did not follow the work of men of God who wrought miracles in the first century.

(3) *These meetings cannot be under the control of the Spirit of God because there is too much indecency in many of them.*

Paul said "let all things be done decently" (1 Cor. 14:40), and Paul spoke by the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 14:37). Those who cannot see indecency manifested in many of the "Holiness" meetings are simply so blinded that they do not know indecency when they see it. We have seen young ladies fall to the floor when anointed by a woman evangelist, and then someone, who had some sign of decency left in them,

had to pull their dresses down over their knees. When did the Holy Spirit ever knock ladies to the floor and leave them sprawled there in unlady-like positions?

(4) *These meetings cannot be under the control of the Spirit of of God because there is too much disorder.*

Paul, directed by the Spirit, rebuked those who were abusing the spiritual gifts which they actually had. He said that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets; for God is not a God of confusion, but of peace." "Let all things be done . . . in order," (1 Cor. 14:32, 33, 40). Confusion reigned in "Holiness" meetings which we have attended. Several arise to speak in tongues in some meetings, and do it all at the same time. Many of them scream prayers at the same time. Shouting and screaming evangelists and audiences fill the air with discord. People on the floor moan and groan, while others jump and dance around. as Ironside said: "We could scarcely believe such scenes were possible outside of a lunatic asylum; and even there the keepers would not permit such goings on." (*Apostolic Faith Missions and the so-called Second Pentecost*, p. 10).

(5) *The "healers" tend to place health of the body and health of the soul on the same level, thereby showing their ignorance of God's will.*

And this ignorance of God's will shows that they do not have the baptism of the Spirit as did the apostles. Dr. Bebe H. Patten wrote: "If He cares for your soul, then He cares for your body." (*Healing Powe in Jesus' Name*, p. 24). This places His care of the soul on the same plane with His care of the body. If this statement is true, then why is not the reverse of it also true. It would be true that "If He does not care for your body, He does not care for your soul." Christ did not care for and protect the body of Stephen when Stephen's body was battered with stones, and on Mrs. Patten's theory Christ did not care for His soul; and yet, Christ did care for His soul and received it (Acts 7:55-60).

God's grace was with Paul and sufficient for him, but He did not care for his body and remove the thorn in the flesh. Timothy was under the care of God and yet he had often infirmities.

Mrs. Patten's logic would lead one to argue that if the body dies it is a proof that He does not care for the individual. The pungent, punching pen of E. C. Fuqua well said: "Physical healing was never a *part* of the system of Christianity. Christianity is a *spiritual* system, Heaven's one panacea for the human *soul*, and in the very nature of things it could not embrace a *physical* panacea as a *part* of a system designed for the *soul*. Physical ills have had their 'specific' from the fall of Adam till now, and no revelation from God, sealed with the blood of His Son, was needed to cure the ills of the *body* which is doomed by Heaven to 'return to dust as it was.' It is the *soul* alone that needs the blood-bought system of Christianity, for life eternal in 'the world to come' is the 'cure' offered through Christianity. It has no such plan as healing or preserving the physical body. It offers to its adherents a *new body*, beyond death, and it could not *preserve* the physical body without militating against its one design. It creates a desire to throw off, rather than retain, this physical body; the earnest desire to 'depart and be with Christ,' which is 'very far better' than to remain here. (Phil. 1:23). Its effect is to create a desire to 'be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord' (2 Cor. 5:8), and to secure the *renewing* of the *soul* by the *disintegrating* of the *body*. (2 Cor. 4:16; 5:1). Every principle, service and aim of Christianity is *spiritual*, and as such it relegates all *physical* healings to a domain separate and distinct from Christianity." (*Modern "Divine Healing"*, p. 1-2). Christ died to atone for our sins, our sickness of spirit, and not our physical ills. Miracles were wrought to confirm the word of God. Christ still hears the prayers of His suffering children, but

Christ did not die to save this physical body and neither has He promised to care for our body as He cares for our souls. John said "Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth." (3 John 2). This interest in our prosperity does not mean that we shall all be rich or that we shall never be in physical want. John did not make health the primary thing, but wished Gaius health "even as thy soul prospereth." And this makes health secondary. Furthermore, we know that God does not always see fit to make men prosper in health as they prosper in soul; for saintly men and women have been sick. Paul and Timothy suffered.

(6) *Holiness of life is in danger of being regarded as a means to an end by these people.*

There are some of them who appear to seek holiness of life because they think that this they must have in order to do miracles or be healed. We should desire to rid our lives of all unholiness, but it is not a means to such an end as healing or miracles. Of the Irving movement, Drummond wrote: "Holiness moreover, is prayed for as a means to an end, viz., that the miraculous operations of the Holy Ghost might be manifested in the recipients." (*Edward Irving and His Circle*, p. 181). We are to be holy because God is holy.

(7) *These people are not filled with the Spirit of God because they cannot discern the spirits.*

John said: "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world." (1 John 4:1; A.S.V. 1 Cor. 12:10). John did not refer to disembodied spirits, but to those who profess to be teachers of the word. This is evident since he gave as the reason, that they were not to believe every spirit, the fact that many false *prophets* were in the world. The people who claim the miraculous baptism of the Spirit today cannot discern false prophets

and neither do they recognize true teachers of the word of God. This is evident from the fact that differing and conflicting cults claim the Spirit, *and have the same type of manifestations to "prove" it*, and yet they often denounce each other and teach conflicting doctrines. The "spirit" in somebody is failing to properly discern the truth for some of them are bound to be wrong (we are confident that they all are; although they hold some truth) and yet the "spirit" in them does not discern that fact. Furthermore, the "spirit" in them, as in the case of Dr. Bebe H. Patten, endorses the "spirit" in certain other teachers *who teach doctrines which are contrary to the doctrines taught by the "spirit" in them*. If they had the Spirit of God they would not endorse people who teach things which are very contrary to what they teach.

The writer, along with some friends, had an interesting experience along this line. One night after one of Dr. Patten's revivals in the City Club Theatre in Oakland, California, he was talking with a lady (whose name as we recall was Mary Gatewood) who claimed to have the Holy Spirit. She told me that two men, on another side of the auditorium, were Catholic priests. So I asked her if the Holy Spirit told her that they were Catholic priests. She said that the Holy Spirit told her that they were. She was wrong for the two men were friends of mine and both preachers in the church of Christ. They were W. Curtis Porter and R. C. Cannon. In the same place, on the same night after the meeting was over, the "spirit" in her moved her to try to convert Bro. Moore, a sailor, who was with us. But the "spirit" in Dr. Patten told all of us to leave the building and go out on the sidewalk if we wanted to argue. We were simply discussing the Bible and we were not making a disturbance. In fact, we would have had to scream and shout to make near as much noise as Dr. Bebe H. Patten had made.

(8) *They do not have the Spirit of God with miraculous gifts since they are unable to discern the teaching that the Spirit has given us in the Bible.*

As we have elsewhere pointed out they are not guided into all truth by the Spirit through inspiration as were the apostles (John 14:26; 16:7-14). Furthermore, they do not know, in many instances, what the Spirit has taught in the New Testament and they often pervert and twist what He has there revealed. Such people certainly do not have the miraculous baptism of the Spirit or they would handle His word correctly.

We must judge our experiences by the word of God, and not the word of God by our human experiences. Dr. McQuilkin well said: "At no point is it more necessary to stick closely to the word of God than in these matters where varying personal experiences are involved It is no discounting of the reality and preciousness of Christian experiences to insist that we must first go to the Word and study what is said there before any experience can be judged in the real light, or before any conclusions can be drawn from personal experience." (Robert C. McQuilkin, *The Baptism of the Spirit: Shall We Seek It?* pp. 5-6). Two things make this clear. *First*, God's word, not human experiences, is the standard of truth. *Second*, relying on their human experiences, without a proper study of the Word, has led different individuals into different and conflicting religious bodies and doctrines. Surely that—human experience—which sanctions so many conflicting things cannot be the final authority.

(9) *"Healers" often become wealthy*

Paul did not become wealthy as a result of his work for the Lord (2 Cor. 12:17, 18). We nowhere read of the apostles charging those whom they healed. Especially do we not read that they took money from people, tried to heal them, and failed! Peter could say, silver and gold have I

none (Acts 3:6), but many modern healers differ from Peter in this matter. They also differ from Peter in that when he started out to heal a person (Acts 3:7-8), he did not fail as do modern "healers" in the vast majority of their attempts. Times have changed. Now the "healers" have silver and gold without healing power, as the apostle had; while the apostle had healing power without the silver and gold! Mrs. Eddy became wealthy as a result of the system, Christian Science, which she promulgated. Dowie, McPherson, and Bebe H. Patten, have all seen the glitter of gold.

(10) *"Healers" are not noted for their modesty*

One only has to read their works, see their advertisements, and hear them preach to recognize that many of the "healers" are not noted for their modesty. "Mrs. McPherson glorifies herself in this book from beginning to end. It is computed that she refers to herself over 10,000 times, a sure mark that she is not infilled by the Spirit of God. The photographs in the books are about herself. She figures prominently, robed in white and black in a most sensational manner. When she comes on the platform she intends to be the cynosure of every eye." (A. J. Pollock, *Modern Pentecostalism*, p. 75).

Chapter VIII

SCRIPTURES FREQUENTLY USED BY HEALERS

I. *The Spirit for the asking* (Lk. 11:13).

Jesus said that "if ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Lk. 11:13). There are some who conclude from this that the miraculous gifts of the Spirits are ours for the asking. If this means that all who ask shall be given the Spirit as the apostles received the Spirit, then we should be able to perform the miracles the apostles performed; be inspired as they were inspired; the gifts of tongues should be given to us; and the coming of the Spirit should be accompanied by a sound as of a rushing mighty wind; and tongues, parting asunder, like as of fire, should sit on each of us (Acts 2:1-4). We do not believe that the *miraculous baptism* of the Holy Spirit is here promised to all that ask for it. We know that there are certain limitations. How do we know? *First*, we asked for God to give us the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, if it is His will for us to have it today, and God did not give the baptism of the Spirit to us. Perhaps the reader will say, you did not ask in sincerity. But, we did ask in sincerity. Furthermore, if one must ask in sincerity and meet certain other conditions in order to receive the miraculous baptism of the Spirit, this indicates that the promise is *limited* to a certain class who meet certain conditions. Asking in itself is not enough. *We must ask in harmony with God's will*. All of God's promises to us are circumscribed by His will in the matter and by our meeting the conditions that He has laid down. *Second*, a limitation is evident in the fact that

things do not occur today as they did in Acts 2:1-4. Men do not see, hear, or do what was seen, heard, and done on Pentecost. All must and all do limit this passage; so the thing to decide is what limitations have been placed on it by God. Let us limit it as does the Bible, and not according to our own will. All must agree it is limited, for all do not manifest miraculous gifts, or even claim them. Where does the *Bible* draw the line of limitations? *Third*, another indication that there is a limitation is found in verse 9 where Jesus said “*ask*, and it shall be given you; *seek*, and ye shall find; *knock*, and it shall be opened unto you.” We know that one must ask in harmony with His will for James said “Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts.” (James 4:3). If all one had to do was “ask”, these individuals would have received what they asked for regardless of what they intended to do with it. The only qualification mentioned by Christ in Lk. 11:9 was “*ask*, and ye shall receive”; however, we know that everything that we ask must come within the will of God in order for us to receive it. If it is not in harmony with His will, we can seek, ask, and knock, but we shall not find. Even when this qualification is not stated in a particular passage, the teaching of the Bible in other passages indicates that a promise is always qualified by the will of God. *Fourth*, all Christians have the Holy Spirit, as we have pointed out elsewhere, and they had to meet certain qualifications before God gave them the Spirit. (Acts 2:38; 5:32; 1 Cor. 6:18-20). However, all Christians did not have the promise of the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit. One may have the Spirit and not have the baptism of the Spirit. *Fifth*, before this passage in Luke can be used to prove that all Christians should receive the miraculous baptism of the Spirit, with the accompanying miraculous manifestations, it would have to be proved that Christ had reference to miraculous manifestations of the

Spirit instead of to the indwelling of the Spirit whose presence is made known by our manner of life (Gal. 5:22). In other words, one would have to prove from other passages that it was the will of God that all Christians should receive the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, *before this* passage could be used to prove that the baptism of Spirit is for all. We know, from other Scriptures, that God did not promise nor give the miraculous baptism of the Spirit to all Christians, and therefore we know that it was not God's will that all should have it. Therefore, when one prays today for the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, or when he seeks it, he is seeking and praying for something that God did not promise him, and therefore he will not get it, for it is not according to God's will. Such ask amiss.

II. *The Spirit bears witness with our spirit*

Paul wrote: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:16). The Spirit bears witness and our spirit bears witness. The Spirit's witness is borne *with* our Spirit. How does the Spirit bear this witness? How can we know that God accepts us as His children. We cannot know unless God lets us know in some way. "For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God; *that we might know* the things that are freely given to us of God. *Which things also we speak*, not in the *words* which man's wisdom teacheth, but *which the Holy Ghost teacheth*; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." (1 Cor. 2:11-13). As he had said in verses 9 and 10, "But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But *God hath revealed* them unto us by his Spirit:

for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." Then it was that Paul pointed out that we could not know the mind of God, but God's Spirit did, and that the Spirit had revealed to them in words what the mind of God was.

Paul does not here teach that everyone is inspired. If they were there would be no need for anyone to speak the words, revealed by the Spirit, to someone else. Those who were inspired, such as Paul, knew and taught the mind of God because the Spirit revealed to them God's mind and taught them what they should say.

Thus we know how one must become a child of God through the teaching which the Spirit has revealed. Anyone who *feels* that he knows that he is a child of God, but who has not done what the Spirit has taught in the New Testament that one must do to become a child of God, does not have the witness of the Spirit of God that he is a child of God.

It amazes us sometimes how much is contained in one passage of scripture, and how much light one passage may throw on another passage. The writer of Hebrews set forth the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice (Heb. 10:10-14). Then he said: "Whereof *the Holy Ghost* also is a witness to us: for after that *he* had said before, This is my covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them; and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Then the writer comments: "Now where the remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin." (Heb. 10:15-18). Under the Old Testament there was a remembrance of sins every year (10:3), since it is impossible for the blood of bulls and of goats to take away sin (10:1-2, 4). The fact that sacrifices continued to be offered indicated that there was not complete remission of sins (10:2). The fact that the New Covenant

was to convey remission of sins, and sins would not be remembered any more, indicates that the sacrifice under the New Covenant would be sufficient, and thus would not be repeated every year. Thus the Holy Spirit, in the prophecy of the New Covenant through Jeremiah, had indicated that the sacrifice which dedicated the New Covenant would be sufficient to take away sins, and would thus be offered once for all.

The Spirit bore witness through the written word. It will be noticed that the writer said that "the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us: for after that he had said before . . ." (10:15). He then quoted something which had been written centuries before. From this we draw the following conclusions:

Jeremiah was inspired by the Holy Spirit (Jer. 31: 31-34), since the words of Jeremiah as quoted and attributed to the Spirit. Just as Jeremiah attributed them to the Lord. They were not just Jeremiah's word, but the Spirit's word.

The written word is the word of the Spirit. Through it the Spirit can and does speak.

The Holy Spirit can and does bear witnesses to us through the written word. When we read it the Holy Spirit speaks to us (10:15 "witness", "said"). Since the Holy Spirit has shown that God speaks to us today through His Son (Heb. 1:1-2; 2:1-4), how can it be said that something in the Old Testament is a witness of the Spirit to us? In this manner: Centuries before the New Covenant came the Holy Spirit promised another covenant in which sins would not be remembered any more. This promise has now been fulfilled, and one of the witnesses we have to the truth and nature of the New Covenant is the prophecy made and recorded by the Spirit, through Jeremiah, centuries before. Thus we see testimony borne by the Holy Spirit through the written word.

This means that the written word is not a dead letter, but that the Spirit speaks to us through it. Jesus set forth this same truth when He showed that God speaks to us through the written word. “. . . have *ye* not *read* that which was *spoken unto you by God*, saying . . .” (Matt. 22:31).

These things have an important bearing on Rom. 8:16, and how the Spirit bears witness with our Spirit. How is the Spirit's witness borne *with* our spirit? How does the Spirit bear this witness?

How the Spirit bears witness that we are sons of God.

Does the Spirit do it today in some miraculous way? The passage does not say that it is borne in a miraculous way. Those who say that it is so done, assume the very thing which they are under obligation to prove, i.e., that this witness is borne today in a miraculous way apart from the word of God. Since neither this passage nor any other passage teach that such witness is borne today in a miraculous, direct testimony of the Spirit to the human soul; and since other passages show how witness is borne; I must not conclude that it is done in some miraculous direct way.

Is the witness borne through our feelings? The passage does not say that it is borne through feelings. We all know how deceptive our own feelings can be. Nowhere has God said that we are His children if we feel like we are. It is right for the children of God to feel good because they are children of God. But they do not know by their feelings that they are children of God. Our feelings flow from our faith, and our faith is based on testimony. If the testimony is wrong our feelings cannot make it right. When, however, we get the testimony from the Word of God we know that it is right, and when we submit to God we can go on our way rejoicing as did the eunuch (Acts 8:38-39). Anyone who feels that he is a child of God, but who has not done what the Spirit has taught in

the New Testament that one must do to become a child of God, does not have the witness of the Spirit that he is a child of God.

The witness is borne through the word of God.

The Spirit speaks to us through the written word. All who do not believe that He can do so doubt both the power and the teachings of the Spirit. John, for example, was commanded to write what he saw, and a blessing was pronounced on the reader (Rev. 1:19, 3). John was told to write to the church at Ephesus (Rev. 2:1). "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches" (Rev. 2:7). The Spirit was speaking to them through the written word—the word which John wrote.

Since we do not have any inspired men today, we must turn to the message in the Bible which was recorded by inspired men. Through His written word the Spirit speaks to us. The Spirit tells us what we must do to become children of God. The spirit of man knows what is within him (1 Cor. 2:11), and our spirit thus knows whether we have accepted and obeyed what God's Spirit teaches us through the written word of God. When God's Spirit testifies as to what we must do to become children of God, and when our spirit testifies that we have done it; then His Spirit bears witness and our spirit bears witness that we are children of God. His Spirit bears *witness* with our spirit. The two witnesses together show that we are God's children. Let us notice what the Spirit of God has said in the word of God. (a) The Spirit bears witness that we must believe (Mk. 16:16). Faith comes by hearing the word (Rom. 10:17; John 20:30). Our spirit bears witness that we do believe. (b) The Spirit bears witness that we must repent (Acts 2:38). Our spirit bears witness that we have repented. (c) The Spirit bears witness that we must confess Christ (Matt. 10:32-). Our spirit bears witness that we have confessed, and that we

are willing to confess. (d) The Spirit bears witness that we must be baptized (Acts 2:38; Gal. 3:27). Our spirit bears witness that we have obeyed Christ in baptism.

The Spirit testifies that we must be born of water and of the Spirit in order to enter the kingdom of God, and our spirit testifies, when we obey the gospel, that we have been born of water and of the Spirit. We are then in the family of God, and thus His Spirit bears witness with our spirit that we are children of God. We know Him because we keep His commandments (1 John 2:3). We must walk in newness of life.

The spirit which the healing cults have bears false witness against the Spirit of God. (1) Their spirit bears witness that salvation comes before baptism, but the Holy Spirit placed salvation after baptism (Mk. 16:16; Acts 2:38; 22:16). (2) Their spirit teaches that denomination-ism is all right, but the Holy Spirit condemns donomi-nationalism (John 17:20; 1 Cor. 1:10-12; Eph. 4:1-6). (3) Their spirit tells sinners seeking salvation that they should "pray through", that they should pray for salvation. The Holy Spirit never told seeking sinners to do that; instead they were told to arise and be baptized (Acts 22:16). (4) Their spirit tells them that all should be baptized in the Holy Spirit; but the Holy Spirit never commanded anyone to be baptized in the Spirit. Some individuals did, it is true, receive the promise of the miraculous baptism of the Spirit; but it was not a command, and it was not a promise to all. (5) Their spirit bears witness that they heal and perform miracles as did the apostles and Christ, but the Holy Spirit's record of miracles in the New Testament, when compared with "modern miracles", reveals that people today do not work these miracles.

We could point out many other instances in which their doctrine conflicts with the doctrine of the Spirit in the New Testament; but these are sufficient to show that *the spirit*

in them bears false witness against the Spirit which was in the apostles, for their spirit teaches, in the name of the Holy Spirit, doctrines which are contrary to the apostles' doctrine. *It is thus evident that they do not have the same Spirit, for they do not have the same doctrine.*

Thus it is very significant that the passage does not say that the Holy Spirit bears witness with our spirit in some miraculous means apart from the word of God. "Holiness" people assume the very thing which they must prove, and the very thing which is not mentioned in this passage, i.e., a miraculous witness apart from the word of God. Since it does not say that it is that kind of a witness, and since we do know that the Spirit does bear witness with our spirit as we have above described, the obvious conclusion is that Romans 8:16 does not prove the "Holiness" position. It does not even mention their position. For it to be used by them at all it would have to be proved first that the only witness which the Spirit could bear was a miraculous witness apart from the word of God. But we know this is false.

III. James 5:14-15

"Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him."

As stated in the first part of this book, the main purpose of miracles was to convince unbelievers that God was speaking through the men who had such power. Although "miracles were performed for the purpose of making believers," it was "not always to make believers of those on whom the miracles were wrought. Dorcas was already a believer before she died, but many others were made believers as a result of the miracle performed on her (Acts 9:42, 43)." (W. Curtis Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 9).

The passage in James shows that at least some elders, during the time when miraculous gifts were given to the church, had the power to heal the sick. This passage in James shows how they were to do it.

(1) *Anointing with oil*

The apostles, at least in some cases, anointed with oil, during the personal ministry of Christ, those whom they set about to heal (Mk. 6:13). On this practise, J. W. McGarvey commented as followed: "The anointing of the sick with oil was not expected to contribute to the cure; for, apart from its inadequacy as a remedy, it could not, in the very nature of the case, contribute to a miraculous cure. But the Jews were in the habit of anointing their hair and their faces every day, and specially when they went out among their fellows. This anointing was omitted when they were sick, and when they fasted (See 2 Sam. 12:20; Matt. 6:16, 17). When an apostle stood over a sick man to heal him by a touch and a word, he was about to send him out of his sick chamber; and just before the word was spoken the oil was applied. It meant no more than that the sick man was from that moment to be confined to his chamber no longer. (Comp. Jas. 5:14)." (Commentary on Matthew and Mark, p. 301).

Tuck's comment is in harmony with McGarvey's statement. "Instead of making a careful inquiry into the ordinary use of oil by the people of Eastern countries, and in that direction seeking for the explanation of the allusions made by St. James, it has been the fashion to associate this anointing of the sick with the official anointing of priests and kings, and, perhaps, prophets. In this way, a symbolical and sacramental character has been given to what is really a simple custom of ordinary family life. This verse offers an illustrative instance of the common mistake of seeking extraordinary explanations of Scripture, when

a very simple and everyday satisfactory explanation lay close at hand.

Oil is in familiar use in the East as an article of the toilet. It takes very much the place for them of our pomades and scents. But it seems that the use of oil for the toilet was regarded as a sign of health, and the neglect of oil was just as precisely the sign that a man was out of health. Those who were sick were not allowed to be anointed, nor those who were passing through a time of mourning.

The ancient customs and sentiments in relation to anointing may be effectively illustrated by our customs, or the custom of our fathers, in connection with the shaving of the beard. The man who is ill neither troubles about shaving, nor will his friends trouble him; and the half-grown beard is a sign that a man is sick. As soon as he gets better and begins to take his place again in life, he will be sure to shave, and show due regard to his personal appearance. We know the sick man of the East is better by his asking for the *oil* necessary to make his toilet.

It may be expressed precisely thus: "The sick man will neither trouble himself, nor be troubled about shaving; but as soon as he begins to recover he will return to his old and cleanly habits. So the ancients would neglect daily anointing while under sickness, and their return to their old ways was the sign of recovering health. When, therefore, James enjoins the elders to anoint the sick—that is, at once make his usual toilet—after prayers for his restoration, he really says just this, "Pray for him with full faith, and show that you have such strong faith, *by acting towards him as if he really were recovered.* Whatever things ye ask when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them. Anoint the sick man as if he were restored to health again." ' The elders were to 'help him rise from the bed, wash, anoint his head and dress, and rejoice with him in view of the healing mercies of God.'

If they had faith, they should give that faith active expression; they should '*show* it by their works'; the particular works which would best show it in this case were, that they should at once proceed to wash, dress, and anoint the sick man, as if they were quite sure that God had heard their prayer and made him well.

With this may be compared our Lord's demand for some act which would give an outward expression to faith. Thus, in the case of the man with the withered hand, our Lord commanded him to 'stretch forth his hand.' The man might fairly have said, 'That is just what I cannot do.' But he could if he believed. So in the case of the paralyzed man. Jesus said, 'Take up thy bed, and walk.' A paralyzed man bidden to walk! But he could if he believed, and the trying was the show of faith.

As some authority may be desired for an explanation which may be accepted only with hesitation, on the very ground of its extreme simplicity, we give the following passages from Van Lennep's *Bible Customs in Bible Lands*, pp. 133, 134:

'The use of oil in anointing the body appears to have been general in ancient times among all the nations dwellings around the Mediterranean. Allusions to this use abound in all ancient authors. The heroes of Homer are described by him as restoring their wearied limbs after battle by frictions of oil. This was Alexander's practice. It was Pompey's daily habit also, as well as that of all the wealthy Romans. We find this custom alluded to in the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments. It is mentioned as forming a habitual part of the toilet on special occasions (Ruth 3:3; 2 Sam. 12:20; Micah 6:15)—not to be indulged in in case of mourning (2 Sam. 14:2; Dan. 10:2, 3). The head was anointed in connection with the daily recurring ablution, as mentioned in Matt. 6:17.'

The 'extreme unction' practiced by the Roman Catholic Church is defended by a misinterpretation of the passage in James, for extreme unction is never applied until it is considered certain that the patient is about to die; whereas the words in James, as well as in Mark 6:13, connect anointing the sick with recovery. We do not consider that in these cases oil was used either as a means or a symbol; the anointing was simply an exercise of faith, similar to Peter and John's saying to the lame man at the gate of the Temple called Beautiful, 'Rise up and walk.' The elders of the church, after praying for the sick man, *were to treat him as though he were recovered.*" (Robert Tuck, *A Handbook of Biblical Difficulties*, pp. 348-350).

The author does not anoint the sick with oil today for two simple reasons. *First* he does not have a special gift of faith which enables him to work a miracle, thus he does not have what James called "the prayer of faith." He prays, with trust and faith in God, for the sick but not with the knowledge that a miracle will be performed. *Second*, since he does not have such miraculous power to heal the sick he does not anoint with oil to indicate that a miracle is to be performed. As James McKnight commended: "Where no miracle is to be performed, to use anointing, as a religious rite, is a vain superstition." Those who claim to heal today may anoint with oil but they do not obtain the results which those did in the first century who had miraculous power. The words of Whitaker should be taken to heart by them. "Let them anoint with oil who can procure health for the sick, and let those who cannot, abstain from the vain symbol."

(2) *The prayer of faith*

James made express reference to the *prayer of faith*. James P. Lange, in *the Epistle General of James* (T. & T. Clark, 1872), wrote: "Not faith in general, but miraculous faith as a special charisma of the Christian spirit (see 1

Cor. 12:9, 10).” James McKnight wrote: “In scripture, *faith* sometimes signifies the spiritual gifts in general, Rom. 12:3, sometimes the gift of working miracles, 1 Cor. 12:9; 13:2, and sometimes the gift of healing diseases miraculously, Acts 3:16, in which sense it is to be understood here. The gift of working miracles was called *faith*, because they were always performed in consequence of an impression made by the Spirit on the mind of the person who was to perform them, moving him to undertake the miracle, and working in him a full persuasion that it would be performed. Wherefore, ‘the prayer of faith’ is a prayer which the elder, moved by the Spirit of God, was to make for the recovery of the sick, in the full persuasion that the Lord would raise him up.” So the faith here referred to is that of the elders and not of the sick. But it is their *prayer of faith* which healed the sick man.

In commenting on 1 Cor. 12:10, MacKnight stated: “In the exercise of this gift, none of the spiritual men, not even the apostles, were permitted to act according to their own pleasure; but were always directed to the exercise of it by an impression inwardly wrought on their minds by God; otherwise Paul would not have left Trophimus sick at Miletus (2 Tim. 4:20); nor have suffered his beloved Timothy to labor under his infirmities (1 Tim. 5:23); nor Epaphroditus to be sick nigh unto death (Phil. 2:26-27). Since there is no account of where they ever tried to work a miracle and failed, after Pentecost, it is evident that they did not try to heal these individuals. So one must conclude that in some way the Lord informed them as to when they were to work miracles.

(3) *Send for elders*

James said that the elders were to be sent for. Evidently some elders possessed the gift of faith and of healing. An elder, it will be remembered, had certain qualifications, among them being the fact that he was the husband of one

wife. In other words, an elder was a man (1 Tim. 3:1-). There were no women elders or pastors. How is it then that women preachers in these healing groups today will quote this passage of Scripture to prove that they are carrying on scriptural work in these healing meetings? They are not elders, and by taking upon themselves the work of a pastor they demonstrate their ignorance of the Scriptures and prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that they are not led by the same Spirit who led the apostles.

(4) *The elders came to the sick*

James stated that the elders were to be sent for and that they would raise the sick. So it is evident that the elders came to the sick person, instead of the sick person being obligated to come to them. This is in contrast with modern "healers" for they widely advertise healing services and tell the sick to come to them. We do not mean that they do not sometimes go to the sick, but the occasions on which they require the sick to come to them are numerous.

(5) *The Lord shall raise him up*

In this statement there is no provision for any failure. Those who claim to follow this Scripture claim that certain people are not healed because they (the sick person) do not have enough faith. In this manner they try to turn attention for their own failures. Perhaps someone says that the apostles did not heal everyone. True. But they did not promise to heal a person, try to heal that person, and then fail. Evidently the apostles knew, and these elders who had miraculous power knew, when the prayer of faith could be prayed. Thus when God did not intend for them to perform a miracle they could not and did not pray the prayer of faith. Thus the author believes that not everyone was thus prayed for by the elders, but that everyone for whom they prayed this prayer of faith was raised up.

(6) *J. W. McGarvey's comment on this passage*

"It is true, also, that in the passage which our sister

cites from the apostle James, sick disciples were directed to send for the elders of the church, that they might pray over them, anoint them with oil, and raise them up; but every reader of the New Testament should know that this was written when many elders of churches possessed the miraculous power of healing, which was imparted to them by the imposition of the hands of an apostle. To argue from this that elders of the church, or anybody else, can do the same in the present day, is to leave out of view the one thing that enabled them to do it then; that is, the imposition of apostolic hands with prayer for this gift.

The practical working of this precept of James, even in the apostolic age, is modified by actual facts which are too often overlooked. Paul had the power to heal by a word or a touch, and he used it on proper occasions; but on one of his journeys through the province of Asia he left Trophimus sick at Miletus (2 Tim. 4:20). On another occasion, Epaphroditus was sick "nigh unto death." He had been sent to Rome by the brethren of Philippi to minister to Paul's wants as a prisoner, and he incurred this sickness in consequence of the journey. Paul was, therefore, doubly sorrowful at the prospect of his death; but he did not heal him. He did not anoint him with oil, nor raise him up (Phil. 2:25, 30). Again, Timothy was an invalid from some disease of the stomach; yet Paul neither healed him nor told him to pray for healing; but advised him to take a little wine as a tonic. These facts show plainly that the precept of James was exceptional and temporary, even in the age of the apostles, and that the later practice of Paul is to be looked upon as the permanent order of the kingdom of Christ". (*Short Essays in Biblical Criticism*, pp. 349-350).

An Alternative Explanation

There are brethren who believe that James here referred to ordinary prayer and to the use of oil as a medical means

or as a custom. Oil was thus used; it is true. With reference to the question of their being raised up these brethren state that this no more necessarily means that everyone would be healed than that Jesus meant that everyone would become a Christian when He stated that if He was raised up from the earth that He would draw all men unto Himself (John 12:32). God may answer "yes," to our prayers for the sick, or He may say "No," or "wait awhile."

If this be the meaning of the passage it teaches that we are to use prayer, and whatever medical means are available, for the healing of the sick. We have at our command greater medical means than they had then so we use them, just as they used the ones which they had. Every Christian, of course, should believe that we should pray for the sick, and then do everything that is within our power to help them otherwise. And although all do not agree that this is what this passage means, yet all do or should agree that prayer and medical means ought to be used. It is also true that the elders of the church ought to visit the sick more and pray for them. Just because some people have made such a "show" of prayer should not make us so shy that we fail to scripturally use prayer. The sick who feel the need of special prayers by the elders should send for them, instead of just waiting until they happen to come by to see them.

The author leans toward the first explanation of this passage, instead of to the explanation just presented. Yet he believes, of course, in the use of prayer and medical means. But it is his opinion that the first explanation is the right one, although it does have its difficulties, and some assumptions are involved.

III. *Greater Works* (John 14:12)

Jesus promised the apostles that they would be able to:
(a) Do the works which He had done; and (b) Do greater

works. Christ enabled them to do miracles such as He had performed (Mk. 16:20; Acts 3; 9:40). However, with reference to performing miracles they did no greater miracles than the raising of Lazarus or the feeding of a multitude with a few loaves and fishes. Modern "healers" do not multiply food. What, then, were the greater works? Christ's going unto the Father was to have something to do with it (John 14:12). What was it that would happen if Jesus went to the Father but would not have happened, if He did not go to the Father? "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you. And he, when he is come will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment . . . he shall guide you into all truth" (John 16:7-13 ASV). On Pentecost Peter said: "Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear" (Acts 2:33 A.S.V.). This promise of the Father was the sending of the Spirit which would enable them to infallibly declare the gospel of Christ to all the world (Lk. 24:49). What was the result? *First*, the apostles were thus equipped to work under the worldwide commission (Matt. 28:19; Lk. 24:46-49). The coming of the Spirit enabled them to start work under this commission (Acts 1:8). Christ's personal ministry had been limited geographically to Palestine. He never attempted to go to all people (Matt. 15:24). Thus, the apostles did a greater work *geographically*, nationally and racially for they were sent to all the world. *Second*, around three thousand were converted by the first gospel sermon (Acts 2:33, 37, 38, 40, 41). From this success they went on to thousands of converts. Their work was greater *numerically*. *Third*, the Spirit led them to take the gospel to Gentiles (Acts 10:11). Theirs was a greater work *racially*. Christ was sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel during

His personal ministry (Matt. 10:6; 15:24). The apostles were sent to all nations (Mat. 28:18-19). *Fourth*, the Lord's personal ministry lasted but a few brief years—around three and one-half. The apostles, all together, had a ministry which lasted until the close of the century. Thus theirs was a greater work with reference to *duration* in time. *Fifth*, the apostles preached the gospel in fact while Christ preached it only in promise and preparation. Christ preached the gospel, or good news, of the coming of the kingdom, and He told of His coming death for the sins of man; but before the apostles started work under the great commission, on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection, the gospel of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ was not preached as an *accomplished* fact. *Sixth*, Jesus did not preach under the new covenant, for the old law of Moses was in force during His personal ministry (Matt. 23:2). The new covenant did not become of force until after Christ's death (Heb. 9:15-17). The apostles preached under the new covenant; so theirs was a greater work in that it was under a greater covenant. All six of these things were connected with the coming of the Spirit, and thus were connected with Christ's ascension to the Father. Thus this, taken together, was the greater work which they were able to do, *because* Christ went unto the Father, and which they could not have done, if He had not returned to the Father (John 14:12; 16:7). Since they did not do greater physical miracles, and since the greater work was connected with the coming of the Spirit, we are forced to conclude that the greater work was the spiritual work which they did in proclaiming the gospel as a fact—before Christ's death it could be preached only in promise, prophecy, and preparation—and in the world-wide results of that work. We today are made believers through their work and the word of truth into which the Spirit guided them (John 17:20; 16:13; 20:30).

The apostles, of course, were not greater than Christ, for all that they did they did through the power which He gave them (Mk. 16:20; Phil. 4:13). However, He did use them to do a greater work—in the above-mentioned respects—than He Himself did personally in His ministry on earth.

Those who use John 14:17 to apply to them and their works fail to demonstrate the promise of this passage in their work. They do not do the miracles that Christ did. They claim that the "greater works" refers to miracles, and since they do not even match the miracles of Christ, it is evident that they do not do greater works. So, even on their own interpretation this promise has no application to their work. What greater miracles can they even *claim* to perform.

IV. *Who is the Sign Seeker?* (Matt. 12:39)

Some of the modern "miracle" workers ask a member of the church whether or not we perform miracles as did the apostles. The answer is that we do not. Then they say that we cannot be the true church. They claim that they can perform miracles, and on the basis of that claim they claim that they are the church. However, when we ask them to show us a miracle, they often answer by saying that an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign and that no sign shall be given to it.¹ They think that they are following Jesus' example (Matt. 12:38).

¹"By comparing Matt. 16:1; Lk. 11:16; Mk. 8:11 it appeareth, that the sign they demanded was a SIGN FROM HEAVEN, by which they probably mean some glorious appearance in the heavens. They had a little before attributed his miracles to Beelzebub; and now they insisted that He should give them a particular kind of sign; and it was perfectly consistent with his character to refuse to humour them in this demand, which he well knew proceeded from a cavilling temper, and not from minds honestly willing to submit to evidence. But though he refused to give them at that time precisely such a sign as they demanded, he yet both continued to work miracles among them, and referred them to his resurrection, which, taking in the circumstances that attended it, and followed upon it, was, in the fullest and properest sense, A SIGN FROM HEAVEN, and was sufficient to convince them, if they were disposed to receive conviction." (Leland's View, pp. 138-139).

However, they really misuse scripture to cover up their inability to prove their bold claim.

(I) *Jesus' Answer to the Pharisees*

- (1) *God did not condemn men for asking that those who claimed to be his prophets should produce their credentials.*

God knew that it was right for Pharaoh to ask Moses for a sign which proved that he was from God, and thus God enabled Moses to give the necessary signs (Ex. 7:8). God has warned against false prophets (Deut. 13; Rev. 2:2). Before Christ was approached by these Pharisees, he had performed miracles in confirmation of His message. He had healed two blind men (Matt. 9:27); the dumb demoniac had been healed (Matt. 9:32); a servant was healed of palsy (8:5); a blind and dumb demoniac was healed (12:22); a leper cured (8:2); fever banished (8:14); storm stilled (8:25); devils cast into the swine (8:28); raised Jairus' daughter (9:23); and healed the man with the withered hand in their presence (12:10). Not only is that true, but in this very verse, which these modern "healers" do not usually fully quote when giving their "reason" for not working miracles, He promised them the sign of the prophet Jonah—His own resurrection.

Why did Christ refuse to give them another sign at this time? These individuals had seen sufficient signs to convince them, if they had been of the truth and will to do God's will (cf. John 7:17; 18:37). However, their heart was wrong, and He who knew the heart of man knew that. "Our Lord here traces the unbelief of the scribes and Pharisees to its true source; an evil and adulterous generation, pretending not to be convinced by miracles which have made manifest 'the finger of God,' still seeketh after a sign, and that in the same *unbelieving* spirit. The reason of this was, that they were evil and adulterous, as their polygamy, frequent divorces, and other sensualities, so

general among them though covered by their hypocrisy, or defended by their immoral casuistry, sufficiently proved." (Richard Watson, *Commentary on Matthew*). Sin, not a lack of signs, was at the root of their unbelief. They had received signs but had refused to accept them, and Christ knew that their hearts were evil and that additional miracles would not help their unbelief, as it was based not on a lack of evidence but on a lack of love for the truth and purity. However, He did tell them that there was reserved for them one great sign—that of the prophet Jonah.

(II) *The Misapplication Made Today*

We do not appreciate the insinuation that because we ask them to prove what they claim to have that we are thereby revealed as evil and adulterous. They make the claim, we ask for proof, and then they insult us. We simply ask them to do what they say they do. Jesus had not boasted of His power to the Pharisees and then refused to give signs when they asked Him to back up His words. Instead He had worked miracles, they had refused to accept them, and then they asked for more. Even then He promised them one. He also gave His apostles power to confirm the word which they preached and they confirmed it. (Mk. 16:20). We ask them today for confirmation and receive insults.

(1) *These modern "miracle" workers are the sign seekers.*

First, the word of God has already been confirmed, and we have the word and the miracles recorded that we might believe (Heb. 2:2-4; John 20:30). These people, however, are not satisfied with those and they approach the Lord and tell Him that He must work more miracles today or He has discriminated against us and has failed to be the same yesterday, today, and forever. They seek additional signs from Him. In fact, they are not as easily pleased

as were the Pharisees, for after Christ's conversation with them He worked other miracles and finally the sign of the prophet Jonah—the resurrection—was given. However, in spite of all these miracles, even more than had been performed for the Pharisees at the time they came to Jesus, these modern "miracle" workers go to Jesus asking for a sign. *Second*, they are sign seekers, for they come to us and ask for a sign and say that unless we can give them one we are not the true church. We are satisfied with the signs which have been given, with the word which has been confirmed (John 20:30), but they are not satisfied. This, then, makes them the sign seekers.

Why do they claim that *we* must do signs in order to be the church, and that *we* must do them at their request; but when we ask them to accept their own teaching and give us the signs which they claim they have and the church must have, they fail to give us the signs which they say we must give them in order to prove to them that we are the church. Surely we are, in this respect, better than they for we neither claim them nor seek them from the Lord today; while they claim them, seek them from the Lord and from us, too, and then fail to produce.

However, they claim that miracles were not given in answer to challenge. But, they are the ones who have challenged us and have made the claim that they possess miraculous powers. We simply want to know why it is that they claim to have such power but fail to go about confirming the word as did the apostles of Christ (Mk. 16:20; Acts 3).

(III) *The Sign of the Prophet Jonah*

They should not quote the language of Jesus to us, even if we were evil and adulterous, unless they correctly represent His language by quoting it all. He said that the sign of the prophet Jonah would be given to that generation. We would be satisfied if they would give us that sign. So,

then, let them complete the answer made by Christ, which they pervert by partial quotation, and tell us that the sign of the prophet Jonah will be given to us. Until they do that they are hypocritically, or in great ignorance, trying to cover up their failure to back up their boast of miraculous power.

If they say that it is not necessary to have this miracle—the miracle of that sign—performed each generation in order for it to be a truth sufficiently established to call for faith, we reply in like language to their entire contention for miraculous power today. The gospel has been revealed and confirmed once for all, as surely as the resurrection of Jesus Christ has taken place and been confirmed once for all.

In conclusion let it be observed that “If any one has spiritual gifts or powers and fails to use them so people can see, he betrays the trust God has intrusted to him and is unworthy to be believed.” (C. E. W. Dorris, *Commentary on Mark*, p. 339).

Chapter IX

WAS THE HEALING OF THE BODY INCLUDED
IN THE ATONEMENT?

It has been argued by some healers that the healing of the body here and now, as well as the remission of sins, is included in the atonement. The offer of the remission of sins and the healing of the body go together. If so, it would be as wrong to go to a doctor for healing as for forgiveness of sins. *The scriptural truth, which these healers have distorted, is that the redemption of the body is promised to the Christians.* The redemption of the body will not come until this corruption has put on incorruption. This shall not take place until the last enemy, death, is conquered. The last enemy shall not be conquered until the return of Christ (1 Cor. 15:26, 38). We are now in flesh and blood and we shall be in them for the remainder of our life on earth (1 Cor. 15:50). However, when Christ comes we shall see Him as He is and be like Him (1 John 3:2). Thus "we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:20-21). The body is not spared, on this earth, from sickness and death. It is, of course, to be used here as an instrument of righteousness, but it shall not be changed, redeemed and entirely freed from the curse brought by the fall of man, until the redeemed enter into glory and God makes all things new (Rom. 6:12-13; Rev. 21:4; 22:3). Then shall be "the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8:22, 23).

(1) *The position, that healing in the here and now is included in the atonement, is contrary to facts.*

First, if the atonement covers diseases, as well as sin, then both must be present together. Where one is the other must be also. If you have one you have the other and if you do not have one you do not have the other. The person who is forgiven is also healed and the person who is not healed is not forgiven. The sickest man is the vilest sinner and the most noble saint is the healthiest person in the world. It follows that sickness among those who claim to be baptized with the Holy Spirit is a sure sign, on this theory, that they are sinners who have not been so baptized. *Second*, it is a fact that redeemed persons have suffered sickness (1 Tim. 5:23; 2 Tim. 1:6; cp. 4:20; 2 Cor. 12:7-9).

Third, death is the most destructive thing that happens to the physical body. From it the body does not recover in this world as it can recover from various diseases. If the healing of the body is included in the atonement the body should not die. Death is a fact which is ever present and it overtakes the saints of God. This indicates that the healing of the body in the here and now was not included in the atonement or, if it was, the atonement has failed. Since the atonement and resurrection assures our own resurrection, why do not these healers maintain that the atonement provides exemption from physical death to those who accept it.

(2) *The position is contrary to the Scriptures.*

First, the Bible teaches that the atonement took place on the cross (Isa. 53:5; 1 Cor. 15:3; Heb. 9:22; 1 Pet. 1:18, 19; 2:24). Men were redeemed in the days of the apostles just as surely as men are redeemed today through the blood of Christ. However, the Bible does not teach that Christ died so that our disease might be healed in this life on the same basis that our sins are forgiven. *Second*, the

remission of sins and thus the benefits of the atonement had been extended to Timothy and to Paul and yet both of them suffered sickness (1 Tim. 5:23; 2 Cor. 12:7-9). Timothy at the very time he was sick was in possession of a spiritual gift which had been imparted to him by the laying on of Paul's hands (2 Tim. 1:6; 1 Tim. 5:23). When Paul wrote to Timothy concerning his sickness he told Timothy to use wine as a medicine. If Timothy's sickness had been the result of sin, and if it would be removed when Timothy turned in faith to the benefits of the atonement, it is strange that Paul did not rebuke him for the sin and tell him to pray and to exercise faith in order that he might be forgiven and healed. Paul said that he left Trophimus at Miletum sick (2 Tim. 4:20). There is no indication that he was unforgiven and that Paul regarded him as a sinner because he was sick. Indeed, "our outward man is decaying" (2 Cor. 4:16). *Third*, the Bible teaches that the atonement has been made but it also teaches that death will continue until Christ's coming (1 Cor. 15:24). It is appointed unto men once to die and then cometh the judgment (Heb. 9:27). Thus the body will be the prey of disease and death as long as man lives on this earth. *Fourth*, if it be objected, the healing of diseases, and *not* the exemption from death, is included in the atonement, we shall point out that the Bible teaches that death entered the world as the result of sin. If disease, one of the things which entered the world as the result of sin, has been overcome by the atonement then why not death which is one of the consequences of the fall of man as much as is disease? "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" (Rom. 5:12). "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ" (Rom. 5:17). "That

as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 5:21). We are promised eternal life through Christ and this is included in the atonement, but death will not be abolished unto Christ comes to claim His own (1 Cor. 15:24; Heb. 9:27). *Fifth*, If suffering and sorrow are not to continue as long as we are in the body, then why has Christ promised to be with the suffering saints and help them bear their burdens (Psa. 34:19; 2 Cor. 6:4-6; Heb. 11:25; 1 Pet. 1:6-7). God's grace enabled Paul to bear his thorn in the flesh (2 Cor. 12:7). (R. P. Shuler, *McPhersonism*). *Sixth*, "to put sickness and sin side by side and cover them both with His blood would be to make the mortal as important as the immortal, the corruptible as worth while as the incorruptible" (2 Cor. 4:10, 11, 12; 5:4; Isa. 1:4-6; Jer. 8:20-22). R. P. Shuler, *McPhersonism*). *Seventh*, their theory "would defeat the very fact of the Atonement, since, whatever bodily cures you may effect, sickness and death at last overcome and do their work" (Heb. 9:27; John 3:15; 5:24). *Eighth*, sickness is not necessarily the result of the sin of the individual who is sick (John 9:1-3). *Ninth*, nowhere does Christ teach that sickness needs atonement. Nowhere did He say that He died for our sickness; except for our spiritual sickness.

(3) *Does Luke 4:17-19 teach that healing is included in the atonement and that therefore the forgiven shall be healed here and now?*

First, we have shown already that such a position is contrary to experience and Scripture. *Second*, a part of the work of Christ did include the healing of the sick as signs that He was the Redeemer. *Third*, physical sickness may well be a *type* of the sickness of sin and thus when Christ healed sick people these signs help certify that He was able to forgive the sins of men (Mark 2:9-11). *Fourth*, the redemption wrought through Christ does ultimately, in

eternity, include the redemption, transformation and glorification of the body. Thus Christ in the healing which He did while on earth pledged, so to speak, the final redemption of the body; for Christ had such power to heal that He was shown to be of God and thus He was shown to be capable of carrying through the promise that the body of our humiliation shall be fashioned anew and be conformed to the body of His glory. However, one might as well contend that we have the incorruptible body here and now, and that all that man lost in the Garden of Eden has been restored here and now, as to maintain that the healing of the body here and now is included in the atonement. *Fifth*, the prophecy quoted by the Lord in Luke 4:18-19 was fulfilled in Jesus' day and not in the 20th century. Jesus himself said: "Today hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears" (Luke 4:21 A.S.V.). *Sixth*, in connection with this very passage Jesus indicated that not all would be healed. "And he said unto them, Doubtless ye will say unto me this parable, Physician, heal thyself: whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own country, and he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is acceptable in his own country. But of a truth I say unto you, There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land; and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian" (Lk. 4:23-27 A.S.V.). If healing was included in the atonement then Jesus would have taught that healing was to be the rule, rather than the exception, as he indicated by referring to Old Testament cases which revealed that healing was the exception.

(4) *Does Isaiah 53:4 teach that healing was included in the atonement?*

It is quoted as follows in Matt. 8:17: "Himself took our infirmities and bare our diseases." This quotation is given in connection with Christ's miracles of healing (Matt. 8:16 A.S.V.). Does this passage teach that healing is included in the atonement which he made through His death? It most assuredly does not so teach. As Dr. Haldeman has said: When was this prediction fulfilled? Was it while He was on the cross or while he was alive and before the time of the cross? It was while he was alive. Two things make this evident. First, "in every single case of healing recorded of Him it was while He was alive, "and not in his death on the cross. It was on the cross that He bore our sin (1 Pet. 2:24). *Second*, The Holy Spirit tells us exactly when this prophecy was fulfilled. He placed it in the time when Jesus was alive and long before He died on the cross. In the very context in which the prophecy is quoted we find this statement, "And when even was come, they brought unto him many possessed with demons: and he cast out the spirits with a word, and healed all that were sick: *that it might be fulfilled* which was spoken through Isaiah the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our diseases" (Matt. 8:16-17 A.S.V.). The reader should notice carefully that Matthew does not say that "Isaiah's prophecy regarding Christ bearing our sins was fulfilled at the time. He only refers to sickness."¹ When Matthew said: "that it might be fulfilled" he meant that it was fulfilled at the time of which he spoke. The reader can convince himself of the truthfulness of this statement by studying the passages in Matthew where he says that certain things were fulfilled. He will discover that Matthew meant that the prophecy was fulfilled at the time of

¹Mrs. Mary Wyburn Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, p. 21.

which he spoke.² Third, are the "healers" bold enough to claim, on the basis of this passage, that they have no infirmities? Timothy had infirmities (1 Tim. 5:23). So did Paul (2 Cor. 12:5, 9, 10; Gal. 4:13).

(5) *How did Christ bear our sickness?*

"There is just as decisive an answer given by Matthew to this as to the previous question.

While at first only discernible to the student of Greek, it can be readily understood by the ordinary reader of the English Bible.

Note first, Matthew deliberately drops the substitutionary word for "bear" which Isaiah uses in the verse quoted by him and uses another word for "bear" which is never associated with propitiation or atonement. Who authorized Matthew to make such a change unless he was guided by the Holy Spirit?

The word used by Matthew (*ebastasen*), although quite common in the New Testament, is never linked with atonement, but is employed to express sympathetic bearing, as, for example, when it occurs in Galatians 6:2: "*Bear* ye one another's burdens"; or as in Romans 15:1, "We that are strong ought to *bear* the infirmities of the weak."

Note secondly that the word used in Matthew in "bare our sicknesses" is a different word to that used by Peter when he says, "He bare our sins."

Peter uses the substitutionary word for "bare"; Matthew does not. The word that Peter uses, which is the same as that used in Isaiah 53 by the Septuagint version, which was the "authorized version" of the Apostles' day, was quite generally used in all its forms in connection with sacrifice

²Matthew 1:21-23; 2:14-15; 2:16-18; 2:22, 23; 4:13-15; 8:16-17; 12:15, 16-18; 13:34-35; 21:2-5; 26:53-56; 27:710; 27:35. Mrs. Fitch well said "They are equally plain and dogmatic in their statement as to when they were fulfilled, and yet there are those who are daring enough, in order to build up a man-made doctrine, to single out one of these quotations and postpone its fulfillment for three years. There is no more warrant for doing this with Matt. 8:16, 17 than there is with any one of the others." *The Healing Delusion*, pp. 24-25.

and offerings, as in Hebrews 9:28, which reads, "Christ . . . having been once offered to *bear* the sins of many, shall appear a second time," etc. (The same root appears in Heb. 5:1, 3; 8:3, 4; 9:7, 14, 25; where it is translated "offer.")

It is further worthy of note in comparing Matthew 8:16, 17; with 1 Peter 2:24, that Peter in the statement "by whose stripes ye were healed" uses a word for "healed" which can be applied either to physical or spiritual healing; whereas the word used by Matthew (*therapeuo*), is always associated with physical healing.

Here also Peter uses the word given by Isaiah, while Matthew does not.

The only conclusion which can be drawn from this textual study is that Matthew is guided to use the spiritual figures of Isaiah 53 *illustratively* of the physical healing ministry of Christ, but that in doing this he is carefully guided to a change in language which indicates this. To build up a doctrine of healing on such a New Testament use of an Old Testament passage was never in the mind of Matthew nor of the Holy Spirit.

It is a significant fact, too, that in every case where Isaiah uses the word "health" or "healing" in the prophecies of his book he has spiritual and not physical health or healing in mind. For example:

"They shall return unto Jehovah and He will be entreated of them, and will heal them" (Isa. 19:22 A.S.V.).

"In the day that Jehovah bindeth up the hurt of His people and healeth the stroke of their wound" (Isa. 30:26 A.S.V.).

"Lest they . . . understand with their heart, and turn again, and be healed" (Isa. 6:10 A.S.V.).

"He went on backsliding in the way of his heart. I have seen his ways, and will heal him" (Isa. 57:17, 19 A.S.V.).

"Thine health shall spring forth speedily" (Isa. 58:8).

And surely Isaiah has spiritual and not physical healing in mind when he says:

“He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed” (Isa. 53:5 A.S.V.).

That Matthew should see in the healing Christ the fulfillment in a physical sphere of what Isaiah has foretold in a spiritual realm is not surprising, but that such a use of Scripture should be made the basis of a whole system of healing is a serious mistake, contradicted alike in the experience and teaching of the apostles and in the experience of its present-day votaries” (R. V. Bingham, *The Bible and the Body*, pp. 55-58).

(6) *Some concluding “Ifs”*

If healing was included in the atonement it would have been preached, as the forgiveness of sins was preached, as coming through the atonement. But in the commission under which the apostles preached remission of sins, etc., (Matt. 28:18-20; Mk. 16:15-16; Lk. 24:46-49) was preached but never healing as a part of the atonement. They did heal many people, but they never preached healing as a part of the benefit of the atonement.

Baptism is for the remission of sins (Acts 2:38), and if healing is included in the atonement people should be baptized for the healing of their bodies; especially since we are baptized into the death of Him who died for us. And yet, the Bible neither teaches that baptism is for the healing of the body, nor does it furnish us with an example of anyone who was baptized for such a purpose.¹

If Christ bore our sickness on the cross when he bore our sins, then He heals us when He forgives us for if heal-

¹See May W. Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, for reference to some cases where deluded people were baptized in hope of being healed as a result of baptism (p. 62). See pp. 64-68 for a refutation of the idea that in being redeemed from the curse of the law (Gal. 3:13) that we are redeemed from sickness.

ing and forgiveness are in the atonement one receives both when he is brought under the blood of Christ. Why, then, should John say: "Beloved, I pray that in all things thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth" (3 John 2 A.S.V.). "Why does John express a wish for a thing which was already provided for? Why not point out his privilege?"¹ If healing was provided for in the atonement, one's health would prosper even as his soul prospered, and when his health did not prosper it would mean that his soul did not prosper.

If healing was in the atonement why were there these gifts of healing (1 Cor. 12:29-30), since there was no miraculous "gift of salvation" placed in the church?

If healing was in the atonement one would not have to do anything special to heal people, other than to preach the gospel and get them to accept the gospel. When they accepted it would be healed as surely as they would be saved.

We must conclude that those who teach that healing of the body here and now is included in the atonement teach a false doctrine.

¹May W. Fitch, *The Healing Delusion*, pp. 74-75.

Chapter X

SPEAKING IN TONGUES

Can we, should we, speak in tongues today as did the apostles and certain other individuals in the first century?

I. *They Spoke in a Known Language*(1) *The apostles on Pentecost*

They had been promised the power to speak in other tongues and here we have one of the instances in which they did it (Mk. 16:17-18; Acts 2:1). "The Greek *glotta*, or *glossa*, uniformly translated 'tongue,' and employed throughout the New Testament in designating the gift now under consideration, is used—(1) for the bodily organ of speech; (2) in Aristotle, for a foreign word, imported and half naturalized in Greek, and hence needing explanation; (3) in Hellenistic Greek, for 'speech' or 'language.'" (Samuel W. Barnum, editor, *Smith's Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 1132). We know that when the apostles spoke in other tongues they spoke in languages which some men, somewhere, knew. The people who had come to Jerusalem from different countries heard them and were confounded "because that every man heard them *speak* in his own language." The difference between the tongues then and "tongues" now is that then all to whom the apostles spoke understood but today all do not understand. What amazed the people then was "how *hear* we every man in our tongue, wherein we were born?" (Acts 2:6, 8, 11).

(2) *Why did some think that the apostles*

were drunken, if tongues were actually languages?

This accusation, of being drunken, was the snap judgment of mockers (Acts 2:13). There is no indication that anyone made such an accusation again after the apostles

had ceased preaching that day. The reason, however, that the snap judgment was made seems clear. Anyone who has ever heard someone else speak in a foreign language—a language which the listener does not know—realizes how “foolish” it seems. It sounds like jabbering. If you did not know Chinese and heard one of your own countrymen suddenly speak in that language, you would think that something was wrong if you did not know the language. Just so the apostles on Pentecost spoke in many different languages. Thus though each heard his own language spoken, he would also hear other languages spoken—languages which he did not know. So these mockers, given to making snap judgment about that which they did not understand, charged that it was mere drunken jabbering.

The people today who profess to have experiences which parallel Pentecost ought to so speak in their meetings that people from around sixteen different nations could understand them each in the language where he was born (2:5-12). Unless they do they are not animated by the Holy Spirit as were the apostles and they do not have the gift of tongues as the apostles had it.

(3) *The church in Corinth*

The term “unknown,” which is used in 1 Cor. 14 before the word “tongues,” is always written in italics in the King James translation. This means that the word was not in the original Greek but has been supplied by the translators for the sake of clarity. It has not been retained in the American Standard version and other translations. Even as used by the translators of the King James version it did not mean a language which was unknown to all men but one which the speaker had not learned and which therefore was the language spoken by other people. In Corinth they were “for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not” (1 Cor. 14:22; compare 14:9-10). If the stranger did not under-

stand he would think that they were mad (1 Cor. 14:23). "If tongues are given for a sign to *unbelievers*, why, when the gift is used, should the unbeliever's verdict be: 'Ye are mad'? The answer is plain enough when it is remembered that the occasion was one at which 'the whole church' had 'come together.' They all understood the same mother-tongue, and yet some were exercising their tongue gifts without interpretations to the mystification of the church; what other verdict could an intelligent spectator give?" (Wm. C. Irvin, *Heresies Exposed*, p. 196). If the stranger or unbeliever spoke the same mother tongue that they did, and yet they spoke in a foreign tongue while he was there; he would not understand it and he would think them mad. Of course, if his mother tongue was a foreign tongue to that spoken by members of the assembly and one of the speakers spoke in that language then the gift of tongues would convey convicting power. Then, too, an unbeliever would think that they were mad if several persons spoke at the same time in different languages. Thus Paul regulated the matter by telling them to speak one at a time (1 Cor. 14:27).

(4) *The speakers may be tested*

Those who speak in "tongues" maintain that they are actually inspired of the Spirit and that they are doing what was done in the days of the apostles. If this be true they should want every one to know it since tongues were a sign to unbelievers. So if these people are really sincere they will want people to test them. We propose that they permit a recording machine to be brought to their meetings and that those who speak in tongues have their speech recorded. And then we can easily see whether or not they have spoken an actual language; a language which they have not learned. If the speakers are unwilling to submit to such tests they simply advertise their fear of failure

and of being exposed. Truth courts the light, error seeks darkness lest it be discovered.

Another proof that the language spoken in Paul's day was a tongue known by someone somewhere is found in 1 Cor. 14:10. "There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without signification." Cōnybeare and Howson translated it thus: "Perhaps there may be as many languages in the world, and none of them is unmeaning." MacKnight translates it: "There are, perhaps, as many kinds of languages in the world as ye speak, and none of them is without signification." James Moffatt translates verses 10 and 11 thus: "There are ever so many kinds of languages in the world, every one of them meaning something. Well, unless I understand the meaning of what is said to me, I will appear to the speaker to be talking gibberish, and to my mind he will be talking gibberish himself."

Perhaps some of the "tongues" movements will reply that they are speaking in the tongue of angels (1 Cor. 13: 1-2), and that is the reason we do not understand what they are saying. Our reply is that we are not angels and in speaking to men Paul taught that the language of men, the language which they understand, is to be used. Otherwise they were to remain silent. But if they really spoke with the tongue of angels then they could get it interpreted (1 Cor. 14:5).

How are we to know that they are speaking the language of angels? We have never heard angels speak, and neither have they. We only have their word for it. If they did the other miracles which are found in the New Testament; if they taught the full truth which is taught in the New Testament; if they did the other works of the inspired men of old; we would accept their word that they speak in the tongue of angels. Since they do not do these things we

are unable to take their word for it. They may be sincere, but they are mistaken.

II. *Cases of Tongues in Acts of Apostles*

(1) *Tongues on Pentecost*

That which took place on the first Pentecost after Christ's resurrection was unique. Those individuals who speak of their "Pentecost" today do not speak as the Scriptures speak. Pentecost was *never repeated*. The kingdom came with power on that day (Mk. 9:1; Lk. 24:47-49; Acts 1:8; 2:1-4). It was the beginning of the preaching of the gospel as a fact to all the nations (Lk. 24:47-49). The apostles, not people today, were told to tarry in *Jerusalem* (Lk. 24:47-49). In harmony with the promise of Jesus the Spirit did come on that day and for the first time to a sinful world was preached the actual death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. With the coming of the Spirit in miraculous power the apostles began to speak in tongues. And that it was the apostles alone is evident from the following considerations. *First*, those who spoke were all Galilaeans and all men (Acts 2:7, 13). But the total number of the disciples included women (Acts 1:13). Peter stood up with the apostles (Acts 1:14). And the audience thought that they were the ones who were drunken—at least the mockers said they were (2:15, 14, 13). And they were making the accusation against the ones who spoke in tongues. So it must be that the apostles were the ones who spoke in tongues for Peter denied that those who were accused were drunk. And the ones who he denied were drunk were the apostles.

As we have already pointed out, actual languages were spoken. They were languages of many different nations. They are listed in Acts 2:9-11.

Not only were actually languages spoken but there were people there who understood these languages and each heard his own language spoken. "And when this sound was heard, the multitude came together, and were con-

founded, because that every man heard them speaking in his own language" (Acts 2:6 A.S.V.). ". . . hear we, every man in our own language wherein we were born" (2:8 A.S.V.). "We hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God" (2:11 A.S.V.).

This speaking in tongues were followed by a scriptural, inspired sermon wherein the gospel was placed, in decency and order, before the multitude. What a contrast in all these features with the "tongues" meetings today.

(2) *Tongues at the Household of Cornelius*
(Acts 10:44-48)

The next case of speaking in tongues is found in Cornelius' household. "It should be particularly noted that, for another occurrence of that sort, Peter had to go back to *the day of Pentecost*. The inference is plain that, in all the years between, there had been *no similar manifestation* to which Peter could appeal. It is, therefore, very far from the truth to say, or to suppose, that all in apostolic times received the power to speak in tongues. It clearly appears, on the contrary, that the bestowal of the gift of tongues was reserved for occasions of unusual importance." (Philip Mauro, *Speaking in Tongues*, pp. 6-7).

(1) Cornelius was *not praying* for the Holy Spirit or the gift of tongues. Neither is there any indication that he *expected* it.

(2) Peter, the preacher, did not tell Cornelius to pray for the Holy Spirit or to expect the gift of tongues. There is no indication that Peter expected such a manifestation. In fact, we know that Peter and the Jews who came with him did not expect such a manifestation for "they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." (10:45). Thus nothing that Peter had said had led them to expect such a manifestation.

(3) The Holy Spirit and this particular gift of tongues were not given through the laying on of hands, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." (10:44). While he was preaching the Holy Spirit, suddenly and unexpectedly, came on the audience.

(4) The manifestation of the Spirit, in the speaking of tongues, convinced the Jews with Peter that God's will was for the Gentiles to come into the church just as did the Jews. They were to come directly into the church through being baptized into Christ (Gal. 3:27; Acts 10:47-48). They did not have to come into Christ's church through the way of the law of Moses. Thus the tongues here were a sign to unbelievers; not to unbelievers in Christ but unbelievers in the sense that they did not until then believe that the Gentiles were to be accepted by God in the same manner as the Jews.

(5) The church in Jerusalem was convinced, of the reception of the Gentiles being in harmony with God's will, through the *testimony* of those who were with Peter when the Spirit came on the household of Cornelius (Acts 11:1-18). The miracle was not repeated in Jerusalem to convince them. They were convinced through the word of those who were there. "When they *heard* these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." (11:18). We believe today just as they believed then—through the testimony of inspired men. They believed when they heard the spoken word and we believe when we read the written word. However, the writing of the word has not taken from the power of the word to create faith (John 20:30). In fact, the passage in John tells us that the purpose of the writing of the word was to create faith in those who read. Thus when we read this we understand God's will in the matter (cf. Eph. 3:4). We no more

need this particular event repeated than we need a repetition of the resurrection of Christ. Those who study God's word find abundant testimony both to Christ's resurrection and to God's will concerning both Jews and Gentiles.

(6) The case of Cornelius is very unusual for in no other instance do we find people *before their baptism* receiving the Holy Spirit or being given the gift of tongues. In Acts 2 the apostles received the Spirit and the power to speak in tongues. In Acts 2:38 people were promised the gift of the Spirit after obedience in baptism. In Acts 8:15 a measure of the Spirit was given through the laying on of the apostles' hands after baptism. Paul did not receive the Spirit before baptism. His reception of the Spirit was dependent on the coming of Ananias but it is evident from Acts 2:38 that he did not receive it until after his sins were washed away (Acts 9:17; 22:16). The people in Acts 19:6 did not receive the power to speak in tongues until after Paul laid hands on them. *There is no record* of any unbaptized people receiving the Spirit as did the household of Cornelius. When Peter saw this he knew that it was right to baptize Gentiles into Christ (Acts 10:47-48; Matt. 28:19; Gal. 3:27; 1 Pet. 3:21). We conclude that Cornelius' case was an unusual one for a specific purpose—to convince the Jews of God's will concerning the Gentiles. It served its purpose, for all times, and thus a repetition of it is unnecessary.

(7) We do not believe that any people today can produce a similar experience. *First*, some claim to receive it after they have come into Christ, Cornelius received it before he baptized into Christ (Acts 10:47-48; Gal. 3:27). *Second*, the preachers tells them to seek, pray and expect the Holy Spirit. Peter did not tell that to Cornelius. *Third*, they are usually praying for and expecting the Spirit. Cornelius was not. *Fourth*, some of them claim that the Spirit is sent to them, as He was to Cornelius, to save them.

Not so with Cornelius, for he was to hear words whereby he was to be saved (Acts 11:14). *Fifth*, people today get something usually after long periods of preaching and expectation but Cornelius received the Spirit as Peter began to speak (Acts 11:15). *Sixth*, Cornelius' case was accompanied by a series of visions and miracles which resulted in the bringing of a gospel preacher, and witnesses. The people today generally already know about Christ and there are no similar visions like this where they are first—while non-Christians and ignorant of the true Christ—told to send for a gospel preacher (Acts 10:3-6, 9, 18, 19). *Seventh*, the experience in Cornelius' house was to convince the Jews of the reception of the Gentiles (Acts 11:1-18; 10:45; 15:8-9). There is no such need or purpose in the "experiences" of seekers after tongues today. *Eighth*, the Spirit did not come on Cornelius to make him a believer for that was done through words spoken by Peter (Acts 15:7). *Ninth*, some pray today for a baptism of the Spirit to purify them. Cornelius' heart, however, was purified by faith (Acts 15:8). The conclusion is that there is today *no need for or example of* such an event as took place in the household of Cornelius.

(3) *The Men on Whom Paul Laid Hands*

Paul baptized about twelve men in Ephesus who knew only the baptism of John (Acts 19:1-6). An examination of this case reveals several things. *First*, it was abundant proof that John's baptism had been superseded by Christ's baptism. John's baptism had not been followed by the coming of the Spirit and the gift of tongues. The fact that Paul baptized them in the name of Jesus reveals that John's baptism—whatever validity it may have had during John's ministry—was no longer valid. *Second*, they did not receive the Holy Ghost until after their baptism. Thus their baptism must have been baptism in water as in the case of the Eunuch, Cornelius and others (Acts

8:35; 10:44). *Third*, baptism itself did not result in the reception of the measure of the Spirit which enabled one to speak in tongues and prophesy. This is evident from the fact that they received the Spirit, in this measure, *after* Paul laid hands on them and not after the act of baptism itself. *Fourth*, the Spirit, in this measure, was given through the laying on of Paul's hands. *Fifth*, the Spirit was given immediately; when Paul laid hands on them (19:6). There was no long period of seeking, waiting, praying. Those who claim this case as their example of receiving the Spirit today should receive such manifestations immediately after hands are laid on them. If they say that they cannot guarantee immediate results because they are not apostles as was Paul, then what makes them think that they can get any results for they are not apostles. If they can do it they can do it as did Paul and the Spirit should be given immediately, without failure, through the laying on of their hands. There is no case recorded in the New Testament where any apostle failed to give the Spirit when they laid hands on people for that purpose.

"In this case, as in the two preceding, there was an evident need that the truth proclaimed by Paul should be specially authenticated by signs and miracles. Ephesus, moreover, was the place where the great temple of Diana was located, and where 'curious arts' (e.g., necromancy, black art, etc.) were practiced (v. 19). Therefore, 'God wrought special (i.e., unusual) miracles by the hands of Paul' in the place (verses 11, 12)." "In none of these cases was the gift of tongues sought, nor was the Holy Spirit sought after the manner of some in the present day. The Holy Spirit simply bestowed the gift when and as He deemed it needful so to do." (Philip Mauro, *op. cit.*, pp. 7-8).

It is evident that no person can claim the case in Acts

19 as an illustration of the way in which they received the gift of what *they call* tongues today. They do not have any apostle of Christ here today to lay hands on them. They do not actually speak in foreign languages which they have not hithertofore learned.

(4) *New Testament Examples of Speaking
in Tongues*

There are, then, these three references, in Acts of Apostles, to people speaking in tongues. *First*, the day of Pentecost when the preachers spoke and people understood, each in the language wherein they were born (Acts 2:4-12). *Second*, the household of Cornelius which we have dealt with elsewhere in this book (Acts 10:46). *Third*, the case of those, who had received John's baptism, but who knew nothing about the Holy Spirit (Acts 19:2). The attentive reader will notice the following in connection with these cases, (1) The gift was given to groups of people, and not just to one or two. (2) "In each case it was a question of that company's introduction to Christianity." The apostles, who spoke in tongues on the day of Pentecost, knew the gospel, but it was the first time they preached it in its fullness as an accomplished fact; and it was the day of the inauguration of the new covenant, the birthday of the church. (3) It was given to all in each group. (4) It was given without the groups, who received it, asking for it. It is especially evident that they did not have to work themselves up into an emotional state in order to get this gift.

In 1 Cor. 12:10, 11, and 1 Cor. 14:27 (which we have examined elsewhere) the gift was not given to all Christians. This makes it evident that those who claim that speaking in tongues is the necessary sign of the presence of the Spirit in a believer, do not know what the Spirit has really taught on the subject and thus show that they do not have the Spirit.

III. *Paul's Instruction Concerning the Use of Tongues*

(1) *Every individual could not speak in tongues.*

Some, not all, had this particular gift (1 Cor. 12:4-11, 29, 30). We know that many of the speakers in "tongues" today have not received the same Spirit Paul received for they teach that the only sure sign that one has received the Spirit is the ability in tongues. One wrote: "The sign of the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost was tongues. Therefore, all who receive the Spirit must have this sign." A false spirit taught that for all in Paul's day who received the Spirit did not speak in tongues.

(2) *Tongues were given to be of profit, of help, to the entire church. (1 Cor. 12:7; 14:5).*

When the use of it did not edify the church it was not to be used.

(3) *Speaking with tongues was not forbidden (1 Cor. 14:5).*

None of us would forbid genuine scriptural cases, if such existed today.

(4) *Speaking with tongues was regulated.*

One person at a time was to speak (1 Cor. 12:27). This is often ignored by modern "tongue" movements.

(5) *Speaking with tongues was forbidden unless an interpreter was present (1 Cor. 14:28)*

If these instructions were disregarded and some one spoke in a language that none there understood, the entire thing would leave the people uncertain (14:7-8), it would be useless (14:9), barbarous (14:11), childish (14:19-20), mad (14:23). "Pentecostals" often violate this passage.

(6) *Tongues were not the greatest of the gifts.*

Tongues and interpretation were listed last (1 Cor. 12:1-11; 28-30; 14:5, 19). It was less desirable than the gift of prophecy for prophecy always edified the church (14:2,

3, 4); prophecy was greater than tongues without interpretation (14:5); it was better to speak a few words with the understanding than thousands without it (14:19); tongues without interpretation turns away the unbeliever but prophecy convinces him (14:23-24); the use of tongues was limited to two or three but all were to prophecy (14:27, 31); speaking with tongues was not forbidden but they were to "covet" prophecy and this indicates that prophecy was the most desirable gift. Let it be observed that the term "prophecy," as used by the apostle, literally means "to publicly expound," and is so translated in Young's Concordance. (Louis S. Bauman, *The Modern Tongues Movement*, third ed., p. 4). The prophet was one who forth-told God's will as well as foretold the future when it was God's will for him to do so.

Since some modern speakers in "tongues" place so much emphasis on tongues, they are not guided by the Spirit who guided Paul. Speaking with tongues was never the most important gift and those who make it so are misguided.

(7) *Tongues were for a sign for unbelievers*

This was true when the language spoken was his (the hearer's) native tongue or one that he knew (1 Cor. 14:22). This helped confirm the word while it was being delivered (Mk. 16:17-20).

(8) *Tongues were to cease* (1 Cor. 13:8).

They ceased when the confirmation of the word, the purpose for which they were given, was completed (Mk. 16:20).

(9) *The gift of tongues was under the control of the speaker.*

The way some rave in "tongues" one would think that they were beside themselves. In Paul's day the true gift of tongues was under the control of the speaker and he was to keep silent unless an interpreter was present (1 Cor. 14:27, 28). One woman who spoke in tongues testified

that "a characteristic of this experience, as physically manifested, is the involuntary shaking of the lower jaw which is beyond one's control, and produces babbling." She later left the Pentecostal tongues movement (Bauman, 13). This is contrary to the Spirit of God who bears in us the fruit of self control (Gal. 5:22, 23).

(10) *God is not the author of confusion*
(1 Cor. 14:33).

God is the author of decency and order (1 Cor. 14:40). The lack of decency and order, and the presence of confusion, in many meetings where "tongues" are spoken are a sure sign that God is not behind such meetings. They may have some spirit but not the Spirit of God.

(11) *God is the author of unity* (John 17:20).

The groups today, which often differ from one another and are not all together in one denomination or church, all possess the same kind of power to speak in "tongues." Their "tongues" are similar. What "tongues" prove for one they prove for all. They cannot prove that God is with them for they often teach conflicting doctrine. Therefore, whatever they may prove they do not prove that these groups are of God. These "tongues" today in different groups are of the same kind but they are not like the tongues mentioned in the Bible.

(12) *Women were not permitted to speak in tongues in a meeting in which revelations were made*
(1 Cor. 14:34-36)

The church meeting which is under consideration in this chapter was a meeting in which prophesying under the direction of the Spirit and speaking in tongues took place. During such a meeting the women were not permitted to prophesy and reveal truth or to speak in tongues. Isn't it strange that many of those who speak in "tongues" in meetings today are women and that in some instances women

have founded movements which emphasize speaking in tongues? This is another proof that they have not received the same Spirit which guided Paul. Those who contradict by their acts and words what Paul here taught are not spiritual or prophets (1 Cor. 14:37).

(13) *People who contradict the teaching of the apostles cannot have the gift of tongues or any other gift of the Spirit (1 Cor. 14:37).*

Adherents of the modern "tongue" movements should seriously face this question: *Do they put their "experience" above God's word?* Would they deny the scripturalness of their "experience" or would they deny the word of God if it can be shown that their "experience" is not in harmony with the word of God?

(14) *The true gift of tongues when properly exercised produced believers (1 Cor. 14:25).*

IV. *Characteristics of the "Tongues" Movement*

We shall refer to a few cases which show how these modern experiences differ from the manifestation of the Spirit which the early Christians received when they were enabled to speak in other tongues.

(1) One "tongues" church had a class in which they *taught* members how to speak in "tongues." They practiced the chatter with which they broke out in their public meetings. Of course, we know that all of them do not do such a thing.

(2) "At a great Pentecost meeting in San Jose, where as many as ten thousand people attended, a certain preacher was 'seeking the baptism,' when a prominent woman worker approached him, and, chucking him under the chin, said, 'Now, just imagine you are a baby and begin to babble!' Imagine Peter, on the day of Pentecost, going around chucking the Jews under their chins, saying, 'Now, just imagine you are babies, and begin to babble!'" (Bau-man, 8).

(3) A man in the "tongues" movement in India told how the "spirit" came on him. "The power began to seize me, and I laughed all through the following communion service." "After some little waiting I began to laugh, or rather my body was used to laugh with increasing power until I was flat on my back laughing at the top of my voice for over half-an-hour. On arising I found that I was drunk on the new wine (Eph. 5:18), acting just like a drunken man in many ways and full of joy." "Then coming to and kneeling I felt my jaws and mouth being worked by a strange force. In a few seconds some baby gibberish was uttered, then a few words in Chinese that I understood, and then several sentences in a strange tongue." (Irvine, 197).

(4) One man, who had received the power to speak in "tongues," wrote Bauman that "To my surprise, I found that these blessed emotions in my soul seemed to be accompanied with sexual passion in my body." (30). Judging from some events he has not been the only one who received such a "spirit."

For such cases see Ray Strachey, *Religious Fanaticism*, and James D. Bales, *Soils and Seeds of Sectarianism*, the chapter on "Emotionalism in Religion."

(5) *No frenzy or exhaustion.* "The gift of tongues were bestowed on men in full vigor and activity, preceded by no frenzy, followed by no exhaustion." (Smith's *Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 1134). This is in contrast with the conditions surrounding the "gift of tongues" in modern meetings. In speaking of the followers of Edward Irving, around 1830, Smith made the contrast clear. "Here, more than in most other cases, were the conditions of long, eager expectation, fixed brooding over one central thought, the mind strained to a preternatural tension. Suddenly, now from one, now from another, chiefly from women,

devout but illiterate, mysterious sounds were heard." (*Ibid.*, p. 113).

(6) *Languages which were not miraculous gifts.* "In certain exceptional states of mind and body the power of memory receives a wonderful and abnormal strength. In the delirium of fever, in the ecstasy of a trance, men speak in their old age languages which they have never heard or spoken since their earliest youth." (*Smith's Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible*, pp. 1133-1134). The author has read of one woman who during an illness recited passages of the Bible in Hebrew. She was an unlearned girl and the question was raised as to how she was able to do it. She had never studied Hebrew. The solution was finally found. She had worked, in her younger days, in the home of a minister. Oftentimes he would walk in the garden, or sit in his study, and quote passages from the Old Testament in Hebrew. The girl had heard these time and time again. Some of them had evidently made an impression on her sub-conscious mind and during her illness she was able to recall these things. And thus it may be that in some of these "tongues" meetings today that people under strong emotional stimulus, or in a hypnotic condition, may repeat some of the things which they heard in a foreign tongue while they were young. But this would not be a case of speaking as the Spirit gave utterance. It would not be a message which contained scripture at all *unless* they had heard in their younger days scripture read or quoted in the foreign tongue.

V. *The Latter-Day Saints and "New Tongues"*

The Latter-day Saints believe that the church today can, and must, have the miraculous powers which were exercised by some in the days of Paul. Among these powers was the power to speak in a language which the individual had not learned. With the Latter-day Saints as their own witness we shall show that they do not manifest this sign.

It is a sad situation when they hold this up as a mark of the New Testament church, maintain that the church of Christ is not *the* church because we do not work such miracles today, and then they themselves fail to demonstrate this characteristic.

Orson Pratt, who was an apostle and one of their most scholarly men, wrote as follows: " 'They shall speak in new tongues.' The benefit of this miraculous sign is obvious to every one. If a servant of God were under the necessity of acquiring in the ordinary way a knowledge of languages, a large portion of his time would be unprofitably occupied. While he was spending years to learn the language of a people sufficiently accurate to preach the glad tidings of salvation unto them, thousands would be perishing for the want of the knowledge. If he could be endowed immediately by the power of the Holy Ghost to speak in any language necessary, how much laborious study would be avoided! how much time would be saved that could be occupied more usefully in the spread of the gospel! how much more accurately would principles be expressed, when, not only the ideas, but the language itself is given by the Holy Ghost! How vastly superior is God's plan of qualifying His servants to preach in different languages and tongues, to the plans adopted by modern divines! The servant of God is qualified in a moment, as it were, to preach by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in the language of any people to whom he may be sent; while modern divines will throw away years in acquiring the knowledge of a language; and when they have acquired it, they cannot preach in it by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, but are still dependent upon their own learning and wisdom." (*Orson Pratt's Works*, Salt Lake City, Utah: George O. Cannan & Sons Company, 1891, pp. 99-100).

"That the principle use of this gift was to preach the gospel to the people of different tongues and languages we

presume no one will deny. And that there was another benefit derived through the medium of this gift is also evident. The members of the church were confirmed and strengthened in their faith by the enjoyment of this gift." (*Ibid*, p. 100).

"The benefits to be deprived from this gift are as essential in this age, as in the first age of Christianity." (p. 100).

"Therefore, as there is no scripture to limit this gift to the early Christians, and no reason why believers should not enjoy it now, we are compelled to admit and this promise of Jesus is in full force yet, and that whenever and wherever we find a church of true believers in Christ, there we shall also find the signs of believers. And as the gift of tongues is not among the apostate churches now on the earth, we are compelled by the word of God to consider them unbelievers. Indeed, they cannot be believers; for if they were they could speak with new tongues, as Jesus promised." (100-101).

This is clear, strong language. According to this test the Latter-day Saints are not believers for their missionaries must learn the language of another race, just as do we Gentiles. If God were exercising such power on earth today we certainly would like to be recipients of it. Is He exercising such a power among the Latter-day Saints? The following references and quotations from a Latter-day Saint publication answers, no.

President Young made an address to the missionaries who had been selected to go to the Lamanites (Indians). The address was given Oct. 9, 1853. In this address he said: "Every Elder, who is now called unto this work, should immediately commence to learn the Lamanite languages. Go to brother D. B. Huntington and take lessons; and I hope soon to see a hundred good interpreters where we now have but one." (*Millennial Star*, Vol. 16 (1854), p. 188).

President Young evidently overlooked the claim of the church, of which he was President, for he sent the missionaries to a language teacher instead of to the Holy Ghost. Why didn't he lay hands on them? (Acts 19:6).

Elam Ludington was on a mission in Burma in Jan. 1854. He wrote to the *Millennial Star* that both he and some of his audience needed an interpreter (Vol. 16, p. 190, 191). Truman Leonard referred to Findlay as nearly a master of the Mahrattée tongue (p. 223). Nathan Tanner, of the Sandwich Islands' Mission, said that most of them found that it "was going to be a slow job to learn the language (p. 236). Richard Ballantyne, on the Madras Mission, said that "Brother Skelton is still learning the Tamil language. For want of a regular teacher, he made but little progress for sometime, but, now he has obtained the help of a well educated native, he gets along well." (p. 239). This sounds like a Gentile learning the language! Missionaries in China wrote that "To go among the Chinese we could not, not being able to speak their language." "Teachers are not easily obtained who can speak English, and they charge very high, and are under the control of the missionaries." "The language must be obtained either by study or the gift and power of God, before we can tell them the truths of heaven. How this is to be brought about, is the question which may be asked, and that is the very thing that we would like to know." (p. 254). In an article on "Language," written we suppose by the editor, it is stated that "The Elders find the diversity of language a most serious drawback to their efforts to extend the Gospel and warn the nations. It is true that by the gift of tongues power is given to men to speak languages otherwise unknown to them, as on the day of Pentecost, and as in many instances in these latter days (we want a few examples, J.D.B.), but all persons have not faith to occasionally receive and exercise the gift of tongues, with the interpretation thereof,

and probably none have faith sufficient to rely, on all occasions, entirely on this gift, whilst on a mission to a people whose language they have not otherwise obtained." (p. 257). Latter-day Saints may furnish examples where people in their meetings have uttered unintelligible sounds but when it comes to the test on a mission field their missionaries must get the language by perspiration and not by inspiration. An editorial in another issue said that quite "a number of persons were busy in learning the Indian language" (Vol. 16, p. 363). James F. Bell, writing from the Malta mission, spoke of learning Italian and of his ineffectiveness with some "on account of my deficiency in respect of the language" (p. 365). (See also p. 397; 419).

What additional examples are necessary in order to demonstrate that, according to Orson Pratt, the Latter-day Saints constitute an apostate church.

By way of summary our conclusion is that the claims of the people today to speak in tongues must be rejected for they do not teach the full gospel as did the apostles, and they do not actually speak in languages which they have not learned. They do not even understand what the New Testament teaches about tongues.

Chapter XI

FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS

I. *Miracles and the Sameness of God*

Modern faith healers have argued that since God is the same today, yesterday, and forever that therefore if one generation had the power to work miracles that all generations should have such power or otherwise God has changed.

(1) *This is a dangerous assumption—is it not tempting God?*

Those who demand miracles today by saying that they must be able to work them, or God has changed, are doing what Jesus said not to do. The devil said to Jesus: "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God" (Matt. 4:6-7). As Richard Watson, in his *Commentary on Matthew*, wrote: "Here the scripture is quoted by the tempter in aid of his design; and as the object of this suggestion was to lead to an unauthorized presumption upon special divine interposition, it represents a numerous class of temptations, by which many have been misled to put themselves into circumstances of moral danger, without a divine warrant. The promises of scripture are also often perverted by such persons to support their vain confidence, who consider not the persons and their circumstances to whom they are spoken. The quotation used by Satan is from Psalm xci. 12, and was employed by him either because the Jews applied it prophetically to the Messiah, or because it expresses God's special care of good men, and

so suited his purpose; for the argument was, If God takes charge of good men generally, how much more of 'the Son of God' himself! 'If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down,' and let thy safety be the proof that thou art so. It is an observation of weight made by Jerom and others, that the tempter makes a mutilated citation of the passage, and leaves out a material circumstance: 'He shall give his angels charge concerning thee, to *to keep thee in all thy ways;*' that is in all thy lawful courses of conduct, of which to cast himself down from a precipice was not one. Thus our Lord was first tempted to distrust God's care, and then to presume without warrant upon it."

"Verse 7 Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.—It has been disputed among critics whether to tempt God in this passage signifies to presume upon his goodness, or to distrust it. The word tempt, when applied to God, as it signifies to make trial of him, has always a bad sense, and in general seems to mean to seek from God displays of his power, on occasions and in a way prescribed by ourselves. Now this may proceed either from distrust or presumption; and so the opinions alluded to may be somewhat reconciled. The passage referred to is, 'Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God, as ye tempted him in Massah.' Deut. vi. 16. Now although on that occasion, so provoking to God, when the Israelites wanted water, they are said to have tempted the Lord by saying, 'Is the Lord among us or not?' it does not appear that this language proceeded so much from distrust, as from a petulant demand for an exertion of the divine power at the time, and in the manner they dared to prescribe. And though in a case of simple presumption upon divine interposition, the perverse temper of the Israelites on that occasion may be wanting, yet the essence of their faults is involved in it; a bold and unauthorized demand being made upon God in our own will for the

exercise of his power. The appositeness of the quotation is therefore apparent." (p. 60).

Jesus did not question God's power or His promises when He refused to cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the temple (Matt. 4:5-7). He did not say that because God would enable Him to overcome the law of gravitation when He ascended that therefore He should cast Himself from the pinnacle for God was always the same and that therefore He should jump. Jesus said that "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." The people who use the argument on the sameness of God virtually demand that God prove His sameness, in the manner that they dictate, by giving each generation the power to work miracles. This assumption is dangerous for it sows the seeds of infidelity for if God has not given such powers unto each generations those who believe that He has will fall into unbelief, in some instances, if they cannot find or obtain such powers. If God did all of the time what He did through Moses then we would be unable to explain how that a Christian could drown (for did not Israel pass through the sea on dry land?) or be overtaken by his enemies (for did not God keep the Egyptians from overtaking Israel?) If a person was thoroughly converted to this particular application of the sameness of God, he would become an infidel when a Christian drowned or was overtaken by his enemies. For, this individual could reason, God is the same today as He was yesterday and if He delivered His people in that manner yesterday He will do it today. He did not do it today, therefore He did not do it in the yesterday. Persons who are not believers in Christ, when they hear this argument, could reason: These modern faith healers claim to have the power that the apostles had; these faith healers do not do the miracles that they claim to do and that it is claimed, in the New Testament, that the apostles did. Therefore, since these people today do not have these powers those

people in Paul's day did not have them, and what they taught and claimed to do is just as false as the claims of modern faith healers.

(2) *The absurdity of this argument for the continuation of the power to work miracles of healings is shown when we apply it to other types of miracles.*

Enoch walked with God and he did not see death (Heb. 11:5). Why not argue that each individual who walks with God must be taken from this earth as was Enoch or else God has changed? If we had enough faith would we be translated as was Enoch? Has God changed because believers today are not so translated? Adam and Eve were created by miracles. Has God changed because we were not created like they were? Why isn't every individual brought into this world as they were? Regardless of our ideas on the sameness of God and what that implies with reference to power to work miracles, we know today that men are not created as Adam was created and that men today do not have the powers which the apostles had. The sameness of God argument, as applied to miracles, would also apply to Christ's appearance on this earth. Peter and others walked with Christ. They witnessed His crucifixion and they saw Him after His death. Why not argue that if God is the same each generation must have Christ present in the flesh and that each generation must witness the crucifixion and resurrection. Why hasn't God granted each generation this power and privilege? Has He changed? Is He any less powerful than He was then? Christ fed thousands with a few loaves and fishes. Has He changed because He has not enabled men to do this today? Does He have any less power because He is not so working today? Is the fact that such is not being done today an argument against either the goodness, the power or the sameness of God? No, it is not; but it would be if the

application, made by the modern faith healers, of the sameness of God, is correct.

(3) *The same argument could be used to demand continuous revelation*

Since God revealed new truth through His prophets of old, since what they wrote became a part of the inspired Scriptures, new revelations and new Scriptures should come forth each generation! Additions should be made every generation to the Bible. And yet, with a few exceptions, most of the modern healers are very emphatic in maintaining that the only Bible which they have is the Bible which we have and that they have no new truth or new revelation to add to the Bible as a part of the inspired record of God's word to mankind. These individuals are inconsistent. Their argument of the sameness of God argues that if God made revelations, and His prophets wrote new scripture, in generations past, then the same must be taking place today or God has changed. The miracles were always secondary. Revelation was primary. If we must have what was secondary we must also have that which was primary.

(4) *Dispensations Change*

It is a fact that He has dealt with men in different ways in different dispensations. He has not given to us, or required of us, the same things in every detail that He gave to and required of the Jews under the Mosaical dispensation. He has not dealt with every generation exactly as He did with Noah's generation. In fact, He promised that He would not again destroy the earth by water (Gen. 9:8-16). In times past He permitted certain nations to walk in their own ways. This time of ignorance He overlooked but now He commandeth men everywhere that they should repent (Acts 14:16; 17:30). God miraculously preserved the shoes and clothing of the people in the wilderness but He is not doing such today (Deut. 8:4;

19:5; Neh. 9:21). He permitted Thomas to see the Lord, but at the same time He pointed out that all would not be given a personal view of Him in order to lead them to faith (John 20:25-29). God has changed covenants (Jer. 31:31; Heb. 8:5). God is not a machine without a will who must do certain things today because He did them yesterday. He has not changed in His nature but He has changed dispensations. He has changed commands in that He has taken away the old covenant and established a new covenant. He has not changed but the complete revelation of His will to the church has already been made. These things show that God does not have to grant revelations and inspiration, and miracles to confirm those new revelations, to each generation in order to be unchangeable. The sameness of God has nothing to do with the issue of whether or not God has granted to the church today the power to work miracles.

Jesus is always the same (Heb. 13:8), but there is no record of His performing miracles in the flesh before the time of His incarnation and personal ministry.

(5) *How God and Christ are Unchangeable*

James Emblem pointed out that "although unchangeable in their *Nature* and *Attributes*, the *Manifestations* and *Operations* of both the Father and the Son *have* changed with the changing Dispensations, according to the divine plan and purpose of each Dispensation." (1) He does not make us like He made Adam and neither does He *appear* to us as He did to Adam in the garden in Eden. (2) He does not *judge* and condemn us to physical death today, and have us executed as He had those under the Old Testament who worked on the Sabbath. (3) He does not *deliver* His people as He did the three Hebrews from the fiery furnace; Daniel from the lion's den; Noah from the flood; or Peter from prison. (4) He does not *intervene* as in the case of the falling of the walls of Jericho; the parting of the Red

Sea; and the provision of manna and meat for Israel in the wilderness (Herbert Lockyer, *The Healer and Healing Movements*, pp. 34-36).

These considerations force us to conclude that the "healers" have the wrong conception of God's unchangeableness and thus draw conclusions which are not found in the Bible nor sustained in their own personal experience.

II. *Favoritism and Miracles*

Some modern faith healers have been so bold as to claim that God is guilty of favoritism if He does not grant to each generation of the church the power which was given to certain persons in the first century. This argument, like the one on the sameness of God, assumes that God must meet the conditions that *we* think that He should meet or He is guilty of favoritism. Unless He grants such powers today He is guilty of favoritism! The foolishness of this argument is seen easily. It would accuse God of favoritism because He has not made every man as He did Adam, or placed each man in the Garden of Eden. He did not select each of us to be Abraham and He did not permit each of us to be with Christ during His personal ministry. He has not given to each of us the view of the resurrected Lord that Thomas had. We are not translated as was Enoch and neither were we called to be Moses or the apostles of Christ. We did not all have the gospel preached to us personally by either Christ or the apostles and all of us did not have the experience which Cornelius had. Furthermore, there were many widows in Elias' day but he was not sent to all of them and there were many lepers in Naaman's time but he was the only one cleansed (Lk. 4:25-27). There were many people alive when Christ arose from the tomb but He showed Himself only to certain witnesses and disciples (Acts 10:40-41). We today do not have direct revelations as did Paul. John did not would say that God is therefore guilty of favoritism.

The modern "miracles" workers will endeavor to show that the above unique events do not constitute examples of "favoritism." If they do not constitute examples of favoritism then the same reasoning applies to the working of miracles. Let them cease trying to lay down conditions for God to meet. Instead let them be content with the way that He, in His own council, has determined to work.

III. *Is Our God a "Has Been"*

Faith healers have accused us of worshipping a "has been" God because we do not believe that God has granted the power to work miracles to His church today. But if this is an adequate basis on which to make this accusation, then are they not in the same condition? Has God enabled them to divide the waters of the sea and to walk through on dry land? Have they fed thousands with a few loaves and fishes and then gather up several baskets full of the left overs? Are they worshipping a "has been" God because Christ was resurrected about two thousand years ago and not in our generation?

Certainly we are not worshipping a "has been" God because we maintain that signs and wonders had a definite purpose and that having fulfilled that purpose that they ceased. We are not such sign seekers that we demand that God give us signs all of the time in order to keep us from thinking that He is a "has been."

IV. *"The Jesus That Was"*

When we maintain that Christ has not granted the church today the power to work miracles, some healers accuse us of worshipping "the Jesus that was." If this is so, they also are worshipping the "Jesus that was," since Christ is not with them in person as He was with the early disciples. Do not they worship the "Jesus that was" when they fail to do the miracles mentioned above? The answer to their argument on a "has been" God is also

the answer to their cry concerning the "Jesus that was."

We are unwilling to apply such terms to God because He has not seen fit to make all things happen in our generations which He has made happen in certain past generations. We are content to let His work and manifestations be directed by *His* will instead of *our* will.

V. *"You Cut Out Part of the Bible"*

We are accused of cutting out part of the Bible because we do not believe that *we* today have the power to work miracles which the apostles and some others in the early church had. We are accused of cutting out the instructions which regulated miraculous gifts.

(1) *Do we cut out the life of Christ because He is not here in flesh today?* No, we do not. We do not cut out the miracles which He wrought just because we cannot repeat them. We cannot raise the dead, give others the power to speak in languages which they have not learned, feed five thousand with a few loaves and fishes or place our hand in the pierced side of Christ. Yet, these things are recorded in the Bible.

(2) *We do not cut out Christ's instructions to the apostles but we do not believe that we are apostles or that we have people on earth today who were with Jesus both before and after His resurrection.* He told them to tarry in Jerusalem until they were clothed with power from on high and that then they were to begin world evangelism (Lk. 24:45; Acts 1:8; 2:1). We do not believe that we must go to Jerusalem and wait until the Holy Spirit comes. We do not establish the church over again each generation. And our position on this point does not mean that we are cutting anything out of the Bible. We are simply handling aright the word of truth and not trying to appropriate to ourselves something that was not meant for us.

(3) *Miracles which our accusers cut out.* Since our accusers do not get manna daily from heaven to sustain

their physical life, since their clothes and shoes do wax old, since they cannot change water into wine, or part the seas or turn a rod into a serpent, since they do not do these and many other things they have cut some things out of the Bible, according to their logic.

(4) *The miracles written in the Bible confirm our faith although we were not there to witness them and although we do not see them repeated and cannot repeat them.* They were recorded that we might believe in Christ and believing have eternal life (John 20:30).

Chapter XII

WHAT DO THEY MORE THAN OTHERS?

Modern healers claim that by their miracles it is demonstrated that God is with them, and that the message which they preach is scriptural. And yet, the type of works which they do, which they call miracles, are like those which are worked by other groups which teach doctrines which contradict some of their doctrines. Surely God is not miraculously backing contradictory religious bodies and doctrines? Such would be confusion indeed, and God is not the author of confusion.

Perhaps it will be said by some of these groups that their miracles far surpass those of other groups. It is true that *if* God was working miracles through them that they would surpass other groups which differed with them. For when God worked miracles in opposition to false teachers the difference in what God's servants did and what their opponents did was so great that there was no doubt as to who was on God's side. Thus although the magicians of Pharaoh seemed to work some wonders at first they were soon so far outdistanced by God's messengers that even Pharaoh finally admitted who was on God's side.

It is not true, however, that any one of these miracle working groups (we do not mean that they work miracles by God's power but that they claim to do so) is outstanding above the others. They all work the same type of wonders and make the same type of claims. Thus to each of them we say: What do you more than others which would prove that God was working wonders through you and endorsing your teaching and church, and not doing the

same for an opposing church and teaching? If you are really backed by God's miracle working power, why is this fact not clearly demonstrated in the superiority of your wonders to their wonders.

(1) *The Roman Catholic Church*

Protestant "miracle" workers surely do not believe that the Roman Catholic Church is the church of the Lord. And yet, the Roman Catholic Church can point to the same type of healings that these healing cults can point to. They are just as good as, but no better than, these healing cults. The author has seen their display of discarded crutches, and other claims of healing, in such places as Montreal, Canada.

The following is taken from *Mediaeval and Modern Saints and Miracles* (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1876, p. 174. No author given).

"The miracles of La Salette were outdone by those of Lourdes even in the infancy of that revelation . . . By the laws of action and reaction the wonders of Lourdes have magnified the dogma of the divinity of Mary . . . crowds or votaries increase every day. New and more brilliant miracles are hourly wrought. The demand for its water is extending, arrangements have been made for its regular exportation to foreign countries, and it competes everywhere with the mineral waters of atheist Germany . . ."

The Superior California Register, a Roman Catholic newspaper published in Sacramento, California (Oct. 3, 1948) reported that over 1,000 doctors from all over the world would "take part in the investigations of the Lourdes Medical bureau." "Dr. Leuret reported on the many genuine cures reported recently and cited the case of 8-year-old Gerard Baillie of St. Omer, France, who was suddenly cured of a six-year affliction of blindness while making the Stations of the Cross with his mother at Lourdes."

(2) *Christian Science*

In *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures* there is a section devoted to "fruitage" wherein numerous cases of healing are reported. They are like the cases reported by all other healing groups. In fact, like the rest of them they often sound like patent medicine testimonies.

"Mrs. Eddy naturally put her best testimonials into the text-book, "Science and Health"; devoting as she did one hundred pages of valuable space to seventy-one testimonials from persons who had received help. These stories made such a strange impression on my mind that I was moved to tabulate the items which they contained. Taking a large sheet of paper, I set down the principal data under the following heads:

(1) Kinds of ailments; (2) Number of cures under each disease. (3) The character of the people healed (as bankers, lawyers, merchants, housewives, etc.) (4) The sentiments expressed (as love, gratitude, religious fervor, etc.).

Then, taking another large sheet of paper, I tabulated the same items found in the testimonials of a book compiled by a well-known patent medicine firm. When the work was done I laid the two sheets of paper side by side for comparison in the four respects mentioned. The degree of similarity was so striking that it almost startled me. You could read the two tabulated sheets up or down, crosswise or bias, and they were essentially identical. In each case principal diseases were conspicuous by their absence. Occasionally there was wrought a wonder, according to the report, like the cure of a cancer; but for the most part it was stomach trouble and rheumatism, or nerves and heart, or some other chronic trouble. In both books they nearly all had been at death's door, and had been given up by their physicians. The people in the two sets of stories were similar, judged by their occupations and by the degree of intelligence manifested in their written

testimonials. The love and gratitude toward benefactors, as well as their thanks to God, were almost identical. I even tried the experiment of substitution "bottles" for "Science and Health," and vice versa, and found that I could not tell one from the other. (Eliminating, of course, the criticism of the churches found in the Christian Science testimonials.)"

"Here, then, are the figures out of the one hundred pages of "Science and Health" in regard to cures, classified approximately :

Cured of tobacco and liquor 13, stomach trouble 10, catarrh 10, back and limb trouble 9, eyes 9, rheumatism and neuralgia 8, heart 7, nerves 6, consumption 6, mind trouble 4, tumors 4, epilepsy 2, eczema 2, hernia 2, blood poison of a year's standing 1, cancer 1, asthma 1, anemia 1, insomnia 1, Bright's disease 1, varicose vein 1, deafness in one ear 1.

Some of these letters are so amusing that one wonders why they were published. I sometimes think that Christian Scientists have not only lost all sense of humor, but the capacity to recognize the ridiculous. For example here is one testimony :

'I was healed of numerous diseases pronounced incurable The healing was so gently done that I was well several days before I fully realized it. Her husband, I believe, first discovered that she was well.

In addition to the foregoing I have made some examination of about one dozen kinds of healing and find them all alike. There is some honesty and some charlatanism in most healing cults. They all do both good and harm. A good psychologist could go the rounds and be an expert in every school because he would understand that the theory associated with the works had nothing to do with it.

The sensible thing for any one to do is to learn a few of the simple truths of scientific psychology, relate them

to a simple and sane religion, and then live an unselfish, devoted, Christian life, full of hope and good cheer.”¹

(3) *Psychology and Psychiatry*

Psychologists and psychiatrists have reported many cases of healing which are fully as wonderful as those of the healing cults. Some of these cases are cited in the chapter on “Faith and Health”. Dr. Carl G. Jung reported a case of hysterical fever, “with a temperature as high as 102, which was cured in a few minutes by a confession of the psychological cause.”

“In another case, a patient had recently undergone an operation for distention of the colon, forty centimeters of which had been removed, but this was followed by another extraordinary distention of the colon. The patient was desperate and refused to permit a second operation, though the surgeon thought it indispensable. As soon as certain psychological facts were discovered, the colon began to function normally.” (Carl Gustav Jung, M.D., *Psychology and Religion*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938, pp. 10-11).

(4) *Latter-Day Saints*

All three groups of the Latter-day Saints work the same type of “miracles”. They rank neither higher nor lower than Christian Science and other healing groups.

(5) *Coue's healings*

The method of conscious autosuggestion advocated by Emile Coue brought healings just like those of the healing cults. A section of the book, *Self Mastery Through Conscious Autosuggestion* by Emile Coue, is devoted to reports of cures. Such healings as the following are listed: attacks of nerves; articular rheumatism; chronic bronchitis; kidney trouble; spitting of blood; constipation; daily vomiting; heart stoppages; and such like (pp. 62-76). The

¹Richard L. Swain, *The Real Key to Christian Science* (New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1917), pp. 91-94.

heart of this method was to repeat time and time again that "Day by day, in every way, I am getting better and better."

(6) *Pagan healings*

Pagan religions have healings of the same type that one finds among the "healing" cults today. Dr. Schofield wrote: "My brother (the late Dr. Harold Ainsworth Schofield, M.A., M.D. Oxon., B.Sc., Lond., F. R. C. S., etc.) who had thrown up a brilliant position in London to become a missionary in China told me that some temples were full of rejected crutches, splints and bandages, left as thank offerings by those who had been healed." (*Behind the Brass Plate*, p. 218).

(7) *The conclusion*

The results of various other healing groups could be cited, but these are sufficient to show that all of them work the same types of "miracles". None of them match the range of wonders and miracles set forth in the Bible.

We know that God is not performing miracles through all of them to confirm their word, for to do so would make God the author of contradictions. This would be so because these various groups teach many conflicting doctrines, and deny the right of the other groups to exist. Whatever the Roman Catholics will affirm, for example, Christian Scientists will deny. Yet they both produce the same type of "signs". Surely no one in his right mind, and who knows the Scriptures, will claim that God is backing the teaching of such contradictory groups.

We know also that if God was working miracles through one of these groups that it would be evident which one it was. When Moses got into a miracle working contest with the magicians of Egypt it was clear to both them, and to Pharaoh, who God was with—God was with Moses. God's servant so outdid the others that all knew who God's servant was. Just so today one of the above groups would

far outshine the other if God was working through one of them. But no one group does outshine the other.

Thus we must conclude that God is not performing wonders through all of them (for He would thus be contradicting Himself), nor is He doing it through any one particular group (for then that group would clearly stand out, and none does). Regardless of the source of their "wonders" God has not given them the power to work miracles as He gave to the apostles, and to certain others in the Bible.

Chapter XIII

THE SPIRIT GAVE DIFFERENT GIFTS TO MEN

When people understand that the Spirit gave different gifts to man, they will recognize that it is possible to have the Holy Spirit and yet not have the miraculous manifestations which certain Christians had in the first century. They will also know that the church of Christ does not deny the Holy Spirit, just because the church denies that people today have been promised, or have received, the miraculous gifts of the Spirit that the apostles received.

Paul said that "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:4). "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." (1 Cor. 12:7). The same Spirit gave gifts to them, but the manifestations were different, as Paul proved by referring to the different gifts. All did not have the same gift but through all worked "that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will." (1 Cor. 12:11). "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" (1 Cor. 12:29-30). No, as Paul pointed out when he stated, earlier in this same chapter, that different gifts were given to different individuals (1 Cor. 12:8-10). Paul also spoke of the "measure of the gift of Christ" and then listed some of the gifts which Christ gave when He ascended (Eph. 4:7-8).

Philip's work in Samaria has some circumstances connected with it which indicate that different gifts were given to different men. Philip was "full of the Holy Spirit" before he was selected as one of the seven (Acts 6:3). In fact, since he was a baptized believer he had the gift of

the Spirit (Acts 2:38). After the apostles laid hands on the seven we find that they worked miracles (Acts 6:6, 8; 8:6). It was likely that Philip received, in this manner, the power to work miracles. Before the apostles laid hands on Philip and the others we find that the apostles were the only ones who were mentioned as working miracles (Acts 2:43; 5:12). But when they laid hands on others they also worked miracles. We know that certain powers or gifts were bestowed through the laying on of the hands of the apostles (Acts 8:14, 15, 17; 19:1-; 2 Tim. 1:6). Philip, we know, worked miracles after this had taken place (Acts 8:6). However, he could not impart the Spirit, through the laying on of hands, to other people. Philip had the gift which enabled him to work miracles but not the gift which enabled him to impart the Spirit through the laying on of hands. It was necessary for apostles to come from Jerusalem and bestow the Spirit through the laying on of hands (Acts 8:14-17). Visible manifestations must have accompanied the laying on of their hands. There are two reasons for this statement.

First, there must have been some sort of manifestation for Simon *saw* that through the laying on of the apostle's hands the Holy Ghost was given (Acts 8:18).

Second, we know that visible manifestation accompanied the impartation of the Spirit through the laying on of the hands of an apostle (Acts 19:1-). A consideration of these things enables us to see that there were different gifts of the Spirit. Philip had a gift but he did not have the gift which the apostles had and thus, although he could work miracles, he could not impart the Spirit through the laying on of hands. We also know that all of the Samaritans who had been baptized had received what was called the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2:38. God gave the Spirit to all them that obeyed Him (Acts 5:32). This was promised on the same condition as the remission of sins. However, it dif-

ferred from the gift imparted by the apostles for although Philip could baptize believers, and these believers could thus receive all blessings promised to the baptized believer (Acts 2:38), he could not give them the particular gift of the Spirit which the apostles could give them. This gift was not essential to salvation for later Philip baptized the eunuch and there was no apostle there to impart the Spirit through the laying on of hands. And yet, the eunuch went on his way rejoicing (Acts 8:39). Thus it is evident that the gift the apostles could give was not essential to salvation for if it had been the eunuch would have had no reason to rejoice for he did not have that gift. In this connection it is also well to observe that since Simon was one of the Samaritans who believed and was baptized, and thus perhaps one on whom the apostles laid their hands (Acts 8:14-7), he did not have the gift which the apostles had. He had the gift of Acts 2:38, and of Acts 8:17, but he wanted another gift. The gift he wanted was that which would have enabled him to impart the Spirit for he said: "Give me also *this power*, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost" (Acts 8:19). It was not given to him.

We know that the apostles received the many gifts from Spirit; that the apostles were able to impart to others, through the laying on of hands, certain gifts; and we also know that all saved people have the Holy Spirit. Let us consider some of the scriptures which relate to these gifts of the Spirit.

I. *Miraculous Endowment Received by the Apostles*

The apostles possessed a multitude of miraculous gifts. Let us notice some of them. *First*, they could speak in foreign languages which they had not learned, but which the Spirit miraculously enabled him to utter (Acts 2:4, 8, 11; 1 Cor. 14:14).

Second, the apostles possessed the gift of inspiration. By divine power they had revealed to them the truths of the new covenant. Involved in this, in so far as the apostles were concerned, was the power of the Spirit which enabled them to remember what Jesus had taught them in His personal ministry (John 14:26). Also was involved guidance into truth which Jesus did not utter during His personal ministry, but which He left for the Spirit to teach them (John 16:12-13). Who today could claim, and back up the claim, that he was not taught the gospel by men, but that directly from heaven without human teaching, or the written word in the Bible, he received the teachings of the new covenant? Paul did (Gal. 1:12), but no one today has thus received it. This is only one illustration of the fact that no one today has received the Spirit and His miraculous gifts as did the apostles.

Third, the apostles were able to impart miraculous gifts to others through the laying on of hands—such power as to speak in tongues (Acts 19:6).

Fourth, the Spirit miraculously enabled the apostles to know some things concerning the future. The Spirit, Jesus said to them, "will show you things to come." (John 16:13). Paul predicted the falling away from the faith, and John, in the book of Revelation, revealed some things that would come to pass from the time of John until the end of the world, the judgment, and the eternal abode of the saints. Those today who claim to show to us things to come make so many mistakes that we know that they are not guided by the Holy Spirit.

Fifth, various other miraculous powers such as healing the sick (Acts 3); raising the dead (Acts 9:37-42); not being hurt by a deadly viper (Acts 28:3-6); in fact, there is no indication that they lacked any of the miraculous gifts which were mentioned in 1 Cor. 12 or Mark 16:17-18.

II. *The apostles only received miraculous gifts on Pentecost*

Christ gave commandments unto the apostles and he told them to wait for the promise of the Father and that they would be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence (Acts 1:2, 4, 5). The Holy Spirit was to give them the power which would enable them to be witnesses unto him (Acts 1:8). The promise was to the apostles.

This particular promise was to those chosen ones, the apostles, who were to be special witnesses for Christ. Around five hundred others had seen the Lord after His resurrection, but only the apostles were His special witnesses. This witnessing was a special work which involved more than having seen the Lord after His resurrection. That this was the case can be seen in the fact that although Justus and Matthias had both seen the resurrected Lord, only *one* of them was ordained to be a witness with the apostles of the resurrection of Christ (Acts 1:21-26). The Spirit was promised to the witnesses in order to qualify them for the work and the apostles only were the special witnesses (Acts 1:3, 8, 22, 25). This being true only the apostles were miraculously baptized in the Holy Spirit on that Pentecost. The apostles only were these witnesses (Acts 2:14,32, 37).

Acts 1:26 tells us that Matthias was "numbered with the eleven apostles." The very next verse, and we remind the reader that the Bible was not originally divided into chapters and verses, states that "when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place" (Acts 2:1). The last "they" that had been mentioned was the apostles.

All on whom the Spirit came were Galileans (Acts 2:7). The apostles were men of Galilee (Acts 1:11). It is hardly likely that the entire group of disciples, which included at least one hundred and twenty people (Acts 1:15), were Galileans. On the other hand, we do know that all of the

apostles were called Galileans (Acts 1:3, 11).

The total number of disciples contained some women (Acts 1:14). All of the apostles were men (Matt. 10:1; Acts 1:13). Some in the crowd mocked and said that "these *men* are full of new wine" (Acts 2:13). They had reference to those who spake in other tongues. Peter stood up with the eleven, the apostles, and denied that these were drunk (Acts 2:14, 15).

The ones who spake in tongues were the ones whom the people thought were drunk; the ones who were the witnesses; the ones with whom Peter stood; and they were the apostles (Acts 2:13, 14, 15 32, 37).

The apostles were told that they would receive the Spirit and that the Spirit was to convict sinners of sin, righteousness and judgment (John 13:1-; 16:7-). The Spirit convicted many in this audience. Those that were convicted were those who heard the word spoken by the apostles (Acts 2:14, 37, 38). Had the Spirit come on the others at that time, they also would have been used to convict men.

The audience thought that the apostles were the ones who could tell them what they had to do. Evidently they thought that the apostles were the *only* ones who could do it for they were convicted and wanted to know to do. They "said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 2:37-38). If the rest of the disciples had been baptized in the Holy Spirit, why were they not addressed by someone for instructions as to what to do?

Jesus had promised that the Spirit would guide the apostles into all truth (John 14:26; 16:7-13). The Spirit revealed the doctrine through the apostles and not through the one hundred and twenty disciples. Thus the doctrine

is characterized as the "apostles' doctrine" (Acts 2:42). If others had received then the miraculous baptism in the Spirit, they would have had a part in revealing the doctrine in which the people continued steadfastly. However, it was the "apostles' doctrine"; the doctrine revealed through them and not through others at this time.

This miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit enabled those who received it to work miracles. For some time after the establishment of the church there is no indication that any others than the apostles worked miracles. After Pentecost "many wonders and signs were done by the apostles" (Acts 2:43). Peter and John healed the lame man (Acts 3:1). "By the hands of the apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people" (Acts 5:12). This indicates that the apostles only were the ones who received the miraculous baptism of the Spirit on Pentecost.

At least two objections have been raised against the position that only the apostles were miraculously baptized in the Holy Spirit on this Pentecost. *First*, that the prophet Joel had pointed out that the Spirit would be poured out on women also (Acts 2:18). However, *all* of the events predicted by Joel were not fulfilled on that day. Some of its complete fulfillment did not take place until later. Gentile flesh, which was embraced in the all flash of Acts 2:17, did not receive the Spirit until the household of Cornelius (Acts 10:44). Philip's four daughters prophesied (Acts 21:9). These considerations enable us to see that although no woman was baptized in the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, since no apostle was a woman, that some women receive afterwards some gifts of the Spirit.

Second, it has been objected that since more than twelve languages were spoken on Pentecost (Acts 2:8-11), that more than twelve people, that is, more than the apostles, must have received the baptism. However, this does not necessarily follow unless it can be proved that each apostle

spoke in only one language. Doubtless they spoke in one language for awhile and in another for awhile. Otherwise, it would not have looked much like a miracle for if each spoke only one language there would be nothing very amazing about that. However, if each spoke in many different languages, at different intervals, that would be and was amazing. Some have suggested that what took place was a miracle of hearing; that is, that the apostles' spoke in only one language but that each nationality heard his own language. But the Bible makes it a miracle of speaking and not of hearing. The apostles *spoke in other tongues*. (Acts 2:4).

IV. *Pentecost cannot be repeated*

The following considerations prove that Pentecost was unique in that it need not, and cannot, be repeated. *First*, it was the fulfillment of the Father's promise to the Lord Jesus Christ, "Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." (Acts 2:33). This promise of God to Christ has already been fulfilled and to ask for another "Pentecost" is to act as if God had not fulfilled His promise to Christ. When a promise has been fulfilled there is no need or occasion for a repetition of it. Pentecost, and what took place thereon, marked the definite fulfillment of this promise.

Second, it marked the announcement of the exaltation and coronation of the Lord Jesus Christ. Peter said, of David, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before *spake of the resurrection of Christ* This Jesus hath God raised up . . . being by the right hand of God exalted Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath

made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." (Acts 2:30-36). Christ does not need to be re-exalted and placed anew at the right hand of God each generation. He has held that exalted position since He first sat down at the right hand of God. In order for Pentecost to be repeated we would have to have another resurrection of Christ, for, as the passages just quoted show, He was raised to sit on the throne. At the time that this took place we would expect some unusual things which would be unique to that event and which would not need to be repeated. To try to have another "Pentecost" is simply to say that Christ was not sufficiently raised and exalted and that He needs to be raised from the dead and exalted again today.

Third, the kingdom came on that day and it came with power. During his personal ministry Jesus said: "Verily I say unto you, That there be some of them that stand here, which shall not taste of death, till they have seen the kingdom of God come with power." (Mark 9:1). They were later told to "tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." (Lk. 24:49). Just before His ascension He said to the apostles, "ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you:" (Acts 1:8). This promise was fulfilled on Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). The kingdom was to come with power and they were to tarry in Jerusalem until the Spirit came at which time they would receive power. So the kingdom came when the power came and the power came when the Spirit came, and that took place on Pentecost. So for one today to ask for a repetition of Pentecost would be an implication that the kingdom had not already come with power; or that it needed to be re-established, to come again. It does not need to come again for it came once for all and it was not to be moved (Heb. 12:28).

Fourth, there are some, such as W. Hoste from whom we

have drawn some material, who believe that the scene in Acts 2 was "the antitype of the Jewish feast of Pentecost or weeks." (*The Coming of the Comforter*, p. 9).

Fifth, it was the fulfillment of prophecy. Peter quoted the prophecy of Joel and said, just before quoting it, "*this is that* which was spoken by the prophet Joel" (Acts 2:16). Everything that Joel spoke was not fulfilled in that one day, but what took place on Pentecost was what Joel prophesied would take place. We do not need, and shall not receive, another fulfillment of that which has already been fulfilled.

Sixth, it marked the fulfillment of the promise of the Lord to His apostles that they would receive the Spirit and be guided into all truth (John 14:26; 16:7-13; Acts 1:5). The work of guiding them into all truth, the work of bringing to their remembrance what Jesus had taught them, *began* on that time and was completed when the last inspired word was revealed through them and penned by them in the New Testament books. Sometime after Pentecost evidently there were other individuals inspired, in addition to the apostles.

V. *The case of Cornelius*

Cornelius was a sincere, honest, devout, and religious man but he was lost so long as he did not obey the gospel of Christ. He was instructed to send for Peter who would tell him words whereby he and his household could be saved (Acts 10:1-; 11:14). Peter came and started preaching to him and as he spake the Spirit fell on the audience. This differed some from the case of the apostles (Acts 2) for on Pentecost the Spirit came on the preachers; but here on the audience. Cornelius was not praying for the Spirit, nor did he expect what took place. He did not expect it for Peter did not tell Cornelius to pray for the Spirit. Peter himself did not expect such a manifestation, nor did the Jews who were with them, for "they of the circumcision

which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 10:45). It is thus evident that no one expected such a demonstration. The Spirit was not given here through the laying on of the apostles' hands. We do not know exactly how much Cornelius knew and believed at the time that the Spirit came upon him. Peter, when reporting to the church in Jerusalem, rehearsed the matter from the beginning "and expounded it *by order* unto them," (Acts 11:5). And he said that "*As I began to speak*, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning." (Acts 11:15).

(I) *What the Spirit did not come to do*

If modern healers were guided by the Holy Spirit they would teach what the Holy Spirit teaches with reference to the purpose of the coming of the Spirit on the household of Cornelius. They do not. In teaching—as various groups do—that one, or more, of the following is the reason that the Spirit came on Cornelius, they reveal that they are not guided by the Spirit.

(1) *The Spirit did not come on them to save them*

The angel told Cornelius to send for Peter "who shall tell thee *words*, whereby thou and all thy house shall be *saved*." (Acts 11:14).

Peter said, later, "But we believe that through the *grace* of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they." (Acts 15:11). Peter was talking about what had taken place at the household of Cornelius. Thus we must conclude that they were saved by words in that through words the grace of God was set before them and they were instructed as to what they must do to be saved.

(2) *The Spirit did not come on them to give them faith*

Faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17). And that this was true in Cornelius' case is clear from what

Peter said about it. "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles *by my mouth* should hear the word of the gospel, and *believe.*" (Acts 15:7).

(3) *The Spirit did not come to purify their hearts*

God "put no difference between us and them, *purifying their hearts by faith.*" (Acts 15:9).

Anyone, who teaches that the Spirit came on them in a miraculous manner to do any of the above things, is surely misled and evidently not guided by the same Spirit who wrote the Bible. Let us now turn to the question as to why the Spirit came on Cornelius.

(II) *Why the Spirit came on Cornelius*

Modern groups such as the "Holiness" appeal to the case of the household of Cornelius, and the coming of the Spirit, to maintain that we today must be baptized miraculously in the Holy Spirit. The question arises, therefore, as to whether or not the apostles *used* the case of Cornelius *to prove* that others should receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and whether or not they *taught* that his receiving the Spirit was an example to others that they should receive the Spirit.

(1) *How did the apostles use the case of the miraculous baptism of Cornelius in the Spirit?*

Did they use it to prove that others should be miraculously baptized in the Spirit? Modern "Holiness" so use it. If the apostles did not so use it the "Holiness" are in error, and thereby prove that they do not have the baptism of the Spirit. The apostles used the case of Cornelius not to prove that others should be baptized in the Spirit, but that the Gentiles should be received into the church without going through Judaism or becoming entangled therein. They used it to prove that the Gentiles were as acceptable to God

as the Jews, and upon the same basis—obedience to the gospel. Let us cite three examples where Peter, who was there when the Spirit fell on Cornelius, used the case to prove that the Gentiles should be baptized and that they were as acceptable to God as were the Jews.

First, Peter took certain Jews with him to the house of Cornelius (Acts 10:23). Peter did this because he knew that since it was considered unlawful for Jews to associate with Gentiles (Acts 10:27, 28), that the Jewish brethren in Jerusalem would call him to task (as they actually did, Acts 11:1). Thus Jewish brethren went with him (Acts 11:12). When the Spirit fell on all who heard the word, "they of the circumcision (the Jews, J. D. B.), who believed were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit." (Acts 10:44-45). They did not think that the Gentiles were to be accepted, as readily and on the same basis as the Jews, by the Lord. So they were amazed when God showed His approval of the preaching to the Gentiles by pouring out His Spirit. Peter used the baptism of the Spirit to show them that they must not refuse water baptism to the Gentiles. "Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid the water, that those should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we?" (Acts 10:46-47). Certainly not, for to do so would have been to reject God's will in the matter which had been made plain by His baptizing the household of Cornelius in the Spirit. So here we see how Peter used the baptism of Cornelius in the Spirit. He did not use it to prove that others should be baptized into the Spirit, but that the Gentiles (toward whom the Jewish Christians did not have the proper attitude) were as much the object of the great commission (Matt. 28:18-20), as were the Jews and therefore they were to be baptized.

Second, Peter was called to task when he got back to Jerusalem and those "that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest into men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them. But Peter began, and expounded the matter unto them in order, saying . . ." (Acts 11:2-4). He told of his visions, of taking brethren with him, and then he said: "As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning. And I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit. *If then* God gave unto them the like gift as he did also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God?" (Acts 11:15-17). Peter used it to prove to them that it was right to teach and to baptize the Gentiles, and not to prove that other men had to receive the baptism of the Holy Spirit. And his argument, based on the fact that the Gentiles had been baptized in the Spirit, convinced the brethren not that all should be baptized in the Spirit, but that the Gentiles were to receive the gospel. "And when they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then to the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life." (Acts 11:18).

Third, later certain Jewish brethren contended that unless Gentiles were circumcized and kept the law of Moses they could not be saved (Acts 15:1, 5). To refute them an argument was presented from the case of the Spirit coming on Cornelius. "Peter rose up, and said unto them. Brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And *God*, who knoweth the heart, *bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, even* as he did unto us; and *he made no distinction* between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith. Now therefore why try ye God, that ye should put

a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." (Acts 15:7-11). This is another clear example where Peter used the case of Cornelius to prove that the Gentiles were to receive the gospel and that they did not have to keep the law of Moses in order to be saved. This was evident because God had sent the Spirit on the household of Cornelius to prove that no man should forbid that the gospel should be preached to Gentiles and that they should be baptized. Never, no not once, did any inspired writer use the case of Cornelius to prove that others should receive the baptism of the Spirit; instead they used it to prove that the Gentiles were to receive the gospel. Therefore, those today who use the baptism of the household of Cornelius in the Spirit to prove that others should be baptized in the Spirit do not use the case as did apostles who were guided by the Spirit. Therefore, they are not guided by the same Spirit who guided the apostles.

The express teaching of the apostles shows that the miraculous baptism of the household of Cornelius in the Spirit was not to serve as an example to show that others were to receive the baptism of the Spirit but to show that the Gentiles were to receive the gospel and be baptized in water. He hold the brethren in Jerusalem "If then God gave unto them the like gift as he did unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I, that I could withstand God?" (Acts 11:17). Since the Gentiles had received the Spirit it was evident they were as acceptable as the Jews. Peter later referred to the baptism of the Spirit as God bearing the Gentiles witness that they too were to be accepted. "And God, who knoweth the heart, *bear them witness*, (notice how God did it, J. D. B.) *giving them the Holy Spirit*, even as he did unto us; and he made no

distinction between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith." (Acts 15:8-9).

Thus it is evident from the teaching of the apostles and the use that they made of the case of Cornelius, that the baptism of his household was to prove to the Jewish Christians that the Gentiles were to be accepted and that they did not have to obey the law of Moses to be saved. It is also evident that the "Holiness" today who use this case to prove something different are not using it scripturally for they do not use it as did the apostles. Therefore, they are not guided by the same Spirit who guided the apostles.

The case of Cornelius was very unusual for in no other instance do we find people receiving the Holy Spirit or the gift of tongues *before their water baptism*. In Acts 2 the apostles received the Spirit and tongues. In Acts 2:38 the people were promised the gift of the Spirit if they repented and were baptized. In Acts 8:15 some received the Spirit after baptism through the laying on of the apostles' hands. The people in Acts 19:6 did not receive the gift of tongues until after their baptism when Paul laid hands on them. There is no record of any people, other than those in Acts 10, receiving the Spirit before baptism. When Peter saw what had taken place he knew that it was right to baptize the Gentiles into Christ (Acts 10:47-48; Matt. 28:19; Gal. 3:27; 1 Pet. 3:21). We conclude that Cornelius' case was an unusual one for a specific purpose, i.e., to convince the Jews of God's will concerning the Gentiles. It served its purpose, for all times, and thus a repetition of it is unnecessary. All who believe in God's word know His will toward both Jew and Gentile. No additional revelation is necessary for us today.

No people today can produce an experience similar to the case of Cornelius. Notice: *First*, some claim to receive the Spirit after they are baptized into Christ. Cornelius received it before he was baptized into Christ (Acts

10:47-48; Gal. 3:27).

Second, people today have generally been told by preachers to seek, to pray for and to expect the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit. Peter did not tell that to Cornelius.

Third, people today are usually praying for and expecting the Spirit. Cornelius was not.

Fourth, some claim that the Spirit was sent to them to save them. They thus show that they do not have the Spirit for if they did they would know that the Spirit was sent to Cornelius to convince the Jews and that Cornelius heard words whereby he was saved (Acts 11:14).

Fifth, Cornelius' case was accompanied by a series of visions and miracles which resulted in the bringing of a gospel preacher. People today generally already know about Christ and they do not have a similar vision which instructs them to send for a gospel preacher (Acts 10:3-6, 99-18, 19). Cornelius was not a believer in Christ when he had the visions.

Sixth, people today get what they think is the baptism of the Spirit after long periods of preaching and expectation, as a rule, but Cornelius received the Spirit as Peter began to speak (Acts 11:15).

Seventh, the experience in Cornelius' house was to convince the Jews of the acceptability of the Gentiles (Acts 11:1-18; 10:45). No such need exists today. All who want to know God's will on this subject can learn it from studying the case of Cornelius. There is *no need* for such an experience today and there is *no example* of such an experience today.

In conclusion, let us notice that some people say that they do not need water baptism because they have the baptism of the Holy Spirit. This proves that they do not have the baptism of the Holy Spirit for if they did they would know that they needed water baptism; that is, when the water baptism is preceded by faith and repentance.

Peter took the baptism of the Spirit as a sign that Cornelius should receive water baptism (Acts 10:47), while some people who think that they received the baptism of the Spirit, although they have not, take it as a sign that they do not need water baptism. Let us follow the word of God and not the feelings of man and the dictates of man's traditions.

VI. *Gifts given through the laying on of the apostles' hands*

There were gifts of the Spirit which differed from the ones on Pentecost, and from the indwelling promised to all Christians (Acts 2:38; 5:32). This type was given through the laying on of the apostles hands and through their hands only. This being true, when the last apostle died God closed the avenue through which this gift was given. Its purpose having been fulfilled it was no longer given to men. Since there were only two cases of the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, and since when the last person on whom the apostles laid hands had died there were no more manifestations of this second type of miraculous gift, we must conclude that the days of inspiration, revelation and miraculous confirmation have ceased. The power to confer gifts through the laying on of their hands was confined to the apostles and was one of the signs of an apostle. When the last apostle died, when all truth had been delivered and the word confirmed, the signs of an apostle of Christ were done away with for there were then no living apostles left. If the measure given through their hands is given today we must have living apostles of Christ. And to have living apostles of Christ in each generation we must have a re-enactment of the life, death, resurrection and ascension of Christ, and a re-establishment of the church, in each generation.

Miraculous powers were conferred through the laying on of the apostles' hands. There is no mention of any one, other than the apostles, working miracles until after the

apostles laid hands on the seven (Acts 2:43; 5:12). However, right after they laid hands on the seven miracles were worked by these very men (Acts 6:6, 8; 8-13). Since we do know that miraculous gifts were imparted by the laying on of the apostles' hands; since no one is mentioned as working miracles before they laid on hands; and since they worked miracles immediately after hands were laid on them; it is my conclusion that we have an example of the apostles conferring the power to work miracles. These seven men, however, had the Spirit *before* the apostles laid hands on them (Acts 6:3).

Philip, one of those on whom the apostles had laid their hands, worked miracles in Samaria (Acts 8:6, 13). He baptized believers (Acts 8:12, 13, 16). These believers received the gift of the Spirit when they were baptized for believers, who repented and were baptized, were promised the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Since both were promised on the same condition it is evident that if they received the remission of sins they also received the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:38; 5:32). There was, however, a gift of the Spirit which was not predicated on baptism and which could not be given except through the laying on of the apostles' hands. The Spirit had not fallen upon any of them (Acts 8:16). Philip could work miracles but he could not lay hands on them that the Spirit might fall on them. Philip had certain gifts of the Spirit, but he did not have the gift that the apostles had which enabled them to impart the Spirit through the laying on of hands. The apostles only could do this so two of them went to Samaria and laid hands on the people (Acts 8:14-18). There must have been some visible manifestation for Simon *saw* that through the laying on of the *apostles'* hands the Holy Spirit was given (Acts 8:18). We do know that audible manifestations did accompany the laying on of the hands of

an apostle when it was done to impart the Spirit (Acts 19:6).

The gift of the Spirit which was imparted through the laying on of the apostles' hands was *not* necessary to salvation. However, it is necessary for all Christians to have the gift of the Spirit promised in Acts 2:38 (Rom. 8:9; 1 Cor. 6:19-20). The gift which Philip could not impart, but which the apostles could, was not the gift promised to all Christians. Why? *First*, the Samaritans became Christians when they were baptized into Christ. They were saved for God had forgiven their sins (Acts 2:38). But they did not have the gift which the apostles gave them later. They were saved without it so it was not essential to being a Christian.

Second, the same Philip later baptized the eunuch (Acts 8:36). There was no apostle there and no apostle was sent to the eunuch to lay hands on him. The eunuch was saved, however, for he was baptized into Christ and went on his way rejoicing (Acts 8:39). If it had been necessary for the apostles to lay hands on him, to impart the Spirit, in order for him to be saved he had no reason to go on his way rejoicing for the apostles did not lay hands on him.

VII. *Those on Whom Paul Laid Hands*

Paul had the power to impart spiritual gifts (Rom. 1:11). However, his statement that he wanted to see the brethren in Rome that he could impart unto them some spiritual gift, indicated that he had to be present to impart such gifts. Since the apostles did impart spiritual gifts through the laying on of hands, and since Paul had to see them in order to impart spiritual gifts, it must be that Paul had reference to imparting gifts through the laying on of his hands. There were some in Rome who had spiritual gifts, but evidently they could not impart them to others or else why should Paul long to do it that

they might be established? (Rom. 12:6; 1:11). Paul imparted a gift to Timothy through the laying on of hands (2 Tim. 1:6).

Paul laid hands on twelve men in Ephesus and imparted to them a gift of the Spirit which enabled them to speak in tongues (Acts 19:1-6). These individuals had been baptized but their baptism was not valid. When they told Paul that they had not even heard of the Holy Spirit he knew that they had not received the proper baptism. Several points are evident from an examination of this incident. *First*, if they had been baptized in obedience to the great commission they would have known of the Holy Spirit for the believer was baptized into the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit and the gift of the Spirit was promised to such a one (Matt. 28:19; Acts 2:38).

Second, John's baptism had been superseded by the baptism which Christ commanded in Mark 16:16. The fact that Paul baptized these people who had previously received the baptism of John, indicates that whatever validity John's baptism had had, at times past during John's ministry, that it was no longer valid. There are people who believe that John established the church of Christ. That is not true for Jesus said that He would build His church (Matt. 16:16). All people who claim to have received John's baptism today need to be baptized scripturally and come, in that manner, into the Lord's church instead of staying in a church which they claim that John the Baptist established. John himself made no such claim and he said that he must decrease and Christ must increase. So if you have only what you call John's baptism, seek out a gospel preacher and be baptized in obedience to Christ's commandment.

Third, water baptism was administered to these men.

It was not Holy Spirit baptism for they did not receive the Spirit until after their baptism.

Fourth, water baptism itself did not result in the reception of the gift of the Spirit which enabled them to speak in tongues and prophesy. This is evident from the fact that they received the Spirit, in this miraculous gift, *after* Paul laid hands on them and not immediately after and as a result of baptism.

Fifth, this measure of the Spirit was given through the laying on of Paul's hands and Paul was an apostle.

Sixth, this particular gift of the Spirit immediately followed the laying on of Paul's hands (Acts 19:6). There was no long period of seeking, waiting, praying. Those who claim this case as an example for us to receive the Spirit today should claim that an apostle of Christ laid hands on them and that they received this measure of the Spirit immediately after this was done. If they say that they can lay on hands, but cannot guarantee immediate results because they are not apostles; we wonder why they claim to be able to get any results in this way since they are not apostles. If they can impart the Spirit through the laying on of hands they should be able to do it immediately and without failure. There is no case in the New Testament where any apostle failed to give a gift of the Spirit when they laid hands on people for that purpose.

Seventh, the proof that they received a miraculous gift was evident in the fact that they spake with other tongues and prophesied. The tongues in which they spake were languages which were spoken by some races. This will be clearly established in our chapter on tongues. No person can claim that this case is an example for us unless: *First*, they receive the Spirit after water baptism; *second*, immediately after hands were laid on them; *third*, the hands must be laid on them by an apostle of Christ; and

fourth, they must speak in foreign languages, which they have not learned, and prophesy after the hands of an apostle have been laid on them.

We are unable to determine with absolute certainty why Paul laid hands on these individuals and gave them the gifts of tongues and of prophecy. Two possible reasons suggest themselves. At least, this case did do two things: *First*, it definitely proved that John's baptism was no longer valid and that those who had received that baptism after it was invalid had to be baptized in obedience to the command of Christ. *Second*, these two gifts enabled these twelve men to teach by inspiration and thus they could help instruct others even when no inspired apostle was around.

VIII. *Exceptions?*

It has been maintained that there are two cases which show that others than the apostles imparted miraculous gifts through the laying on of hands. *First*, the case of Ananias and Saul. Ananias told Saul that he had been sent that he, Saul, might receive his sight and be filled with the Spirit (Acts 9:7). Did Ananias lay hands on Saul that he might be filled with the Holy Spirit? The following indicates that it was not for that purpose. (1) Jesus told Ananias that Saul "hath seen in a vision a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him, *that he might receive his sight.*" (Acts 9:12). Saul saw in a vision that which later took place in fact, and what he saw in a vision, with reference to the laying on of hands, was that Ananias laid hands on him that he might receive his sight. This was the purpose of the laying on of hands in this case and this being true it was not to impart some miraculous gift of the Spirit to Saul. (2) If Ananias, who is characterized simply as a certain disciple (Acts 9:10), could impart the Spirit through the laying on of hands it is very strange that Philip could not do it al-

though he was one of the seven, an evangelist, and able to perform miracles. Philip could not impart the Spirit by the laying on of hands to the Samaritans but, according to some, Ananias could do it with reference to one who was called to be an apostle. (3) If Ananias gave Saul the Spirit, through the laying on of his hands, Saul received the Spirit before he was baptized into Christ (Acts 9:17). The Samaritans had received the miraculous gift *after* their baptism and *after* two apostles laid hands on them. Saul did not receive the Spirit before his baptism. Cornelius did, it is true, but we have shown the special need that existed in his case; which need did not exist in the case of Saul. (4) Saul elsewhere claims that he was not a whit behind the very chiefest of apostles (2 Cor. 11:5). He would have been somewhat behind them if he had received the Spirit through the laying on of the hands of a disciple who was not even an apostle. The other apostles had received the miraculous baptism of the Spirit; they had received it directly from heaven and not through the laying on of hands. If Paul was not a whit behind them, he, too, was thus baptized in the Holy Spirit. The miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, we remind you, was not administered by man or through man but directly from the Lord Himself. (5) The record does not say that Saul received the Spirit as soon as Ananias laid hands on him although it does say that he immediately received sight (Acts 9:18). (6) In what way did Saul's reception of the Holy Spirit depend on the coming of Ananias if the Spirit was not given to Saul through the laying on of Ananias' hands? Three things depended on the coming of Ananias. (a) Saul's receiving his sight. (b) The baptism of Saul. (c) Saul's reception of the Spirit. However, all of these things did not take place at the same moment, nor did they all take place as a result of the laying on of Ananias' hands although they were all predicated

on the coming of Ananias. Saul was not a Christian until he was baptized into Christ (Gal. 3:27; Acts 22:16). Therefore, it would be very difficult to assume that Saul was given the Spirit through Ananias' hands before he was in Christ. There is no case in the Bible where anyone was given the Spirit through the laying on of hands before their baptism. Cornelius' case was not one in which the Spirit was given by the laying on of hands. It was directly from heaven without a human mediator. However, since Saul's reception of the indwelling of the Spirit (Acts 2:38) and his miraculous baptism of the Spirit depended on his being baptized into Christ and being a Christian; and since Saul's baptism depended on the coming of Ananias; well could Ananias say that the Lord had sent him that Saul might see and receive the Spirit. He could have added also, what his actions tell us, that he was sent that Saul might be baptized (Acts 22:16).

Second, did Timothy receive a miraculous gift through the laying on of the hands of the elders who were not apostles? Paul told Timothy to "neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." (1 Tim. 4:14). It has been suggested that some of the presbyters or elders may have been apostles also for Peter, an apostle, was also an elder (1 Pet. 5:1). Paul elsewhere affirmed that he conferred a spiritual gift on Timothy. "Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." (2 Tim. 1:6). The Greek term "with" in 1 Tim. 4:14 "implies that the *presbyter's* laying on hands was the mere *accompaniment* of the conferring of the gift. 'By' (2 Tim. 1:6) implies that *Paul's* laying on his hands was the actual *instrument* of its being conferred." The elders had taken part in the ceremony in which the gift had been conferred by the laying on of Paul's hands (*Jamieson-Fausset-Brown*)

Commentary on 1 Tim. 4:14). Paul did the principle act but the elders showed their concurrence and the laying on of Paul's hands, which conferred the gift, was accompanied by the laying on of the elders' hands. Hands were laid on individuals for other purposes than the giving of gifts, and the elders showed their approval, of Timothy's appointment as an evangelist, by laying hands on Timothy. James MacKnight translates 1 Tim. 4:14 in this way: "Neglect not the spiritual gift which is in thee, which was given thee according to prophecy, together with the imposition of the hands of the eldership."

Since the record indicates that the apostles only had the power to impart the Spirit through the laying on of hands; since there is no record of where one on whom they laid hands was able to impart the gifts to others; and since no one today has the miraculous baptism of the Spirit; it is evident that when the last apostle died and when the last person on whom they laid hands died that miracles ceased. Thus miraculous gifts may have extended even into the second century, since the apostle John lived until about the close of the first century, but no further.

However, if it could be proven that we are wrong in the position concerning the imparting of gifts by the laying on of hands; it still could not be proved that miracles are to be performed by Christians today as they were performed by certain Christians in the first century. Our present argument is only *one* in a series of arguments concerning the question of miracles. Thus if this one argument was shown to be wrong, the entire position on miracles would not thereby be shown to be wrong. It would only prove that an argument which we thought supported the position did not support it although many other arguments do support it.

IX. *The Special Manifestations of the Spirit in Acts Were Unique*

The Spirit was to guide the apostles into all truth (John 16:7-13) and they were to preach the gospel to all nations, not just to the Jews (Matt. 28:19). Under the power given to them by the Spirit (Acts 1:5, 8), they were to proclaim and confirm the great salvation (Heb. 2:3-4). The special manifestations of the Spirit in *Acts* are connected with this work. (1) On Pentecost it enabled them to preach to the Jews the message of the risen, and ascended, Christ, and to baptize them into Christ (Acts 2:37-38). (2) In Acts 8:14-18 we find that Philip had baptized Samaritans. Jews were prejudiced against the Samaritans (John 4:9), but when the apostles laid hands on the Samaritans and they received the Spirit in miraculous manifestations, all could see that God and the apostles approved preaching to and baptizing Samaritans, the same as Jews. (3) In the case of the household of Cornelius, who was a Gentile, the prejudice of the Jews (Acts 10:28, 29, 34, 45-47; 11:3, 15-18; 15:8-9) against the reception of the Gentiles, on the same basis as the Jews, was removed by the testimony of the Holy Spirit to this work that was done by an apostle. (4) In Acts 19 we find that the Spirit demonstrated His approval of the action of the apostle Paul in baptizing disciples of John. These four cases clearly demonstrate, for all times, that the gospel is for all. We know it by the command given in the great commission and by the examples approved by the Holy Spirit. We do not need a repetition of these cases because we do not need another demonstration that the gospel is for all any more than we need another great commission. These cases settle the matter and one who will not believe from these cases that the gospel is for all would not believe on any additional evidence. It is clearly established for all times.

The uniqueness of these events is borne out in the fact

that even the "Pentecostals" who claim these as authority for seeking such manifestations of the Spirit today, *do not* and *cannot* follow these examples. This becomes clear through presenting the characteristics of each case.

(1) Pentecost. There are none today who were told to wait in Jerusalem for the Spirit (Acts 1:5, 8; Lk. 24:49). The church of the New Testament was established then for it was then that the new covenant first began to be proclaimed as being in force; there is no need or possibility of its being established anew today. It was founded once and for all, although we may help establish local congregations within the kingdom that was then established. There can be no repetition of this for there can be no repetition of the ascension of Christ and of His sending the Spirit, as He promised, to those who were with Him in His personal ministry (Acts 1:5, 8; 2:33). It was without human intervention. The "Pentecostals" have no sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind; no tongues like as of fire; no speaking in languages that people of many nations understand; and no apostles who were eyewitnesses to the facts of the gospel (Acts 2:1-14; 1:21-22). Since they have none of these things it is evident that the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost is not and cannot be a model for people today to receive such manifestations of the Spirit. (2) The manifestations of the Spirit granted to the believers in Samaria cannot be a model for us today for we already know from this case that God, the Spirit and the apostles approve taking the gospel to the Samaritans. This case demonstrates it to us as it did to them. Furthermore, there are no apostles of Christ for whom we may send today to lay hands on people (Acts 8:14, 17). (3) In the case of Cornelius we do not have the attitude toward the Gentiles that the Jews then had; and even if we had such an attitude this case, recorded in the Bible, would be enough to remove it for all who sin-

cerely study God's word. We have no apostles to receive a vision to go to such a household. Then, too, if this was a model for us today to seek such manifestations of the Spirit it would come on the audience as we begin to speak to them (Acts 10:44; 11:15); without our mentioning such manifestations of the Spirit to the audience; without their knowing anything about it; without their requesting it in any way whatsoever; it was without human intervention such as praying for it to come on the audience or laying hands on the audience; it was without the expectation of, and to the surprise of, those who went with Peter (Acts 10:45); it was to show that the Gentiles were to be baptized (Acts 10:47; 15:8-9); and it was before they were baptized. So if this is the model one must wait until he receives the Spirit, without seeking for it or knowing about it, before he can be baptized. This would indeed be a reversal of the Pentecostal teaching that baptism with water must come first, in general at least. (4) We cannot use Acts 19 as a model as to how one is to receive miraculous manifestations of the Spirit since we do not have living apostles, as was Paul, and we have none today "who have been baptized with the baptism of John."

In every case of these striking manifestations of the Spirit as in these four cases, "the record in Acts is dealing with something that could only come in that period of the church, and cannot be the model of that which is to continue as the normal experience." (Robert C. McQuilkin, *The Baptism of the Spirit: Shall We Seek It?*, pp. 17-19).

X. *The Spirit Given to Every Christian*

It is evident that every believer did not receive the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit. They did not all receive the gifts given by the laying on of the apostles' hands for the eunuch had no apostle to lay hands on him (Acts 8:14, 38).

(1) *The Spirit is promised to all those who are baptized into Christ.*

The promise of one gift of the Spirit is as extensive as the promise of remission of sins. Both were, and both are, promised on the same conditions. All who believe, repent and are baptized into Christ receive the gift of the Holy Spirit and the remission of sins (Acts 2:38; Gal. 3:27). The Holy Spirit through Peter said so, and the person who contradicts it has received a spirit which differs from that Spirit who guided Peter. God gives the Spirit to all who obey Him (Acts 5:32). The baptism to which Peter referred was not baptism in the Holy Spirit but the water baptism commanded by the great commission (Matt. 28:19). If it has reference to Holy Spirit baptism, what was the gift of the Holy Spirit which was promised to the baptized? It was something distinct from their baptism. Holy Spirit baptism was a promise, not a command.

The Spirit gave various gifts unto men (Eph. 4:8; 1 Cor. 12:4). However, the people on Pentecost were not promised a gift, or diversities of gifts as some Christians later received, but *the* gift of the Spirit. *What gift of the Spirit has been promised to all Christians?* Was it some miraculous gift? No. *First*, all the baptized believers on Pentecost were promised the same thing, the gift of the Spirit. They were not promised *different* gifts. However, with reference to miraculous gifts, all Christians did not necessarily receive the same miraculous gifts. Paul said, "Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? Have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" (1 Cor. 12:29-30). The answer is, No. Since all Christians in Acts 2:38 were promised the same gift of the Spirit; since Christians did not receive the same miraculous gifts; it is evident that the gift promised to all in Acts 2:38 could not be a miraculous gift for all did not receive the same miraculous gift. If

the miraculous baptism was promised in Acts 2:38, all would have had the gift of tongues for this miraculous baptism was always accompanied by the gift of tongues. However, since all did not have the gift of tongues, all were not promised the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Second, baptism of the Holy Spirit was accompanied with miraculous manifestations but there is no record of any Christians, other than the apostles, working miracles before hands were laid on the seven a good while later (Acts 2:43; 5:12; 6:6, 8). If Acts 2:38 referred to the miraculous gifts all Christians would have been able to work miracles.

Third, even some people today who claim that all should, or must, have the baptism of the Holy Spirit do not always claim that all can speak in tongues or work miracles. However, those who had the miraculous baptism could speak in tongues and work miracles. (Acts 2:1-4, 43). If all must have this baptism of the Spirit, and if Acts 2:38 promises it, then all who cannot speak with tongues or work miracles are not Christians.

Fourth, the gift promised to all those in Acts 2:38 was promised on repentance and baptism and not on that *plus* the laying on of hands. The *two conditions* were that those believers, who asked what to do, were to repent and be baptized. Thus when they met those conditions God forgave them and gave them the Spirit. If He did not give them the Spirit on those conditions, when they met the conditions, He did not forgive them when they met those conditions. All baptized believers did not have the hands of the apostles laid on them (Acts 8:38), but all did have the promise of Acts 2:38. Therefore, since the promise of Acts 2:38 is to all it could not have reference to the gifts given through the laying on of the apostles' hands for they were not laid on all.

Fifth, since all believers received the gift of the Spirit which was granted to all alike; and since all believers had the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (1 Cor. 6:19-20; Gal. 5:22; Rom. 8:9, 11); the promise in Acts 2:38 must be the promise of the Spirit as a gift in that He dwells in us. This indwelling of the Spirit is not accompanied by miraculous manifestations, but by moral characteristics (Gal. 5:22).

Does Acts 10:45 and 11:15, 16 indicate that the gift in Acts 2:38 is the miraculous baptism since in Acts 11:15, 16 it is referred to as "the gift" and the "like gift"? *First*, we have shown already that the miraculous baptism was given to a few only and that the gift in Acts 2:38 was promised to all. Therefore, they cannot be the same.

Second, Peter's statement in Acts 11:15 indicates that nothing like that which had taken place at Cornelius' household had happened since the beginning, since Pentecost. However, if the miraculous baptism of the Spirit was promised to all it would have happened every time a person became a Christian. Thus Peter would not have had to go back to the beginning for a similar case. Therefore, it cannot be the same as the gift promised in Acts 2:38.

Third, the gift in Acts 2:38 was promised to the baptized believer; but the manifestation at Cornelius' house was received before his baptism (Acts 2:38; 10:44).

Fourth, the same word in a *different context* may refer to different things. The term prayer in Acts 10:2, 3 and 10:48 differs with reference to the object of prayer. In 10:2, 3 it refers to a request addressed to God and in 10:48 it was a request made of a man. 1 Cor. 12:4 reveals that the gifts of the Spirit were not always the same. Thus even during the days of miracles a distinction was made between the Spirit as a gift, in His indwelling presence,

and the gifts given by the Spirit, such as those in Eph. 4:8; 1 Cor. 12:4.

(2) *How does the Spirit dwell in us?*

Even if a person did not know all of the details as to how the Spirit dwells in all Christians, that would not keep the Spirit from dwelling in Christians. Does anyone know *exactly* how their own spirit dwells in them? Does their spirit fail to dwell in them because they cannot explain exactly how it is done? Christ dwells in us through faith (Eph. 3:17). The Spirit is also the Spirit of Christ (1 Pet. 1:10-11). Therefore, it is my belief that the Spirit dwells in us through faith.

(3) *How do we know that the Spirit dwells in us?*

First, through faith in God. We know that He has promised the Spirit to all Christians; we know that we have been baptized into Christ; and therefore we know that God has been faithful to His promise to give the Spirit to Christians (Acts 2:38; 5:32; 1 Cor. 6:18-20; Rom. 8:9). God does His part and fulfills His promises when we meet His conditions. For us to deny or to doubt that all Christians have received the Spirit, is for us to deny or doubt God and His word. I believe that the Spirit dwells in me on the same basis that I believe that God forgave my past sins when I was baptized into Christ. The evidence is the word of God, and my obedience to that word when He required faith, repentance, and baptism. I have faith in God's faithfulness to His promise. I do not base my faith on feelings, for feelings are often deceiving, but on the word of God.

Second, the presence of the Spirit, in the gift promised to all Christians, is revealed by the actions of the Christian. How do we know whether or not a person's spirit dwells in him? By his actions, by his manifestations of the signs of life (compare Jas. 2:26). The sinner follows the leading of the Spirit, the directions of the Spirit, when

he follows the word of the Spirit and believes, repents and is baptized into Christ. God then gives him the Spirit. The presence of the Spirit is manifested in love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance (Gal. 5:22-23). It is true, however, that individuals may produce in different degrees the fruits of the Spirit according to their level of spiritual maturity. The parable of the sower also indicates that men bear fruit in different degrees (Lk. 8:11). However, if a person refuses to try to heed the word of the Spirit and to produce the fruits of the Spirit he lacks the indwelling of the Spirit.

Chapter XIV

A MORE EXCELLENT WAY

(1 Cor. 13)

The different arguments, concerning the duration of spiritual gifts, each add their strength to the strength of the general position. One particular argument, however, may be shown to be wrong without the main position being overthrown. For example, if the argument which is made on 1 Cor. 13 were fallacious it would not do away with the position, advanced in this book and supported by other arguments, concerning the duration of spiritual gifts. It would simply mean that *one* of the arguments was unfounded. The author is convinced, however, that the argument on this passage will stand. Although what we present may have some difficulties for some readers it clearly does not have the difficulties which beset the explanation that in 1 Cor. 13 Paul is speaking of the state of the church on earth in contrast with the state of the church in heaven in eternity.

I. *The Setting of First Corinthians Thirteen*

After discussing spiritual gifts in 1 Cor. 12, Paul pauses to present a *more excellent way* before he discusses the regulation of some of the spiritual gifts in 1 Cor. 14 (1 Cor. 12:28). Paul's statement about the way of love as the more excellent way is in striking contrast to the position of some of today's "miracle" workers who seem to believe that the way of miraculous gifts is the most excellent way and that without it the church cannot exist as Christ's true church. This reveals that some today have a different idea, from that of the inspired apostle, as to the place and purpose of miracles. This reveals that what-

ever spirit they may have it is certainly not the Holy Spirit which inspired Paul. The more excellent way is the way of loving obedience to God (1 Cor. 13). This way of loving obedience, for love necessitates obedience since Jesus said that if you love me you will keep my commandments (John 14:15), is described by Christ as more excellent and greater than professed miracles. Christ said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name: and in thy name cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matt. 7:21-23). He then pointed out that the wise man was the one who heard and did His word for such a man was building on the rock and his building would stand the test of time and judgment (Matt. 7:24-28). Loving obedience is the way more excellent, and it will never disappoint one at the golden gate of heaven, as the way of the people in Matt. 7:21 who placed so much confidence in their assumed power to perform wonders and yet failed to do Christ's will. Without love all else does not profit. This love is not sentimentality but an unbounded good will which seeks the good of all and the condemnation and destruction of none. *One can do without miraculous gifts and be saved, but where there is no love there can be no salvation.* Therefore, love is more essential than spiritual gifts. Love is so important that without it even faith profiteth nothing and thus even faith when alone can never save a person.

II. *Love never faileth* (1 Cor. 13:8).

"Love never faileth: but where there be prophecies, they shall be done away; whether there be tongues, they shall cease: whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away.

For we know in part, and we prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child; now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things. For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known. But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." (1 Cor. 13:8-13; American Standard Version).

Prophecies, knowledge and tongues were to fail; or to pass away as the Greek indicates. This is also evident from the fact that Paul contrasted love, that which was not to cease, with those things which were to cease or come to an end (13:8). They were to cease, come to an end, in the church; but the way of love, which did not seem so excellent to some of them, was to remain.

(1) *Love never faileth* (13:8). It shall not cease to be the more excellent way throughout all time. Even in eternity love will abide, will remain.

(2) *Prophecies were to fail or to cease* (13:8). To prophesy meant both to teach as well as to predict by inspiration. Paul did not here teach that the teaching or predictions would prove to be failures. He taught simply that prophesying by inspiration, as in 1 Cor. 14:22, 29-32, would cease; or be "*abolished*" as MacKnight translates the term which is translated "*fail*" in the King James translation. When would teaching by such a method as prophecy be no longer needed? It certainly would not be before the complete revelation was delivered. Since prophecy was one of the means by which God was revealing His will, while the New Testament was being revealed to men, prophecy as a channel of revelation had to continue until God had fully revealed the new covenant in Christ. However, when the complete revelation was finally delivered

such a channel as prophecy would no longer be needed for it would have then served its purpose. Certain *means* may be needed to reach a certain *end* but once that end is reached the means used to reach that destination are no longer necessary as they have achieved their purpose. One may call a friend on the telephone and reveal the thoughts of his heart to that person. Once you have delivered to him the message which you had in mind, once you have made the full revelation to him, he does not have to continue to stand at the telephone with the receiver to his ear in order to know your will. Why? Simply because he has already received the message and once the message is received the phone, the means of communication, does not have to continually be employed for the person to preserve that message. It was necessary to get it to him, but once he got it it was not necessary to his preservation, understanding and appropriation of the message.

Christ promised the apostles that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth (John 16:13). If *they* were guided into all truth they must have been guided *during* their lifetime. And unless Jesus was unfaithful to His promise, which no Christian could affirm, the apostles were guided into all truth and thus by the time that the last apostle died "all truth" had been delivered unto the church, once and for all (Jude 3). Prophecy was one of the means of conveying this truth and thus, since the full truth was conveyed by the time of the death of the last apostle, then the all truth was delivered and prophecy was no longer needed as a channel of revelation. It ceased, having served its purpose, as it was no longer needed.

It is a fact that instruction, received directly from God by inspiration, has ceased. Paul said that it would, and it has. No individual today knows the will of God, which is set forth in the New Testament, unless he has studied it himself or has received it from someone who has studied

it. This was not the case with inspired men. (Gal. 1:12; John 14:26; 16:13). These people that claim that miracles, as wrought by the apostles, are still wrought *by men* today cannot teach without a study of the word. What knowledge of the will of God have they received by inspiration? What portion of the New Testament can they reproduce by inspiration without even studying the New Testament? *None*. Their inability to so reproduce the New Testament is definite proof, based on their actions not merely on their claims, that they do not have the Spirit in the miraculous gifts as did some in the days of the apostles. Furthermore, the fact that they—these so-called modern miracle workers—teach some false doctrines shows that they are not in possession of the gift of “prophecy”.

Since it is a fact that prophecy has ceased; and since God’s prophecies would not cease in the sense of failing; it is evident that “fail” in this passage means that it would come to an end as a spiritual gift, as a means of instruction and prediction.

(3) *Tongues were to cease*. The tongues were languages (compare Acts 2:1-14). All must agree that Paul taught that tongues were to cease. The only possible point of difference is: When were they to cease? We know that they do not exist today. *Paul said that they would cease and they have ceased*. If anyone denies it let a group of twelve of his faith speak with other tongues, other languages, which they have not known, and speak in such a manner that people of sixteen different nationalities will hear them, each in the language wherein he was born (Acts 2:1-14). The facts prove that Paul was right when he said that tongues would cease. *Missionaries today must learn the language of the people to whom they preach, they do not get it by inspiration*.

(4) *Knowledge shall cease or vanish away.* Paul did not refer to knowledge which is received through the senses in study, experiences and observation. He does not mean we shall have a "blank" mind. We shall always be able to know that we know God and when Christ comes we shall know what He is now like (1 John 1:2; 3:1). Paul is discussing spiritual gifts, in contrast with the more excellent way. He has already referred to the gift of knowledge in chapter 12:2, 8. The phrase "to another the word of knowledge", shows that not all had that "knowledge". "Knowledge" here has reference to the spiritual gift of knowledge which enabled the possessor of that gift to impart truth by inspiration unto the church. Thus there would be a time when such knowledge, such an impartation of it through a spiritual gift, would no longer be revealed. What time could be more appropriate for it to cease than that time when the "all truth" was revealed? This cannot refer to heaven since supernatural knowledge will greatly increase when Christ comes.

Paul received his knowledge of the New Testament truths by inspiration, and not by instructions from men. "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." (Gal. 1:11-12). What man today has received the gospel in that manner? No one, and the proof of it is to be found in the undeniable fact that where the New Testament truths have not been taught men do not know the gospel of Jesus Christ. Paul said that such knowledge was to cease—that is, that such a medium or way of receiving it was to cease for the knowledge delivered through Paul is still with us—and we know that such knowledge has ceased. Today individuals get the knowledge of God's will through study, not through direct inspiration, just as they learn foreign languages through study. Even those

people today who claim to be inspired as were the apostles, have to study the revealed, written word in order to know God's will; and evidently they do not study it profitably for they teach many false doctrines and refuse to heed Paul's teaching that "knowledge" was to cease. One gets it through study or he is ignorant of the Word. All people today know about God's will toward them, about Christ, about His word, about heaven and about hell, may be found, and can only be found, in the Bible. All those who claim direct inspiration today and who do not study the Bible to get their teaching, soon go wildly astray and deny fundamental Christian doctrines. However, if they do get their knowledge of God's will from the Bible, instead of directly from God through their so-called inspiration, then by that very act they admit that they are not really inspired as were the apostles. The apostles had no written New Testament to guide them; thus they needed to be directly inspired that they might know, reveal, confirm and write the will of God. This has been done and all who do not depend on the Bible for guidance soon wander into spiritual darkness. If men today are inspired they can remember the teaching of Christ without having first studied it (John 14:26; 16:13). Who is bold enough today to try to meet this test?

Paul said that "knowledge" would vanish away and we know that such a method of the revelation of knowledge, by men with the spiritual gifts of knowledge, has ceased. Knowledge through inspired gifts, knowledge thus directly given from heaven, has ceased. Since the "all truth" has been revealed no new revelation of knowledge concerning Christ's will toward us, concerning those things which pertain to life and godliness, has been revealed. The proof of this is found in the fact that no new spiritual, religious, and ethical truth has been revealed since the writing of the New Testament. We are willing that the truth of this statement be tested. If any Bible believer will put the fol-

lowing headings over three columns on a blackboard or a piece of paper we shall prove our statement. Over column one place the word "Bible". Over column two place Gal. 1:6-8. Galatians 1:6-8 contains the inspired teaching of Paul which says that "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Over column three put "discernible by human reason". The test is simply this: Let any Bible believer bring forth one new revelation which contains some so-called new truth and we shall put it in either column one, two, three, and show that it belongs in one or the other. We shall show that it is already revealed in the Bible, and thus given to us by the written revelation, or that it contradicts Bible teaching and thus is a part of "another gospel" which Paul condemned, or that human reason could discern it without revelation. Even if an angel, or pious man, did reveal it to you, if it contradicts the revelation of Christ's apostles, it is not of God.

Although Paul mentioned only three of the spiritual gifts, we gather from the context that what he said applied to the other spiritual gifts also.

III. *The things in part were to be done away.*

(1) *What was that which was in part?* or bit by bit as Moffatt translates the Greek term translated "part" in the King James translation. The revelation of "all truth" was not given all at once. Peter and the apostles did not impart all of it to the people on Pentecost, more was imparted as time went on. Thus the revelation of all truth was given in "parts", a part at one time and a part at another, a part revealed at the household of Cornelius, truth concerning the relation of the Gentiles to the new covenant, which had not been fully revealed before that. This was revealed

to Peter and six brethren and through them to the rest of the church (Acts 15:7). The scene itself was not, and need not be, repeated. A part was revealed through one and a part through another. Different persons had different gifts that they might assist in the revelation and confirmation of the truth. Paul referred to this diversity of gifts in 1 Cor. 12:4-30.

(2) *The spiritual gifts were the things which were given in part and which were to be done away.* This is clear from 1 Cor. 13:9-10. All can agree that Paul did teach that the spiritual gifts of 1 Cor. 12:4-30, three of which are mentioned in 1 Cor. 13:9-10, were given in part and were to cease, to be abolished, for that which was in part—and they were in part—was to cease.

IV. *When were the things in part to be done away?*

(1) *The things which were in part were to cease when that which is perfect was come.* (1 Cor. 13:10). James Moffatt translates it thus: "As for prophesying, it will be superseded; as for "tongues", they will cease; as for knowledge, it will be superseded. For we only know bit by bit, and we only prophesy bit by bit; but when the perfect comes, the imperfect will be superseded." We maintain that the perfect has already come and that the imperfect has been superseded.

(2) *Paul said that tongues, prophesying and knowledge were to cease.* We have proved that they did cease and that there is no evidence that they exist today as they did then. Some so-called "miracle" workers today say that they did cease, although they attribute their cessation to the apostasy. Paul did not say, however, that the apostasy would cause them to cease; but rather that the coming of that which is perfect would supersede them or cause them to cease. *But they were not to cease until that which is perfect was come. They have ceased and therefore that which is perfect has come.* The scriptures which elsewhere,

as well as here, teach the purpose of such miraculous gifts, and thus their cessation when they had served their purpose, indicate that such gifts have ceased. We repeat that they were not to cease until that which is perfect was come. They have ceased therefore that which is perfect has come.

This is further emphasized by the fact that that which is perfect is set in contrast with that which is in part, or imperfect. That which was in part were the spiritual gifts. The whole thing, that complete or perfect thing, which was to be delivered through the spiritual gifts, was the "all truth" into which inspired men were to be guided (John 16:13). Therefore, when all truth was delivered, the parts (the bits of truth which because they were just a part, not the whole, lacked perfection in the sense of completeness or completion) were all brought together into a unity, a completion, and they constituted that which was perfect. James referred to the perfect law of liberty (Jas. 1:25). The perfect law was the complete law. This perfect law was delivered bit by bit and before it was completely revealed it was not perfect and complete. However, when all the bits or parts were brought together the perfect law was then fully revealed and spiritual gifts having served the purpose of revealing the law, bit by bit until all was revealed, were no longer necessary. Today the scriptures are able to furnish the man of God perfectly, completely, unto every good work if he only studies and uses them (2 Tim. 3:16).

All truth, as we have shown, had to be revealed to the apostles during their lifetime, according to the promise of John 16:13. The complete, perfect, revelation or law of liberty was revealed during their lifetime. A part was revealed at one time and a part at another. A part to one apostle, a part to another, and part to some who were not apostles but who were inspired. When it was all revealed, the perfect had come. It was all revealed during the life-

time of the apostles, therefore that which is perfect came during their lifetime. And when it came, that which was in part, the spiritual gifts ceased.

The Greek word, *teleios*, which is translated *perfect* in 1 Cor. 13:10 carries the idea of *complete*, in which sense it is translated in *Young's Analytical Concordance*. The idea of *perfect* in the sense of complete is the meaning of perfect in this passage for we remember that Paul placed that which is perfect, in contrast with that which is a part, and thus incomplete. The complete is contrasted with the incomplete. The perfect thing which came in after the bit by bit, and which was to supersede those things in part, was the all truth. Thus that which is perfect was the all truth.

(3) *There are many who maintain that that which is perfect refers to Christ, not to the complete revelation.* Christ is perfect, but spiritual gifts, not Christ, are here under consideration. *First*, the gifts were to cease when that which is perfect was come. The gifts have ceased; therefore that which is perfect has come. Christ has not yet come; therefore, that which is perfect in this place, cannot refer to Christ in this place.

Second, the "part" is contrasted with the "perfect". The "part" referred to tongues, prophesying, etc. (13:8-9). The "part" (imperfect) was to cease, to come to an end (the same thing is said about "knowledge", etc, since they were the "parts" which Paul said would cease). They were to cease when the perfect was come. These incomplete things, things associated with the period during which the gospel was being revealed, were to cease when they had accomplished their purpose which was to make known to man the complete, perfect, will of God. The revelation of the complete will of God was finally made, and thus the complete (perfect) thing made unnecessary those things which were in part. They ceased because they had fulfilled their function. Their ceasing was inherently con-

nected with the coming of the "perfect", for with its coming they had fulfilled the purpose for which they had been given.

Thus the context makes it clear that Paul is not here referring to Christ. He is contrasting that which is in part, imperfect, with that which is perfect, complete, a whole. While the revelations were in part, while the New Testament was incomplete, the gifts were needed to furnish the church with means of guidance and to confirm what was being revealed. But when through these gifts the all truth, of John 16:13, was revealed, the perfect had come; the things in part had fulfilled their purpose; and thus they ceased to operate.

Third, we have already shown that the term perfect conveys the idea of complete. (An example of such a use of the term perfect is found in Matt. 5:47-48. Jesus pointed out that God loves and tries to save both the good and bad, both His friend and His foe. He said for us to be perfect as our Father is perfect. Of course, we shall never be God and possess the perfection of power, wisdom and holiness which He possesses; thus this consideration, and the context revealed that Jesus is teaching His disciples to have the complete and unbroken circle of love which includes friend and foe and not an incomplete love which like the non-Christian loves only those that love them. We are to be complete in our circle of love as God is complete. In that manner we can be perfect in love as He is.) Since the term perfect is used in the sense of complete, and the context in 1 Cor. 13:10 indicates that it is there so used, we maintain that it refers not to Christ but to the complete revelation. *Fourth*, the word itself indicates that it does not have reference to Christ who is a person. Paul did not say when "he which", or "he who", is perfect shall come. He said "that which is perfect". He does not have reference to a person, but to a thing, to a complete system. Now

what complete, perfect, thing was to come in the lifetime of the apostles? It was the "all truth" (John 16:13), the complete revelation of the Christian system. Also what complete, perfect thing, when it was fully revealed and firmly confirmed and established, would no longer need miracles to reveal and to confirm it? That perfect thing was the will of God. The thing in part was to reveal and confirm it? That perfect thing was the will of God. The thing in part was contrasted with the thing in completion and that which was in part was to cease when that which was complete came. The faith has once and for all been committed to the saints, to the church, and we have the perfect law of liberty (Jude 3; Jas. 1:25). What could "spiritual gifts" do, now that the word has been revealed, confirmed and written, that the confirmed written word cannot do? *Nothing!* Spiritual gifts were necessary to reveal and confirm it but not to perpetuate it. Today the written word can produce faith which leads to eternal life. (Rom. 10:7; John 20:30).

V. *Infant stage of church contrasted with manhood state*

(1) *The infancy of the church is contrasted with the state of maturity* (1 Cor. 13:11). In the context where Paul is speaking of the things in part which would be done away when that which was perfect was come, Paul said: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child; now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things." The things in part were the things which belonged to the childhood stage of the church. That which is perfect was to exist in the stage where these things were to cease, where they would put away childish things—things suitable to and necessary in the period of childhood.

Paul is not talking about the earthly state of the church in contrast with its heavenly state. He is showing those

who have the diversity of gifts that there is a way more excellent (1 Cor. 12:31). This more excellent way is that of love and it is the way which must be walked in while on earth. Faith, hope and love abide in the state of the church on earth but when we get to heaven faith will be lost in sight and hope in fulfillment. Although trust in God, and love for Him, will abide throughout eternity; yet faith and hope as we now know it will receive their consummation in heaven. Tongues, prophecies and knowledge were necessary during the beginning of the church but after the church was fully established and that which is perfect was come, faith, hope and love were to be the things which abide. Just as surely as Paul passes from the state of childhood to manhood on this earth, just so surely the church passes from childhood to manhood on this earth. Those who object to the idea of the church passing through a period of infancy ought to remember that: *First*, the church had a beginning (Acts 11:15). *Second*, that as more and more truth was revealed, a part now and a part then, the church grew in the knowledge of Christ until the faith was once for all delivered, in all of its parts and thus in its perfection and completeness, unto the saints.

The spiritual gifts were characteristics of the church in its childhood. They were to cease just as Paul put away childish things when he became a man. Paul here indicates that the church was to put these things away when the church reached manhood. (1 Cor. 13:8, 9, 10, 11). Was the church, in the sense of God's revelation of the church, to reach manhood on earth? If so, these childish things were to cease, be put away, during the church's earth stage. Paul taught that the church was to reach the manhood state on earth. Paul stated that the things which were in part were to cease (1 Cor. 13:8), when the perfect, or complete, came (13:10). He then illustrated this in the next sentence by the person who puts away childish things

when he reaches manhood. We have already shown that that which is perfect, or complete, has already come and that these things have actually ceased. Therefore, the church has reached the manhood stage for she has put those things away.

(2) *Modern "miracle" workers maintain by their claims that the church is still in the childhood stage and that it will never reach anything else as long as it is on earth.* Since Paul associated these gifts with childish things, since he said that they were to cease, to be put away, and since they maintain that they are to be perpetuated as long as the church is on earth, and since Paul said that the manhood stage would be reached on earth; we must conclude that those who argue for the perpetuation of these gifts are not inspired by the same Spirit who inspired Paul for they do not teach that which Paul taught.

(3) *If the things of the childhood state are still with us they must serve the same purpose which they served in Paul's day.* Their purpose then was to reveal and confirm the truth, to make known the New Testament which had not been made known before the days of the apostles. If they exist today they must serve the same purpose. However, they cannot serve the same purpose now for the same conditions do not exist as they did then. We already have the revealed and confirmed word. They did not have it before the apostles' day but the church has had it ever since that day. The only consistent "miracle" workers are those who maintain that they are receiving new revelations today which are to be added to the Bible and which are of equal authority with it. However, we have already shown that all truth has been revealed. Furthermore, in another study we have shown that "modern" miracles do not serve, and cannot serve, the same purpose or produce the same results which they produced in Paul's day.

(4) *Jesus' statement to Thomas in John 20:29 reveals that it is a mark of immaturity to demand signs. We have sufficient confirmation of the word today and are of those whom Jesus' pronounced blessed because we have believed although we have not seen Him.*

VI. *Now we see through a glass darkly*

(1) *When did they see in a glass darkly? "For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known." (1 Cor. 13:12). The "now" maintained in this verse is the period of childhood, the period covered by the references in verses nine and ten. In verse twelve Paul said, "now I know in part", which is the same thing that he said in verse nine when he wrote "for we know in part, and we prophesy in part". In verse twelve he said that "then shall I know even as also I am known" and in verse ten he said that when that which is perfect is come that which was in part would be done away. The time of that which is perfect in verse ten is the time of verse twelve when Paul would no longer know in part but know fully. Paul here teaches that we see in a glass darkly when we know in part but when that which is perfect is come we shall know fully. It was not all clear—face to face—before the truth was delivered. Some of it was dark, obscure, before that time.*

This passage is sometimes thought to refer to the heavenly state of the church and well it might if it were not for the context in which it appears. However, the heavenly state of the church is not under discussion. Paul is considering the more excellent way which is superior to tongues, prophecies and knowledge which were in part. This better way is for the church on earth even before the heavenly state is reached. Faith, hope and love abide on earth but tongues, prophecies and knowledge cease. They abide even though the manhood state has been reached and the childish things put away. In the heavenly state faith

and hope will not abide in the same sense that they now abide. Faith is the assurance of things hoped for and the conviction of things not seen (Heb. 11:1). In heaven this faith will be lost in sight. We now believe that Christ is in heaven; then we shall see Him in heaven. We shall still trust Him but this will be somewhat different in character. We now believe that He exists and we thus have confidence in His word. We shall then see Him and know that He exists, but we shall continue to trust Him. But still the character of our faith as it exists today will be superseded by sight. Hope will not exist in heaven in the same way that it exists on earth. "Hope that is seen is not hope; for that a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it" (Rom. 8:24-25). The Christian's hope of heaven will be swallowed up in realization. The faith, hope and love that Paul referred to in 1 Cor. 13:13 abide on earth as the more excellent way. Immediately after this statement Paul continues his discussion of spiritual gifts. This all indicates that Paul is discussing two stages of the church on earth, and not the earth state in contrast with the heavenly state. Faith, hope and love are sufficient—now that the "all truth" has been revealed and confirmed through the medium of the spiritual gifts—to enable us to be ushered into the heavenly home of the soul after our life pilgrimage is at an end. But here and now "we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord" (2 Cor. 3:18). We look into the perfect law of liberty (Jas. 1:25).

When did Paul say that "we" see in a glass darkly? *Now* (the time he was writing). When did he say that "we" know in part? *Now*. When was this "knowing in part"? *It was the time when the spiritual gifts were being manifested* (13:8-9). When shall "we" see face to face?

When shall we "know even as also I am known"? When that which is perfect is come (verse 10), for it was then that that which was in part was to be done away. So evidently it was then that verse 12 was fulfilled, because it was then that he knew completely rather than in part; it was then that the childhood stage (verse 11) was to be passed. Thus we see that that which was in part was to be done away when that which is perfect was come; that he was to see "face to face" when that which is perfect is come.

Thus we see that Paul is not drawing a contrast between the earthly stage and the heavenly stage of the church. It is a contrast between the more excellent way, and the things that will abide, mentioned in 1 Cor. 12:31 and elaborated on in 1 Cor. 13, and the way of spiritual gifts. It is the contrast between the infancy of the church—the period of time that the truth was being revealed; and the maturity of the church—the time when all truth had been revealed which was to guide the church on earth in all generations.

(2) *Did the church see in a glass darkly while the truth was being revealed?* Yes, for some subjects were obscure at one time but later after the truth on those subjects was revealed. When only a part of the truth was revealed that which was not yet revealed was in the dark in so far as the church's vision of it was concerned. For example, at the first Christians did not realize the relationship of the Gentiles to the new covenant. They did not realize that the Gentiles were to be accepted on the same terms as the Jews. It took the revelations connected with the conversion of Cornelius, and the miracles which confirmed the revelation, to instruct properly the church on this matter. However, even after this part of the truth was revealed, after the church was no longer in the dark on this vital subject, there were some who refused to see the light. Of course, such people will always be in the dark and they

stand in danger—if they do not love the truth—of being turned into the outer darkness where there is anguish. What was true with reference to the above question was also true with reference to other questions and so on and on until all truth was revealed and the light of God's word drove away the ignorance of man on all subjects concerning which God has seen fit and necessary to reveal His will.

VII. *Then fully and face to face.*

(1) *We shall never know Christ as He knows us.* If that which is perfect refers to Christ, which we have shown it cannot, then Paul taught that He would know Christ as fully as Christ now knows him. However, there is no scriptural support for the position that we shall know things with the perfect knowledge that Christ has. In order to know Christ as He knows us we would have to be elevated to the heights to which He has been elevated; but where does the Bible promise that we shall be equal to Christ in knowledge? To have a perfect knowledge of Christ as He has of us would necessitate our being equal with Christ in that point at least. The idea that man can possess knowledge as God possesses it and to the extent that He possesses it, is a form of the lie which was preached by the tempter in the garden of Eden (Gen. 3:5). Man was promised that he would be as God in his knowledge of good and evil. This was a lie by the father of lies. Paul certainly did not teach that lie, or one form of it, which brought the fall of man.

Christ is not the subject of the discourse. The subject is concerning spiritual gifts and the more excellent way, the way of love. Christ was not in part, or imperfect; nor was he here presented as being perfect, in verses 8-10, in contrast with the truth in its incomplete stage of revelation. There is no mention of Christ or God in this passage; and thus there is no reason to assume that when Paul said that

“then shall I know fully even as also I was fully known”, that he means that then he will know God and Christ fully even as they now fully know him. He simply does not say that he will know God even as God knows him.

When I was a child I was known as a child, but then I grew and became a man. The church, too, had its childhood state, but it was complete, the perfect man, when the “all truth” was delivered. When I grew up I was known as a man. All know that I had been a child. I am known as a man now. Just so the truth is known in its maturity, its completeness, for all of it has been delivered, concerning the church on earth. Thus Paul used himself and compared the church to his own experiences as a child and as a man. Paul—on earth—was no longer a child. He was full grown and known as such. The same is true now concerning the revelation of the church as the one new man in Christ Jesus (Eph. 2:15; 4:24). The reason Paul advanced this comparison was that they might understand that the church was not always to be in its childhood period—the period of spiritual gifts—but that maturity would be reached; just as Paul had reached maturity, just so the church would be known as the complete, perfect man, the one new man.

(2) *Paul's complete knowledge was to come when that which was perfect was come* (1 Cor. 13:10-13). That which was perfect was to supersede that which was in part, imperfect. When the perfect came Paul was to see face to face, not in part, and know fully even as also he was fully known. We have shown that that which was perfect has already come. Therefore, when it did come Paul then knew fully and his knowledge was no longer in part and thus imperfect but it was the perfect knowledge with the parts brought together in a complete unity. Before all truth was revealed the complete revelation was not right before one, face to face, but part of it was veiled,

hidden, obscure, in the unlighted darkness of the future. However, when all the parts were brought together it was before him face to face so that he, and all others, could gaze face to face into the perfect law of liberty. Then there was no part of God's "all truth", which He set out to reveal to man, hidden for it was all right before him.

Paul said that he would know even as also he was fully known. Paul was then fully known in that he was known as one person, as something complete, as a unity, and not as a being or system which had not yet been completely revealed. When the revelation was still in part it could not be fully known or known as a unit. However, when it was fully revealed, and the perfect came, then it was known and before man as a perfect, complete, unit and known as a whole—not just a part—just as Paul was now known as a whole, a unit, a man—mature, not a child.

What would Paul know fully? God? No, but that which is perfect, the complete revelation of God's will.

Another glance at 1 Cor. 13 will show that Paul uses several contrasts. First, there is the contrast between the way of spiritual gifts, and the way of love which is the more excellent way. Second, there is the contrast between the permanent and the temporary. Third, there is the contrast between the complete and the incomplete. Fourth, there is the contrast between the child and the man. Fifth, there is the contrast between the dark and the clear. The contrasts between the dark and the clear, and the child and the man, are used to illustrate the position of the church, and thus of individual Christians in the church, in the time of the incomplete as compared with the time of the complete.

Thus we conclude that Paul teaches, in 1 Cor. 13, that the spiritual gifts were for a limited time and purpose. They have fulfilled that purpose and thus they have ceased. This does not mean that the church is crippled because of

a lack of miraculous gifts. It is not, for these gifts were for the purpose of revealing and confirming the truth which would guide the church. That complete revelation has been made and confirmed and the church today is equipped unto every good work by this truth (2 Tim. 3:16-17).

Note:

Verse twelve is the most difficult verse in this chapter. In the chapter Paul draws a contrast between the way of spiritual gifts, and the most excellent way—the way of love. This contrast is illustrated in several ways. (a) The contrast between spiritual gifts and love. (b) The contrast between that which fails, or ends, and that which shall not cease (13:8). (c) The contrast between the part and the whole; or, to put it in other words, the incomplete and the complete—that is, the imperfect and the perfect. (d) The contrast between the childhood state and the state of maturity. (e) The contrast between the knowledge in part and the full knowledge (13:9, 12). (f) The contrast between seeing things darkly and seeing them face to face (13:12).

Throughout these contrasts a blow is struck at their pride in spiritual gifts. He shows that they are a means to an end, and that end is to reveal God's will that men may obey it. If the way of love, which was delivered by means of spiritual gifts, is not followed, then it does not profit a person anything to have the spiritual gifts. For he has missed the very thing that the spiritual gifts existed to deliver—that is, the truth of God setting forth the way of love. This blow is all the more severe because he shows them that gifts are temporary; and that up to now even though they had gifts all of the truth had not yet been completely revealed. Gifts were associated with the state of immaturity, and not of maturity. That is, the stage of immaturity (of incompleteness) in the revelation of the "all truth".

Let us notice a little more closely verse twelve.

Now we see things darkly. There are some things, in other words, which are obscure and have not been revealed as yet (that is, at the time he was writing. Of course, we today do not know everything, but everything that God intended to include in the New Covenant for us to know on earth has already been revealed—and that revelation was evidently complete by the time that the last apostle died). Then we shall see face to face, Paul continues. What is the contrast? It is the contrast between things being obscure and things being clear—for things are clear when one sees face to face, to use Paul's illustration. Paul is contrasting two things here: Darkly with face to face. Darkly surely involves the idea of dimness or obscurity. What is the contrast to darkly? It is the idea of clearness. This idea Paul expresses with the term "face to face", just as you see a person clearly when you come face to face.

Then Paul gives the contrast in another way. Now, he said, I know in part. This "now" (in which he knows in part) is the same "now" in which he sees through a glass darkly. So evidently things, at least some things that were as yet unrevealed to them, were seen darkly because they were seen or known only in part. Then Paul went on to say that "then shall I know even as also I am known." The "then", in the last phrase of verse 12, is the same time as the "then" in the second phrase of verse twelve. It was the "then" when he would know "face to face. Thus when it is seen clearly it will be known fully. To "know in part" is in contrast with the last phrase of verse twelve which is to know as he is known. What stands in contrast with know in part? To know in whole, or in its completeness. So by the phrase "then shall I know even as also I am known" Paul illustrates the idea of completeness. He is now known in his state of maturity as a man who has put away childish things. Just so, when all truth was delivered,

when the "perfect" had come, Paul would know the truth in its maturity just as he is known in his maturity. The state of the revelation of truth which he would then know is the state of its completeness, its manhood state, its maturity or fullness. This is contrasted when he knew in part (13:12). And the time when he knew in part was, as shown by verses eight through eleven, when the whole had not yet been delivered, but was being revealed a part through one and his gift and a part through another and his gift. To know the truth in part—when it was not fully revealed, when all parts had not been delivered—was the same as knowing the revelations of the New Covenant in their childhood state. It was to know it before it had been completely delivered. But when it was completely delivered it would be known in the manhood state—the state of completeness; the state when revelation ceased because the full revelation had been revealed.

Those who apply verse twelve to something that will take place in heaven are faced with insurmountable difficulties so far as the author can see. *First*, we know that verse twelve is talking about the same things that the previous verses have been talking about. This is evident from the following:

Now we see through a glass darkly.

Now we know in part.

When is this now? When does he know in part? It is the time at which he was writing and the spiritual gifts were still needed to reveal more truth. For in verse nine he said: "For we know in part, and we prophesy in part." We do not, he says, at this present time know the whole, the complete, message of the new covenant for all of its parts have not yet (at the time he was writing) been revealed. It was not known fully for it was not fully revealed. They know only the parts that had been revealed, but everything had

not then been revealed. When is the "then" which is contrasted with the "now"?

Then face to face.

Then shall I know even as also I am known.

This "then" is the time when knowledge, tongues, and prophecies, have ceased or have come to an end. It is the time when the perfect state of revelation—that is, the state of the complete revelation—as reached, and the state of the incomplete revelation is passed. For

When that which is perfect is come,

Then that which is in part shall be done away.

Thus it is that they would see face to face, instead of darkly, when that which is perfect is come. And when that which is perfect came, then would he know even as also he was known.

Since we know that the miraculous gifts have been taken from men, and the complete revelation has already been delivered, we know that the period of time (the "then") has been reached when "then shall I know even as also I am known". So even if one finds this illustration difficult to understand we know that the time of which he spoke has come.

The *second* great difficulty in the way of those who apply verse twelve to what will be known in heaven is that we know that these miraculous gifts have already ceased. Since they were not to cease until that which is perfect was come, we know that that which is perfect or complete has come. Therefore, the period of time mentioned in verse twelve has come, for it is the same period of time as in verses eight through eleven.

The *third* great difficulty is that there is nothing in the context to indicate that Paul is talking about heaven. There is nothing to indicate that he is contrasting the earthly state of the church with the heavenly state of the

church. The entire context deals with spiritual gifts, and then spiritual gifts in contrast with the most excellent way which would not cease.

The *fourth* great difficulty is that those who apply verse twelve to heaven assume that Paul is saying that he will know God, or Christ, as God or Christ knows him. But God and Christ are not mentioned in the context or in the text. Besides, there is no indication in the Bible that we shall know them as fully as they know us. For to know them with the perfection of knowledge with which they know us would be to be equal to them in knowledge. Surely this is not taught in the Bible. To know God as fully as he knows us would be to be as God Himself in knowledge.

Thus we conclude that the explanation which we have offered of verse twelve, as well as the entire thirteenth chapter, is far less difficult and more in harmony with the scriptures in general, and the context in particular, than any other explanation. And although there may be some minor points of statements which we have made with which one may find fault, the author is confident that the position as a whole is sound.

Chapter XV

DO THEY HAVE THE SAME SPIRIT?

Those who claim to have the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, as did the apostles and certain other individuals in the first century, have these gifts for the same purpose, and with the results—if *they have the same Spirit*. Do these who make these claims have the same gifts of the Spirit with the same *purpose*, the same *actions*, and the same *teaching*?

(1) *The purpose for which the apostles and others had miraculous gifts*

If Christians do have today the same miraculous gifts that the apostles and others had in the first century it must be because we today have the same need—springing from the same lack—which they had. While Jesus lived there was no written New Testament. After He ascended He did not leave a written record. How, then, were the apostles to be sure that what they preached to others was the word of God? How could they be sure that they remembered Jesus' teaching correctly? Jesus said that the Spirit would do the work of remembering and guiding. Jesus was not talking to any man living today when He said that the Holy Spirit would guide them into all truth and bring to their remembrance what He had taught them (John 14:26; 16:7-13). This is evident because: *First*, we have His word recorded and thus do not have to depend on our memory as the apostles would have had to depend if the Holy Spirit had not come; for they had not the written word. *Second*, he was speaking directly to the apostles and making a promise to them (John 13:1; cf. Lk. 24:46; Acts 1:8; Matt. 26:20). *Third*, He has

taught us nothing in person which we are apt to forget. The ones whom he had taught and who might forget what *He* had taught them, were the apostles (John 14:26).

Thus the purpose of the Spirit's coming to them was to bring to their remembrance what Christ had taught them, guide them into all truth and make believers through the word which the Holy Spirit would furnish them (John 16:7-13; 17:20). The Spirit was given to enable them to reveal and confirm the teaching of the new covenant (Mk. 16:20; Heb. 2:1-4; John 16:7-13). The inspired men revealed, confirmed and recorded that word and today the written word produces faith and makes us complete (John 20:30; 2 Tim. 3:16-17). The Spirit revealed things to the apostles who spoke and wrote them that others by hearing and reading the word might be able to understand the will of God (Eph. 3:2-4). Since the apostles and inspired men of the first century have passed on we learn of their word through that which they wrote under the inspiration of the Spirit of God (2 Thess. 2:15; 3:6, 14). *The purpose then of the coming of the Holy Spirit on the apostles was to enable them to reveal, confirm, and record the New Testament.* They had no New Testament to study. They did not have to study to be able to produce it, although they may have had to study the word which was revealed through them after it had been revealed. But they did not study and thus learn to reveal it. Any studying of the word which they did was done after the Spirit brought it to their remembrance. From this it follows that if the people today have the measure of the Spirit the apostles had it must be for the same purpose. Thus they should not have to study the New Testament in order to preach it to others for the Spirit will bring it to them without study (John 14:26). The apostles did not depend on a study of the written New Testament in order to know God's will for they had no such written

book. Thus these people today who claim to have the Spirit as did the apostles should be able—without studying the New Testament—to write it word for word as did the apostles and other inspired men. If they say that such is unnecessary because it is already written; we reply, that is true and it also follows that since the apostles received their measure of the Holy Spirit to equip them for the task of revealing, confirming and writing the truth; and since it has been so revealed and written; that we no longer need the measure of the Spirit which they had. We today like Timothy must study the word of God which has already been revealed (2 Tim. 2:15). There is no need for the measure of the Spirit the apostles had for the “all truth” has already been revealed (John 16:7-13; Jude 3; Heb. 2:1-4). And since there is no need to rewrite the New Testament if these people really have the Holy Spirit as did the apostles they must be revealing another testament for a new dispensation. Why, then, don't they write their revelation and include them in the Bible just as the apostles wrote theirs and added them to the Bible which then existed—the Old Testament.

We maintain that these people do not have the same spirit the apostles had for the simple reason that the spirit they have does not fulfill the same purpose which the Spirit fulfilled through the apostles. The all truth was revealed during the lifetime of the apostles, or else Jesus' promise to them failed (John 16:13). Thus since it has been revealed we do not now need the same measure of the Spirit which they needed in order to reveal the “all truth.”

(2) *The teaching delivered by the Spirit through the apostles and other inspired men*

If these people today have the same Spirit which the apostles had they will teach the same things the apostles taught. In other words, they will speak where the Bible

speaks and be silent where it is silent. If they go beyond the doctrine of Christ, if they add to or take from what the inspired men then taught, they are accursed and without God (Gal. 1-6; 2 John 9; Rev. 22:18). We do not need the same measure of the Spirit that the apostles had in order to do this. *All we need to do is to preach what is written.* When we do that then we are guided by the Spirit for we are guided by His word. We preach the "all truth" when we preach the New Testament.

If these people today diverge from the teaching of the New Testament they may have some sort of spirit but they do not have the Spirit the apostles had or else they would teach what that Spirit taught through them when He guided them into "all truth." Since "all truth," that God wants us to have concerning His will for man in Christ, has been revealed, nothing can be added to it, or subtracted from it, or otherwise modified. However, so many of these people will tell you that denominationalism is all right (cp. John 17:20; 1 Cor. 1:10-12; 3-1); that women may be pastors; that tongues are not a known (that is, known to some people and spoken by some race) language of the earth (cp. Acts 2:1-14); that people are to "pray through"; and otherwise contradict the word of the Spirit in the New Testament. They cannot have the same Spirit the apostles had and yet differ from and contradict the apostle's teaching to Christians under the same dispensation.

(3) *The small actions must be produced*

If these people have the same Spirit the Spirit will produce the same actions in them that it produced in those in Paul's day. When the apostles received the baptismal measure of the Spirit and spoke in other languages every person understood them in the language wherein they were born (Acts 2:1-14). When some of these people speak in tongues today it is seldom anyone even professes to

understand them and certainly they do not speak in a language of this earth which they have not learned through study. The Spirit the apostles received was not the author of confusion (1 Cor. 14:33) but bedlam reigns in the meetings of some of those who claim to receive the Spirit. The Spirit that the apostles received did not knock them down "under the power" or make them froth at the mouth, or make them wallow in the dust, or tell people to pray through, or keep them waiting for hours or days in prayer for the coming of the Spirit.

We do not see the same actions produced in the people, who claim they have the Spirit, as were produced in the apostles and others. However, the spirit they get makes them do things which reminds us of the evil spirit which was in a boy in Jesus' day. This one had a "dumb spirit" "And wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him; and he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away"; (Mk. 9:18). "And they brought him unto him; and when he saw him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and walloweth foaming" (9:20). The actions in some of the Pentecostal meetings today resemble the actions produced by the dumb spirit and not by the Holy Spirit.

We deny that either the purpose, the correct teaching and the actions are evident in these people that were evident in those in Paul's day who had the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. Their actions prove that they do not have the same spirit. They may have something, but it is not the Holy Spirit.

In the appendices will be found some things which have been taught by two women who have been leaders in some of the healing groups of today. It is evident that these individuals—who are but samples of this whole movement—are not guided by the same Spirit which guided the apostles of Christ. They do not have the Spirit for

the purpose that the apostles had miraculous gifts; they often differ from the teaching of the apostles; and the things that they do are different from what the Spirit led the apostles to do.

Chapter XVI

MIRACLES ALONE WERE NOT SUFFICIENT

It is very significant that some people who claim the miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit have overlooked the fact that the New Testament teaches that miracles were not sufficient within themselves to prove that a teacher is from God. If such people really had the baptism of the Holy Spirit the Spirit would have brought this to their remembrance and would have led them carefully to consider their doctrine in the light of the Bible in order that they might be sure that they were not substantiating false doctrine by their so-called miracles. Let us see where the Bible teaches that miracles alone were not, and are not, sufficient. *First*, Christ will reject some individuals in the day of judgment who have been depending on *their* miracles and prophecies. Jesus said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:21-23). These confident individuals were depending on miracles and prophecies and they did not examine their own doctrine and thus they deceived themselves into believing that their miracles proved that they were doing God's will. We do not know that they actually performed them. However, since they were workers of iniquity who did not do the will of God it is doubtful that they performed any real miracles. But at any rate these disobedi-

ent people wrought some things which they called wonders. *Friends*, remember that the saved person is not just one who says "Lord, Lord" and who claims to perform miracles. Jesus said "And why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Lk. 6:46).

Second, false teachers are abroad in the land. Jesus said beware of them (Matt. 7:15; 2 Pet. 2:1-3; 1 John 4:1). These false teachers are to be rejected regardless of the wonders which they claim to perform. God told the children of Israel that if a man claimed to be a prophet and even made successful predictions, he was still to be rejected if he taught false doctrine (Deut. 18:1). John said "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world." "We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error" (1 John 4:1, 6). John also taught that to know God is to do His commandments and that the person who says that he knows God and doeth not His commandments is a liar and the truth is not in him (1 John 2:3-4). The miracle worker who teaches false doctrine refuses to hear the doctrine taught by John and other inspired men and thus we know that they have the spirit of error and that they are to be rejected regardless of their prophecies and miracles. *Friends*, this is vital and since it is each of us ought to carefully weigh the doctrine of so-called miracle workers in order to see whether or not it is of God. And you can rest assured that any miracle worker who calls a person to the mourner's bench and tells them to pray through, to pray for the Spirit to save them, and then tells them that they can be saved at this mourner's bench; such individuals, we say, are not of God. God's inspired men in the New Testament told seeking sinners to repent and to be baptized into Christ in order to wash away their

sins (Acts 2:38; 22:16; Gal. 3:27). No individual should console himself with the idea that it is impossible for him to be deceived; or that I know that such and such a miracle worker is sincere; and that therefore we can take them for what they claim to be. Some of them may be sincere but they are sincerely mistaken. They may be intellectually honest and yet be in error. Others are dishonest for Jesus said "For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. Behold, I have told you before" (Matt. 24:24-25). The church in Ephesus was commended because they "tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars" (Rev. 2:2).

Third, there are some who claim to be able to make predictions and to work miracles but they obviously fail. The Old Testament labeled that kind of an individual as a presumptuous person who was to be rejected (Deut. 18:20-22). Vain claims are empty things and anyone can make them, but it is something else to back up the claims with both miracles and proper doctrine. And that is why we say to modern miracle workers: Bring us both your miracles and your doctrine and we shall be able to point out that you fail to work miracles as did the apostles of Christ and Christ Himself and that in addition to this your doctrine is not in harmony with the Bible in many respects.

Fourth, all individuals should be on their guard for the messengers of Satan have performed lying wonders. We are not accusing all modern miracle workers of being conscious servants of the devil or of being sustained by his power. This is not true for many of the so-called miracle workers operate in the same realm that faith healers and psychiatrists operate in when they perform cures. However, the Bible does warn us against messengers of

Satan and all who believe the Bible ought to be on their guard. Paul said that "such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works" (2 Cor. 11:13-15; see also Exodus 7, 8). Paul said that the man of sin's coming "is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders" (2 Thess. 2:9). The second beast of Rev. 13:11-13 did great wonders and made fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men. However, the destiny of such a wonder worker was not heaven. "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone" (Rev. 19:20).

Chapter XVII

MIRACLES DID NOT SAVE MEN

The way some groups talk about miracles one would conclude that it was necessary for such to be performed in order for people to be saved. The only connection, however, that miracles ever had with spiritual salvation was simply that of being one of the things which confirmed the message of salvation *while it was being revealed from heaven*. Those, however, who count on their claims of mighty works today need to meditate on Jesus' statement of one of the things which would take place on Judgment day. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:21-23).

(1) *What does save us?*

If men were not pardoned by miracles, how were, and how are, men saved? One thing alone does not save men. Just as one thing alone does not give or perpetuate physical life; just as one thing alone does not enable a farmer to raise a crop; just as there are a number of essential things in life; just so we are not saved by one thing alone but by a number of things which work harmoniously in bringing about our salvation. Those who do not believe that do not believe the Scriptures or they do not know the Scriptures. Fundamentally, our salvation is Christ and the grace of God, but the Bible teaches that other things have

a part also. We are saved by God: (1 Tim. 4:10); Christ (Matt. 1:21; John 3:16); Christ's life (Rom. 5:10-11); Christ's blood (Rom. 5:8-9); the gospel (1 Cor. 15:1-2; Rom. 1:16); grace (Eph. 2:8-9; Titus 3:3-7); faith (Rom. 5:1-2); works of faith (Gal. 5:6; Jas. 2:14-26); hope (Rom. 8:24-25); words (Rom. 11:14; 1 Cor. 1:21); calling on the Lord (Rom. 10:13-14, 17; Acts 22:26); ourselves (Acts 2:40-41); and by baptism (1 Pet. 3:20-21; Mk. 16:16).

(2) *What was said?*

In spite of the proof, which we have presented concerning the purpose and duration of miraculous gifts, some will say: "But I have had the experience of talking with God or with Christ and I know that such and such is the case." Such individuals often maintain that they are saved by grace only, or by faith only, or that God in the vision told them that they were forgiven. We ask them to stop and consider. *First*, all that appears to be a visitation from God may not be; it may have been the results of an overworked imagination and constant expectation that such an event would take place. Or it may have been of the devil for he has worked wonders. *Second*, if you do not have love for the truth, you may have experienced a strong delusion (2 Thess. 2:10-11). *Third*, strong delusions may come to those who have pleasure in unrighteousness. *Fourth*, God has not left us without a safeguard. We must abide in the doctrine taught by the apostles and those who teach contrariwise, although they may appear to be an angel from heaven, must be rejected (Gal. 1:6-8; 2 Tim. 3:13-17). This means that your experience, no matter how precious it may have seemed to you, must be brought to the test of God's word. *What were you told in your vision?* If you were told that you were saved, you did not see the Lord. There is no record of the Lord, after the establishment of the church, ever appearing in

person to an individual and telling him the plan of salvation. The gospel has been committed to earthen vessels and one must learn from the teaching of the Bible what one must do to be saved. If you were not told to contact a Christian, and if the Christian was not placed in contact with you, you can rest assured that your vision was not of the Lord. We have already shown, just a few pages before, what people, to whom the Lord appeared in the New Testament, were told to do.

What will you do? Will you continue to trust in your "experience" or will you follow God's word? If you trust in your miracles you may be like those individuals Christ referred to in the sermon on the mount. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity" (Matt. 7:21-23). Jesus asks: "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" (Lk. 6:46). Do you place your hand on your heart and dramatically say: "I know that I am saved; I feel it right here?" To you we say: "And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him" (1 John 2:3-5). Can your doctrine and your profession of knowing God, stand the test of close comparison with the word of God? If it cannot, then you must reject it regardless of your so-called visions and miracles. Tremendous issues are involved, much is at stake, so do not be deceived for you will have to pay the

cost of the deception in so far as you are concerned. Turn from so-called modern "miraculous" works to God's word.

(3) *Men were not pardoned by miracles*

The gospel, which has been revealed and confirmed, is sufficient to save, sanctify and secure the seeker for salvation. While it *was being revealed*, while the inspired men *were being guided* into all truth, while *they* were confirming the truth which was being revealed through them, they possessed power to work miracles to confirm and establish the word which was being revealed. However, when it *was fully revealed*, when they were guided into all truth, then the revelation and the confirmation were completed. Unless there is a new dispensation in this generation, unless another covenant is being made, there is no need for additional revelation and confirmation. We know that there is no new dispensation today, which is different from the dispensation inaugurated by the apostles. *First*, every dispensation before the one inaugurated by the apostles was preparatory and pointed forward to something to come and to take its place. The new covenant in Christ is preparatory to eternity, to heaven, and not to another dispensation on earth. It looks forward not to another dispensation on earth but to its consummation with the end of the world. *Second*, the covenant in Christ is the consummation of all that went before. It is the completion of the series of dispensations of God's dealings with man on this earth.

It is important to notice that even while the truth was being revealed and confirmed *people were saved by the gospel and not by miracles*. *First*, the people on Pentecost had to hear the word, believe it, repent, and be baptized into Christ (Acts 2:37-38). They were saved not by a miracle but by obedience to the gospel. Miracles were involved in the revealing of the gospel while it was being revealed and confirmed. But, even then, it was the revealed

gospel, not the miracles, which saved them. A mail system may be necessary to get the letter to you while it is being delivered. But, once it is delivered, you can read it and enjoy the message without expecting the mail-man to stay at your door forever. *Second*, The eunuch had to obey the gospel to be saved. An angel and the Spirit spoke to Philip, but it was the word, spoken, believed, and obeyed, which saved the eunuch (Acts 8:26-38). *Third*, Saul saw the Lord, but the Lord did not then speak peace to his soul. In fact, after seeing the Lord, Saul was three days in distress while fasting and praying (Acts 9:6). The Lord did not tell him that he was saved, the Lord did not reveal to him the plan of salvation. He simply told him to go into Damascus and that it would be told him what he must do. Ananias came and told him to arise and be baptized and wash away his sins (Acts 22:16). *Saul was saved by the gospel*. No one spoke peace to his soul before he was baptized. No one said that because he had seen the Lord in the way, that he did not have to be baptized and that he was safe as he was. *Fourth*, Cornelius had a vision, but peace was not spoken to his soul, and he was not told that he was saved. He had to contact a gospel preacher who would tell him words whereby he was to be saved (Acts 11:14). *Fifth*, we are to be judged by the word revealed through Christ and His apostles (John 12:48; 14:24; 13:20; 16:7-13; 17:8, 20; Gal. 1:8). Though an angel from heaven should tell you that you are safe when you have not met the terms of pardon laid down in that word, you are still not safe and that angel is to be accursed (Gal. 1:8). The conditions—not the cause, for the blood of Christ is the cause—of our pardon are that we believe Christ and His gospel, repent of our sins, be willing to confess Him before men, and be buried and raised with Him in baptism (Matt. 28:19-20; Mk. 16:15-16; Acts 2:38; Rom. 6:2; Gal. 3:27; Col. 2:12; 1 Pet. 3:21). *Do not trust*

your "experiences" for pardon; trust in God and His word. The people in Matt. 7:21 were trusting in their signs, but they were condemned for not doing His will. God will receive you if you come to Him through Christ. Remember: Men had never been pardoned by miracles in this gospel age. They always had to be baptized into Christ. The gospel has been committed to earthen vessels, and since Christ ascended, He has revealed to no one the plan of salvation except through those inspired men in the early years of the church. Even then, people learned it from them, and not from dreams, visions, or experiences.

Chapter XVIII

ONCE FOR ALL

For men to claim the powers which were manifested in the revelation and confirmation of the gospel; and the establishment of the church; is to claim that they are called on to do the work that the apostles, and other inspired individuals, were called on to do in the first century. And yet, it is impossible that we today should be called on to do their work. *First*, we are not in the position that they were in. They were with Christ in His personal ministry; they had preached with Him that the kingdom of heaven was at hand; they were the ones through whom Christ was to establish His kingdom; they were to reveal (John 14:26; 16:7-14) and confirm (Heb. 2:3-4) the New Testament revelation and record it that men might believe (John 20:30-31). They established and instructed the church by delivering once and for all the faith to the saints (Jude 3); they revealed and recorded the New Testament revelation. Inspiration and revelation enabled them to know and preach that truth and miracles enabled them to confirm the fact that they spoke with authority from heaven; in other words the miracles were a part of the credentials that they had to confirm the message from God. No one today is in the position that the apostles were in and no one today can do or needs to do the work to which they were called and which they successfully completed—that of establishing the church and revealing and confirming the truth of the new covenant.

Second, to say that we need the power that they had is to say that we are called to do the same work that they were called to do. To make such a claim is to say that they

failed in their work and did not reveal and confirm the gospel and establish the church. We know that they did not fail for they delivered the faith once and for all (Jude 3). We, further, cannot do the work they did since no amount of claims and words can put us back in the time of the personal ministry of Christ and of the establishment of the church. Their work was done once and for all as surely as Christ's personal ministry, death, and resurrection, was once and for all. We can do the same thing today with reference to the work and message of the apostles that we can do with reference to the personal ministry of Jesus, and His resurrection. We can proclaim it as the revealed and confirmed truth of God. We did not reveal or confirm with miracles the gospel but we can and must preach the gospel which those in the first century revealed and confirmed. And, as we have elsewhere pointed out, the gospel and the miraculous gifts by means of which it was revealed and confirmed are two different things. They were necessary to its revelation and confirmation but now that these things have been accomplished (and those who say that they have not been confirmed are saying that the apostles did not do the work which was committed to them), all that is necessary to save men is to preach and live the gospel.

The truth delivered by the apostles must be ours, and we must obey the things that are required of us, but the experience of the apostles in revealing and confirming the truth are not models for our experience and neither can they be, as we have shown.

Third. Christians no more have a *right* to ask for a repetition of the signs and wonders wrought through the apostles, than they do to ask for a repetition of the life and miracles of Christ. We no more have the *power* to repeat the one than to repeat the other. For the miracles of the apostles were simply a continuation of the work of the

Lord Jesus Christ after He ascended to heaven and directed and empowered them by means of the Holy Spirit (John 14:26; 16:7-14; Acts 1:8; 2:33). Those who revealed and confirmed the gospel were revealing and confirming the message which Christ first began to speak (Heb. 2:3-4). Their work was unique just as was His work. If it is not hard for the modern "miracle" workers to understand why there is no need or possibility of the repetition of the life and work of Christ, it should not be hard for them to understand why there is no necessity or possibility for the repetition of the life and work of the apostles and other inspired disciples of the first century. Such consideration should enable these misguided people to see that we can no more expect a repetition of the miracles of *Acts* than of the life and resurrection of Christ which is recorded in the four *Gospels*.

Fourth. The modern "Pentecostals" forget an important fact to which Dr. McQuilkin has emphasized. The first four books of the New Testament, as all recognize, form "an incomplete stage of revelation. When we study Sunday School lessons on the meaning of salvation, for instance, and take our material from one of the Gospels, we need carefully to consider that the story of salvation cannot be completely told or understood till after the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus. The germ of all Christian teaching is in the Gospels, but it is an uncompleted story, and is not to be used as the final or complete word apart from its relation to the later revelation." We pause here to again point out that people find no difficulty here and thus they do not demand a repetition of the life and work of Christ; and yet, they could do so on the same principle that they demand a repetition of those things which were connected with the establishment of the church and the revelation and confirmation of the gospel. We have the record of that life and that is sufficient (John 20:30). And

exactly so we have the record of the revelation and confirmation of the gospel and that is sufficient. We have no more right to demand their miracles than folks in Acts had the right to demand to see Christ. McQuilkin continued by pointing out that in the revelations which came after that of the first four books of the New Testament, we find additional revelation which makes clearer even some of the things mentioned in the first four books. In the preaching in Acts and the rest of the New Testament there was no repetition of the facts which were preached and recorded in the first four books. These facts were preach, not re-enacted.

To take the book of Acts and to try to repeat the miracles therein recorded is to overlook the fact that "the book of Acts is an incomplete stage of revelation, just as the four Gospels are. It is the recorded of the establishing of the church of Christ, and the establishing of its doctrine,—the opening of the new dispensation of the Holy Spirit . . . It is the record of the continued activity of the Lord Jesus Christ, now ascended and glorified, as He, not they (but He through them by means of the Spirit, John 14:26; 16:7-14; Acts 1:8, J.D.B.), gave shape to His church and its doctrine. There was a tremendous revolution needed to establish a church so utterly different from anything the world had ever known, and a doctrine of salvation by grace so in contrast with what the Judaism of the day was ready to accept."

"It goes without saying that in every line of the Acts there is teaching and inspiration for the Christian today. But it should also go without saying that the experiences of these early apostles in founding the church are not necessarily models for Christians today, any more than the command of the Lord of his apostles in the Gospels to preach only to Israel, not the Gentiles, is a command to be followed by missionaries today." (Robert C. McQuilkin,

The Baptism of the Spirit: Shall We Seek It? pp. 10-12). Today we may establish local congregations by preaching the gospel which the apostles revealed, but we need not and cannot found, establish, the church itself and reveal to it God's truth directly from heaven as did the apostles. The modern "miracle" workers have made the serious mistake of trying to imitate the power of the apostles, power given to accomplish their special work, without being called (to which no one today is or can be called) to the special work which they did. Let us not think, through either ignorance or arrogance, that we can repeat the work and miracles of those inspired men in the first century, any more than we can do the work and miracles of Christ.

Thus the conclusion to which we have been driven, by facts and by the Bible, is that the works of the modern "healers" are mirages, not miracles, in so far as their being a repetition of the type of miracles which are recorded in the New Testament. Some of their converts they have harmed physically through leading them to believe that they must dispense with doctors. Their false teaching misleads multitudes. Some they have healed of functional disorders, but they have done no greater wonders than some healers who do not profess to do it in the name of religion. Some of their converts have claimed that they were healed because they were taught that they must affirm it in order to get the healing; others were led to believe that they were healed in spite of the fact that the "symptoms" did not go away. In some cases they may have been healed by the power of the devil. It is just a mirage, however, which makes them think that they have either the power, the works, or the full word which was given to the apostles of Lord Jesus Christ and certain others in the first century, by means of which God used them to establish the church and deliver and confirm the word of God.

APPENDIX

The Signs in Mark 16:17, 18

In August 23, 1945 issue of the *Gospel Advocate* the author published an article on the signs in Mark 16:17, 18 with special reference to whom this promise was made. Brother Frank Van Dyke wrote three articles on the subject. They appeared in the *Advocate* October 18, 1945; November 1, 1945; and August 29, 1946. *I now agree with Brother Van Dyke.* The reason that these articles are reproduced is because it is believed that they more or less fully present both positions on the question. It should always be our desire to avoid an unscriptural argument and brethren do us, and those whom we help teach, a favor when they call our fallacies to our attention.

THESE SIGNS FOLLOWED THEM

James D. Bales

"Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen." (Mark 16:14-20.)

There are two positions which men have taken on this promise of miraculous power. One position maintains that the promise of miraculous powers was to the person mentioned in verse 16—i.e., he who believed and was baptized. The other maintains that the promise of miraculous powers, in verse 17, was to the apostles. This is the position taken by the writer. However, even if we are wrong on this particular point, it does not invalidate the other arguments on spiritual gifts. It would still be true that miracles had a particular purpose; that they were given for a sufficient length of time to accomplish that purpose; and that that purpose of confirming the word was accomplished in the first century. Let us now give the reasons for our position.

1. The people who claim miraculous powers today neither claim nor demonstrate all of these signs. In fact, if not in theory, they limit the "them" of verse 17, so that it does not include all the baptized believers of verse 16. Few, if any, of their believers, who claim miraculous powers, claim to be able to do all of the wonders promised in verse 17. However, even if some of their believers do claim to demonstrate in their own work all of these things, none of them actually do it. As a general rule, they limit their efforts to tongues and healing, although a few try to go beyond this and claim the power to take up serpents and to cast out devils; but I know of none who are poison drinkers. Even those groups which try to demonstrate miracles, and which claim that the promise of miraculous power in verse 17 is to the baptized believers of verse 16, do not have a church membership in which everyone of them try, or even claim, to work these miracles. Thus although their theory applies the promise of these powers to all baptized believers, their practice limits the effort to demonstrate these powers to a very small part of their membership. Since they themselves limit it, why should they complain that we are unfair in limiting it? We, at least, are consistent; for we claim that it applied to the apostles, while they claim it applies to the baptized believer, and yet all of their baptized believers do not work these wonders. Why do they limit these gifts in practice, so that only a few believers get only a few gifts?

2. If the ones promised, in verse 17, these powers were the believers mentioned in verse 16, the promise applied to all these baptized believers. There is no indication in the New Testament that all baptized believers possessed the power to work even one of these wonders, much less that all baptized believers worked all of these wonders. For example, even those believers in Corinth who had some miraculous gifts did not all have all of these gifts. To one was given one gift and to another, another gift. Some believers had some gifts (1 Cor. 12:4-11, 29, 30). All believers most assuredly did not have all the gifts. This fact shows that those who interpret the promise in verse 17, as applying to the baptized believers of verse 16, interpret it contrary to the testimony of the rest of the Scriptures. The fulfillment of the promise is not in harmony with their theory, and our conclusion must be that therefore their theory is not in harmony with the promise of verse 17. The theory, not the fact, must be given up.

3. The apostles did possess all of these powers which are promised in verse 17. Two things make this evident. First, the Lord

promised, in verse 17, that "these signs shall follow them that believe." He then mentioned the signs. In verse 20 the apostles "went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." Second, apostles did all of these wonders. They cast out devils (Acts 16:18); they spake with new tongues (Acts 2:1-4); they were not hurt by serpents (Acts 28:3-6); the New Testament does not record their drinking of deadly things; they laid hands on the sick and they recovered (Acts 3:7). Since the apostles only were the ones who possessed all these powers, they must have been the ones who were the object of the promise.

4. Who was it, to whom the Lord was then speaking, who had not believed? The apostles had failed to believe the witnesses to the resurrection (Mark 16:13); and when Christ appeared unto the eleven, he upbraided them for their unbelief. He told them what to do, and he promised them that if they believed (verse 17), they would be able to perform wonders.

Brother Beam, in the Gospel Advocate (April 2, 1942), has pointed out:

That "Mark 16 has two classes or groups of persons in it cannot be denied. Jesus was speaking to one group—viz., the apostles. He spoke of another class or group—viz., those that would believe upon him through the word of the apostles. Not only this passage of Scripture, but all related passages in the four Gospels, put a wide difference between the apostles (one class) and those made believers (the other class). Qualification of the apostles was that which many believers could not fill. Powers of the apostles and authority were separate from those of the ordinary believer . . . They were an exclusive group, with specially-delegated powers. No man could by desire add himself to their number to partake of their bishopric. But many men have tried to claim powers and privileges which belonged exclusively to this group. To claim such powers is in effect to appoint one's self to the apostolate. This is not permitted. The argument that would permit it must, therefore, fail. That these apostles could delegate by laying on of hands, some of these powers to one and some to another, does not make against these miraculous gifts being the specific badge of the apostles, but the same does establish it. A deputy sheriff with a badge is evidence of the sheriff with power to issue the badge. And so with the 'signs of an apostle,' (2 Cor. 12:12.) If these miraculous powers were to be given to all believers, they would cease to be the 'signs of an apostle.' With this much before

us, Mark 16 should be interpreted in the light of this general teaching of the Scriptures.

"Of those who believe upon Christ through the preaching of the apostles it is said: 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' But to the apostles themselves Jesus spoke. He 'upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart.' It took faith for those with miraculous powers to be able to use the same. (Matt. 17:20.) After, therefore upbraiding them for lack of faith, he tells them what he desires them to do. He likewise states to them: 'These signs shall follow them that believe.'"

Jesus ascended, the apostles went forth, and signs did follow them.

5. What "them" was the Lord speaking to at this time? The Lord was speaking to the apostles. (Mark 16:13, 14.) He finally ceased speaking unto them, the apostles. (Verse 19.) Then what did they, the apostles, do? They went forth preaching the word, and signs followed them (verse 20), just as Christ had promised in verses 17 and 1. The "them" referred to in verse 19 is the "them" of verse 14. This "them" was the apostles. The "them" who worked the miracles of verse 20 did so in fulfillment of the promise of Jesus to the "them" in verses 17 and 18. The "them" of verse 20, who worked the miracles, were the apostles. Therefore, the "them," who were the object of the promise of verses 17 and 18, were the apostles, for in them the promise was fulfilled. The apostles, in verse 20, to repeat, performed signs which were the fulfillment of the promise of verses 17 and 18. Therefore, they were the ones promised such powers when Jesus said that these signs would follow them that believe. They must have been the subject, the object, of the promise, for in them was its fulfillment; for they were the fulfillment of it.

6. The modern "miracle" workers who claim verses 17 and 18 do not try to demonstrate all of them. First, their healings are no more wonderful than those of the Christian Scientist, who denies every fundamental of the Christian faith. Second, they do not speak in foreign languages, unless they have previously learned these languages. Third, they are no more poisonproof than we are. Fourth, with some exceptions, they do not try to take up serpents. Why not seek that miraculous power and make a demonstration of it? After all, they seek the power to lay hands on the sick to heal them. And the power to take up serpents was one of the powers promised in verse 1. Perhaps they will argue that they ought not to tempt God by taking up serpents. If such an

"argument" is made, they might as well make the same argument on healing the sick. Why? Because the promise of power to take up serpents is promised as certainly as the power to heal. Furthermore, it is promised in the same way. Notice the parallel. "They shall take up serpents." "They shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." If the expression "they shall," when applied to the serpents being taken up, does not mean that they shall seek to demonstrate such power, "they shall," when applied to laying hands on the sick, does not mean that they were to seek to demonstrate such power of healing. On the other hand, if they say that the "they shall," with reference to healing, means that they are to seek to demonstrate such power, then why does it not indicate the same thing when the promise was made that "they shall take up serpents"?

7. These signs did follow, and still follow, the work of the apostles. These signs confirmed their work while it was being revealed. They were recorded so that the confirmation would be available for all generations. And the Bible teaches that the record of miracles helps furnish a basis for faith. (John 20:30.) Thus wherever the word and work of the apostles go, these signs go with them. However, these signs today do not follow their work by someone today working or reworking these signs. "Working signs is one thing, and signs following is a different thing. Here are two things instead of one." For example, Mary has been dead for centuries, but her work in Mark 14:9 goes wherever the gospel goes, but not through someone reworking the work which she did. It does it through the record. "The signs worked by Christ and the inspired men are recorded in the New Testament; and wherever the New Testament goes, the signs of Christ and the inspired men go, for the reason that they are in the New Testament." (C. E. W. Dorris, "Commentary on Mark," Nashville, Tenn., Gospel Advocate Company, page 396.) These signs, wrought by them, follow their work, not signs wrought by someone else in our generation. For example, the signs of Paul were worked to show that Paul was an inspired messenger of God. He did not work them to show that Moses was an inspired messenger of God, or that Peter was such a messenger. Incidentally, his signs may have supported the claim that God once spoke through the prophet Moses, in that the New Testament teaches that God once spoke through Moses to people under the former dispensation. However, it proved it incidentally only because it proved first of all that Paul was a prophet of God. Thus if people work such signs today, they do not, and they can-

not, work them fundamentally to prove that the writers of the New Testament were inspired. They cannot work them fundamentally to confirm the words of those who heard and preached Christ's message in the first century. (Heb. 2:2-4.) The primary work of such signs today would be to prove that those who worked them today are inspired men of God; and only as they proved that could they show, incidentally, that the New Testament writers were inspired men of God. And yet most of the modern "healers" do not work "miracles" to prove that they are inspired messengers with a message which they received by revelation, instead of through studying the message which came through such inspired men as Paul. (Gal. 1:6-12).

8. This passage contained no promise of miraculous powers to the apostles, if the promise referred to the baptized believers of verse 16. Why so? Because the apostles were the ones who were to teach and baptize under the Great Commission; they were not the ones who were to be taught and baptized under the commission. Thus if the promise refers to the baptized believers, those who heard and obeyed the gospel under the preaching of the apostles, it does not refer to the apostles. This would not mean, however, that the apostles were not elsewhere promised miraculous powers.

Objections to This Position

There are objections to the position that the promise of verses 17 and 18 applied to the apostles only. Let us consider them.

1. Why continue baptism if the miracles are not continued? First, the world was to receive the gospel. The whole world has not yet received it; so it still needs to be preached. The apostles, however, were the only ones who were promised, in this place, miraculous power; so this promise was fulfilled in the apostles and their work. We have no such apostles today. Second, there is a difference between the signs and the word. In this passage in Mark this distinction is evident, for signs followed the preaching of the word by the apostles. (Mark 16:20.) Third, the signs were not the gospel, nor a part of the gospel. Faith and baptism, however, are a part of the conditions laid down by Christ on which men accept and appropriate the blessings of the gospel to themselves. They are not the grounds of our salvation, but they are the conditions on which the gospel and its benefits are extended to the individual. Fourth, the signs confirmed the word while it was being revealed. (Heb. 2:2-4.) This revelation and confirma-

tion were completed in the apostolic age. We have the word already confirmed.

2. It is objected that our position means that the commission applied to the apostles only; therefore, we are without authority to preach the gospel today. The reply is that we do not get our authority to preach from this passage. We have no authority to preach in the manner that they preach—that is, under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit, who brought the words of Christ to their remembrance and guided them into all truth. (John 14:26; 16:7-13.) They did not have the written record. They depended on inspiration. We today have the record, the New Testament books, which they wrote. We can teach only what they taught. And that we have the right to teach to others the gospel which was revealed through the apostles is evident from the teaching of the New Testament. When the members of the church were scattered abroad, they went everywhere preaching the word. (Acts 8:1, 4.) The apostles, at this time, remained in Jerusalem. (Acts 8:1.) Those who hear and respond to the call of the Spirit and the Bride, which call is given through the word of the gospel—they are to invite others to come. (Rev. 22:17.) Christians ought to develop into teachers of the world. (Heb. 5:12.) Since people cannot believe without the word, the word must be taken to them. (Rom. 10:14-17.) Timothy was to teach faithful men who would teach others. (2 Tim. 2:2.) The apostles were to teach their converts to observe all things that Christ commanded them. (Matt. 28:19, 20.) The apostles taught Christians to teach others, but they did not teach that the church, throughout the entire time of its existence of this earth, would be able to work miracles.

3. It is objected that others worked miracles in the days of the apostles; therefore, the promise of Mark 16:17 was not limited to the apostles. The answer is three-fold. First, others did work miracles, but they were not promised such powers in this passage, regardless of what they were promised or received elsewhere. Second, all Christians did not possess all of these powers; thus their miraculous gifts were not promised to them in this passage, for the promise in this passage was that all who believed would be able to do these things. Thus the other Christians who worked miracles must have received their powers in some other promise than this one. Third, we know that miraculous powers were given to others through the laying on of the hands of the apostles. (Acts 8:12; 19:1.) Thus we do not need to go to Mark 16:17 in order to find how that other Christians received power to work miracles.

It is objected that our position violates a rule of grammar. This objection says that "if we simply made 'they' and 'them' refer to the apostles, we do not let the pronouns agree with their antecedents in person, which would be just as much a violation of the rules of English as to violate them with respect of number." Our answer is as follows: First, since the interpretation which says that the "them" refers to the believers of verse 16, it involves a violation of the rules of English with reference to number, for they make the "them" of verse 17 have the antecedent "he" of verse 16. The objector, in the quotation just made, admits that one is just as much a violation as the other. Thus the objection drawn from the rules of English grammar is just as much against one position as another. Therefore, the question must be settled on other grounds than that of English grammar. And on other grounds we believe that we have established the position that the promise here, of miraculous powers, is limited to the apostles.

We find that the Lord did, in his speaking, sometimes change from the second to the third person when speaking of the same individual. In Matt. 7:7, Jesus said: "Seek, and ye shall find." He is saying: If you seek, you will find. In the next verse Jesus said: "For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth." The "he" here is the "ye" or "you" of verse 7. Could one sustain the objection here that he must be talking of someone else because of the change of person from "ye" to "he"?

Verse 17 does not say that he that believed and is baptized shall do these things, but that these signs "shall follow them that believe." The ones who manifested unbelief, in this context, were the apostles of verses 13 and 14, and not the "he," the believer, of verse 16. Some of the apostles had doubted when the first news of the resurrection was brought to them, and Jesus rebuked them for their unbelief when he appeared to them. He then gave them the commission and promised that those who believed would be able to do wonders. If just half of them believed, just half of them would do miracles. If all of them believed, all would do miracles. But miracles would be performed only by those who believed. Regardless of whether a part or whether all believed, these signs were to follow them that believed, and only them that believed.

We do not want the reader to accept this position unless the arguments carry conviction to his mind. If he does not accept it, we remind him that, regardless of the position one takes on this passage, it does not affect the other arguments which are made concerning the purpose and the duration of the age of miracles.

These other arguments stand, regardless of whether or not this particular argument stands. And if this argument stands in the reader's mind, he will realize that, since we do not have any living apostles today, the promise of verses 17 and 18 does not apply to anyone living today.

"THESE SIGNS SHALL FOLLOW"

Frank Van Dyke

"Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." (Mark 16:14-20.)

The promise of miraculous power (verses 17, 18), it seems to me, is to baptized believers, not to the apostles. Let us now give the reasons for this position.

The Context

The context makes this the most natural and obvious reference. Two speeches are contemplated here—one, the upbraiding speech, is only mentioned (verse 14); the other, the giving of the commission, is recorded (verses 15-18). McGarvey, in his "Fourfold Gospel," has the two speeches delivered at different times and different places. He puts the upbraiding speech (verse 14) on Sunday evening (the day Christ arose), when Jesus appeared to the apostles the first one—the meeting recorded in Luke 24:36-43 and John 20:19-23. The commission (verses 15-18) was given on a mountain in Galilee not so long before Christ ascended. (Matt. 2:16-20.) B. W. Johnson also takes this view.

There are good reasons to believe that McGarvey and Johnson are right.

1. Mark 16:9-13 records things that did occur on the day Christ arose. Verse 14 could well be a continuation of what happened

on that day. The "afterward," with which verse 14 begins, does not have to mean on another day; it may mean later in the same day—after the event in the preceding verses. This is the significance of "after" in verse 12, and so it may be with "afterward" in verse 14.

2. When had the apostles failed to believe "them which had seen him after he was risen?" On the day he arose, and verses 10-13 have just discussed this. So far as the record shows, that day is the only time they ever doubted such reports. And Christ did appear unto them immediately after this, on the evening of the same day. (Luke 24:33-36.) It is only natural to suppose that it was then that Christ upbraided them for not believing those reports. Why would he wait nearly forty days later to do it?

3. Did the apostles doubt the resurrection when Christ gave them the commission? Hardly so. They had believed at the first appearance nearly forty days before this (John 20:20, 25, 28), and there is no conclusive evidence that they ever doubted the resurrection after that. From Matthew's account many conclude that some of the apostles did doubt at the time the commission was given. Matthew just mentions the eleven in this connection; however, he does not say they were the only ones present. McGarvey and Johnson think this was the time Christ appeared to above five hundred, and that Matthew's meaning could be this: "And when they (the eleven) saw him, they worshipped him (the eleven believed): but some (others) doubted." (Matt. 28:17.)

4. The upbraiding in verse 14 was "because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." This sounds like his first appearance; for even if the apostles did doubt the resurrection after that first appearance, Christ should have upbraided them then for not believing their own eyes—not for failure to accept the report of others.

5. The appearance mentioned in Mark 16:14 was while the apostles sat at meat. This was not likely on the mountain in Galilee when Christ gave the commission. At that first appearance, however, the apostles were in a room. (John 20:19.) And evidently they had been eating, for Jesus asked for meat and got it—most likely a part of what the apostles had been eating. (Luke 24:41, 42.)

6. The appearance in verse 14 seems to have been sudden and unexpected. This fits the first appearance, but the meeting on the mountain in Galilee was by appointment. (Matt. 28:16.) The apostles went there expecting to see the Lord.

7. Verse 15, though it may seem to be relating something else that happened at the appearance in verse 14, may very properly begin an account of a different incident—something that occurred much later. Cases like this are common in the Gospels. An example is in Luke 24:36-48. Verses 36-43 record the appearance Christ made to the apostles on the day he arose. Verse 44, with no apparent break in the narrative, begins a discourse that was given much later. Reading Luke's account alone, one might get the idea that Jesus made this speech at that first appearance, immediately led the apostles out near Bethany, and ascended. Everybody knows, however, that such is not the case. So Mark 16:15 may begin a speech which was given a long time after the incident in verse 14.

For these reasons we are compelled to believe, with Johnson and McGarvey, that the upbraiding in verse 14 did not occur at the time and place of the speech in verses 15-18. The promise in Mark 16:17, therefore, has no connection whatever with a speech in which Christ urged the apostles to believe. Christ had not just been telling the apostles to believe; so there is no basis for an interpretation like this: "Christ had just upbraided the apostles for not believing, and then told them if they believed, they could work wonders."

Such an interpretation would not be justified if all of this had happened at the same time. Even then, beginning with verse 15, Christ is no longer trying to get the apostles to believe; he is instructing them to make believers of somebody else. So the promise in verse 17 still would not be directly connected with the exhortation for the apostles to believe; it is part of the speech to the apostles about making believers of every creature in all the world.

Without some indication that he intended to switch the thought back to the apostles in verse 17, all rules of grammar, proper coherence, and smoothness of diction would demand that the "them" be from all the world, the last group under consideration. Even if we were to grant that all of these things in verses 14-18 happened at the same time, it would still take a strained effort to refer the promise to the apostles. To do so would at least make the savior's statement ambiguous. His coherence would be poor, not showing the transition of thought from one group to another. Such a connection between verses 14 and 17, considering the grammar and sequence of thought, would be unnatural and awkward. The language would be subject (and that easily so) to a different interpretation.

The Grammar

Christ was addressing the apostles in the second person. If "them" refers to the apostles, then we have a pronoun in the third person with its antecedent in the second person, which is not permissible; for a rule of grammar says that "a pronoun must agree with its antecedent in gender, number, and person." Another rule of grammar says that the second person indicates the one spoken to; the third person, the person or thing spoken about. Jesus said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature And these signs shall follow them that believe." It is strange to me that anybody ever thought of referring "them" to anyone except the group (all the world) introduced in the beginning of the discourse—the ones spoken about.

It may be said that the ones spoken about may be among the ones spoken to, like this: "You believe, and these signs shall follow them (of you) that believe." Such is not the form, however, in Mark 16:17. There, as we have seen, Christ was not urging the apostles to believe when he made the promise. The event in verse 14 happened at a previous time. But even if all this had occurred at the same time, we still would not have a case like the example given above; for in that example no third party has been introduced to whom "them" could possibly refer. In Mark 16:15-18, however, a third party (every creature in all the world) has been introduced, and Christ is urging the apostles to make believers of them. Immediately following this, not immediately after urging the apostles to believe, the promise in verse 17 was given; and from the grammar and sequence it naturally seems to refer to the last group mentioned—the ones spoken about.

A very unfortunate example is sometimes used to justify making "them," a pronoun in the third person, refer to an antecedent in the second person. Jesus said: "Seek, and ye shall find; . . . for . . . me that seeketh findeth." (Matt. 7:7, 8.) It has been said that "the 'he' here is the 'ye' or 'you' of verse 7." No, no, no! The "he" is indefinite; it comprehends everybody, and is restricted only by the modifying clause. Turn the statement around: "He (anybody) that seeketh findeth; therefore, you (a particular person or group of persons) seek, and ye shall find." Anybody ought to see that the "he" is not the "ye."

This violation of grammar is sometimes dismissed this way: "The interpretation which says that the 'them' refers to the believers of verse 16 involves a violation of English with reference to number, for they make the 'them' of verse 17 have the antecede-

dent 'he' of verse 16. Thus the objection drawn from the rules of English grammar is as much against one position as another. Therefore, the question must be settled on other grounds than that of English grammar."

There are serious objections to this statement. First, the question cannot be settled on any grounds that will make Jesus wrong in his grammar. We have used faulty grammar as one argument against the claims for inspiration of Joseph Smith and others. Be careful—somebody will throw it back at you that Jesus was not divine! Second, "the interpretation which says that the 'them' refers to the believers of verse 16" does not "involve a violation of the rules of English grammar with reference to number." This does not "make the 'them' of verse 17 have the antecedent 'he' of verse 16." Take the "he" first. What is its antecedent? It is any person that will believe and be baptized. The "he" is indefinite except as restricted by the modifying clause. Likewise with the "them." Is its antecedent the "he"? No, it is all who will believe. The "them" is indefinite except as restricted by the modifying clause; its antecedent would be the same if the "he" were not in verse 16.

It may be said that "them that believe" must not be extended beyond the group under consideration—that if a particular group is contemplated, then it can only mean the ones in that number who believe. Exactly right! But a group—every creature in all the world—is introduced in verse 15. (The distributive form "every creature" does not alter the fact that a group, the whole world, is considered.) Now, consider verse 16. Since the passage contemplates the whole world, the meaning is obviously this: "He (in all the world) that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Just so with verse 17. The whole world is still under consideration, so the meaning is this: "Them (in all the world) that believe." The "them," like the "he" of verse 16, finds its antecedent in the group mentioned in verse 15, and the modifying clause restricts the antecedent to certain ones in that group.

The relation between verses 16 and 17 is this: they both contemplate believers—believers made by the apostles in all the world. Verse 16 uses the distributive form: "He (every one in all the world) that believeth," etc. Verse 17 uses the collective, or aggregate, form: "Them (in all the world) that believe." It is perfectly in order to switch from the singular, or distributive, form to the plural, or collective, form. An example of this is in John 15:6: "If a man (any man in the world) abide not in me, he is

cast forth as a branch, and is withered; and men gather them (all that are thus withered), and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." Would anybody argue that the "them" here has the singular "man" as its antecedent?

Verse 16, though it does not express the grammatical antecedent of the "them" in verse 17, does refer to a believer of the same class, and says he is a baptized believer. Let nobody quibble, therefore, that our explanation makes it impossible to tell whether or not the believers of verse 17 are baptized believers.

Conditions and Time Element

Any other conditions, or means, stipulated elsewhere, necessary for baptized believers to receive miraculous power must be understood to prevail in the fulfillment of the promise in Mark 16:17. Christ did not state just how and when believers would receive this power. When we learn how baptized believers did come to possess miraculous gifts, then Mark 16:17, interpreted in the light of this, is simply a promise that believers would receive this power that way. When apostles laid hands upon baptized believers and gave them miraculous power, this could well be the way the promise of Mark 16:17 was fulfilled. Our position does not demand that believers possessed such gifts immediately after, nor as the direct result of, their baptism.

Is it objected that this is adding conditions that Jesus did not stipulate? Well, this same passage promises salvation to one who believes and is baptized. Another condition, repentance, is stipulated elsewhere; and nobody has any trouble interpreting this promise accordingly. And, too, I take it that those who apply the promise of verse 17 to the apostles will agree that something not mentioned here (the baptism of the Holy Spirit) actually occurred before the apostles had such powers. (Not before they had any miraculous power, for they performed some miracles under the limited commission; but before they had the full measure of such powers—that which was theirs after Pentecost.)

Neither did Christ state how long the signs would follow. Eph. 4:11-13; 2 Tim. 3:16, 17; and 1 Cor. 13:8-10, considered together, show that miraculous gifts continued in the early church only until the New Testament was revealed and recorded. Mark 16:17, interpreted in the light of this, is simply a promise that believers would have such powers—the signs would follow for that time only.

Some make a distinction between "signs following" and "working signs." They say that two things are found in the promise—first, that the signs could be done; second, that the signs would

follow. The first, they agree, has ceased; but the second continues. The signs follow even now in the record of the work done by those who once performed them just as a person's deeds follow, or live on, after he is gone. It is true, of course, that the signs do continue to follow in this manner; but such an idea does not seem to me to be in the text. "These signs shall follow them that believe"—that is, "in my name shall they cast out devils," etc. The latter part, which says they shall do them, seems to tell what he meant by saying that the signs would follow.

But Christ did not say how long the signs would follow—no, he did not say they would follow until the end of the world. Attention will be given to that point in another article in which we shall discuss the objections offered against the explanation set forth herein. Keep this article for reference when the next one appears.

"THESE SIGNS SHALL FOLLOW"

Frank Van Dyke

In a previous article we set forth the view that the promise of miraculous power in Mark 16:17 was to baptized believers. That article was written with special emphasis upon the fact that grammatically the promise does not refer to the apostles—that it can, and does, refer to baptized believers. In strict grammatical analysis, "apostles" is not the antecedent of "them" in verse 17. Though our first article viewed the promise strictly from the standpoint of its reference to baptized believers, it may not be necessary to conclude that the apostles were excluded. Some refer the promise both to the apostles and to baptized believers. This is permissible.

We learned that the "them" of verse 17 finds its antecedent in the group—the whole world—introduced in verse 15, with the modifying clause restricting it to believers in that group. Well, the apostles were believers. Though in grammatical analysis "them" in verse 17 does not refer to the apostles, the promise made there, since it comprehends all believers in the world, may by projection of thought be made to include them, since they were believers. Speaking to the church today, one might say: "Make disciples of everybody in the community, and the Lord will bless those who do become Christians." Grammatically, "those who do become Christians" does not refer to the ones spoken to. The promise, however, is something God does for his people; hence, the thought, though expressed in specific reference to new converts, may be extended to those who were already such. Thus Mark 16:17,

though a direct reference to those to be made believers, may be understood, by projection of thought, to include the apostles, who were already believers.

According to this, the promise would carry no indication of just how and when believers would receive its fulfillment—it would not even demand that all classes of believers (apostles and those not apostles) would have to receive it alike. Any conditions, or means, by which different classes of believers did actually come to possess such powers would have to be understood to prevail in the fulfillment of the promise. When the apostles were baptized with the Holy Spirit and received miraculous power, this might well be the way that the promise, inasmuch as it refers to the apostles, was fulfilled. When baptized believers had these powers delegated to them by laying on of hands, this could very properly be the way the promise was fulfilled to them.

This explanation, we say, may be permissible. We have no objection to including the apostles in this manner. At the most, however, the apostles were only included. The promise most certainly was not restricted to them. It does refer to baptized believers (that which is denied by the other view), whether or not it refers to them exclusively. Let nobody object that we are just trying to work the apostles in by a "roundabout method" to escape difficulties presented by leaving the apostles out of this promise. We are satisfied to leave the apostles entirely out of this particular promise. The supposed "difficulties" caused by so doing are easily explained.

Let us consider some of those objections—objections to the whole explanation we have given, not merely to leaving the apostles out.

1. "Why limit the time element in verses 17, 18, but not in verse 16?" Answer: If other passages showed that, for a limited time only, people were saved by believing and being baptized, then Mark 16:15, 16 would have to be interpreted as a promise of salvation upon those conditions for that time only. Other passages limit the one, but not the other.

2. "Jesus said: 'I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' (Matt. 28:20.) This is parallel with Mark 16:17, so the signs are to continue until the end of the world." Answer: The passages are parallel, but every item in one does not have to have its counterpart expressed in the other. We simply put the two passages together to get all items—this way:

"Gospel" and "believeth" are not synonymous with something

in Matthew, but are other items given by Mark. So with "signs shall follow" and "with you . . . unto the end of the world." These are two distinct promises—one stated by Mark, the other by Matthew. How long were the signs to follow? Christ did not say. How long was he to be "with you"? Until the end of the world.

If there is anything to this argument on parallel passages, it would ruin the position that applies the promise of Mark 16:17 to the apostles. The latter part of the promise, which says the signs would be done, seems to explain what was meant by saying the signs would follow, like this: "And these signs shall follow them that believe"—that is, "In my name shall they cast out devils," etc. The signs were to follow by being done—that is, signs following is the working of miracles. If the expression in Matt. 28:20 means the signs would follow until the end of the world, then it means they would be performed that long. But the apostles were not to live that long, so they could not be the only ones to work the signs.

To offset this and escape the conclusion that miracles can be worked today, some brethren, agreeing that Jesus did not say the signs would follow until the end of the world, make a distinction between "working signs" and "signs following." The first, they agree, has ceased; but the signs will follow (live on the record of those deeds) until the end of the world. But if Matt. 28:20 qualifies one part of the promise, the part about signs following, by the same logic, would it not have to modify the part that says signs would be done? If not, why not? The Holiness could still argue, therefore, that Jesus promised that signs could be done until the end of the world. So if their argument on parallel passages is true, it forbids limiting the promise to the apostles, even if the promise has two parts.

This argument must be met, then, whether we apply the promise to baptized believers or restrict it to the apostles. Actually, there is nothing to it; for the statement in Matt. 28:20, as we have shown, has no bearing on the promise in Mark 16:17.

3. "If the ones promised, in verse 17, these powers were the believers mentioned in verse 16, the promise applied to all of these believers." Answer: Not necessarily so. Believers, as a group, did possess such powers; but each individual did not have to. It is common to speak of a number this way: "They sang, prayed, and preached." Every person present did not do all of these, some sang, others prayed, and another preached. Perhaps some in the group did none of these. John the Baptist said: "He that cometh

after me . . . shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." (Matt. 3:11.) He was speaking to a group, but not all of them were to receive both of these. Some were to receive one; some, the other. Not all in that group were to receive even one of these.

Our position does not demand that every believer had to have even one of the gifts, much less all of them. Some did part of the signs; others, the rest. Some perhaps did none. Baptized believers who did not receive "laying on of hands" did not share in the promise of Mark 16:17; and the form used in the promise, as has been shown, allows for this. The objection that "all believers most assuredly did not have all the gifts" and that "there is no indication in the New Testament that all believers possessed the power to work even one of these wonders" simply goes for naught.

This way of referring to a group without demanding that each individual receive the things promised may account for the change from the singular "he that believeth" to the plural "them that believe." Each believer would have had to possess the gifts if Jesus had said: "These signs shall follow him that believeth," etc. Not so, though, when he switches to the plural and refers to believers as a group.

4. "This passage contained no promise of miraculous powers to the apostles, if the promise referred to the baptized believers of verse 16." Answer: We have seen one way the apostles may be included. But even if they are not included, this is no objection; for it is admitted that "this would not mean, however, that the apostles were not elsewhere promised miraculous powers." (John 14:26; Acts 1:8; and Acts 2:1-4 show when and how the apostles did receive miraculous power, and "thus we do not need to go to Mark 16:17 in order to find how" the apostles received power to work miracles.

Those who are excited about us leaving the apostles out might consider this: Our position does not leave the apostles without a promise of miraculous power; but their position, which restricts the promise to the apostles, does leave baptized believers without a promise of such powers as they actually received. They had miraculous powers (under the conditions already explained). When and where were they ever promised such, if not in Mark 16:17? No, they did not have to have a promise; they could have possessed these without a previous promise. But so could the apostles!

5. "Since the apostles were the ones who possessed these powers, they must have been the ones who were the object of the promise." Answer: Not unless the apostles were the only ones who ever

possessed these powers. Even if this proves that the apostles were objects of the promise in Mark 16:17, it does not prove that they were the only objects of that promise. Others did have miraculous powers, so they could have been objects of the same promise, as already explained.

But the fact that the apostles possessed these powers does not even prove that they were objects at all of the promise in Mark 16:17. They were "elsewhere promised miraculous powers," so they could have possessed the gifts of fulfillment of this "elsewhere" promise only.

6. "The list of special gifts possessed by early Christians does not include all the signs in Mark 16, 17; therefore, we cannot say that baptized believers had the powers promised here, so they were not objects of this promise." Answer: It cannot be shown that all of them were done by apostles, for there is no record of an apostle drinking poison. Apostles did the others, and it is inferred that they could do that one too. Well, baptized believers upon whom the apostles laid hands did some of these. Is it unsafe to infer, as our friends do with the apostles in the case of the poison, that they (some of them) could do the others too—that is, that the apostles could delegate all of these powers? Is there any reason to believe that the apostles could delegate only a part of these gifts? Is it necessary to assume that the New Testament lists every miracle performed by early Christians?

7. "Who was it, to whom the Lord was then speaking, who had not believed?" Answer: Here it is assumed that the speech in verses 15-18 was given at the appearance in verse 14. It is said that Christ "upbraided them for their unbelief. He told them (at the same time) what to do, and he promised them that if they believed (verse 17), they would be able to perform wonders." Christ had not then been upbraiding the apostles. Verse 14 happened at evening on the day Christ arose; verses 15-18, nearly forty days later. (See previous article for full discussion of this point.) So Christ, when he made this promise, was not talking to anybody who had not believed; he was talking about somebody—every creature in all the world—who had not believed.

Even if we admit that the Lord had just upbraided the apostles for their unbelief, it is still begging the question to say that verse 17, therefore, refers to them. It would first have to be shown that "them that believe," in the light of the grammar and the sequence of thought, refers to the apostles. When that is done,

then it could be said that he was telling the apostles that if they believed, they would be able to perform wonders.

Whether or not we separate verses 14 and 15 in point of time, the question to settle is this: Beginning with verse 15, whom is he speaking about that had not believed? He is speaking about every creature in the whole world, telling the apostles to make believers of them. He is not telling the apostles what will happen if they believe, but is telling them what will happen when they go and make believers of others.

8. "If these miraculous powers were to be given to all believers, they would cease to be the 'signs of an apostle.'" Answer: This may be an objection to the position of Holiness, who apply the promise to all believers of all time; but it is no complaint against our position. It is admitted that the fact that "these apostles could delegate by laying on of hands, some of these powers to one and some to another, does not make against these miraculous gifts being the specific badge of the apostles." Well, then, our explanation offers no difficulty; for the promise of Mark 16:17, according to our view, was fulfilled to baptized believers only when they had such powers delegated to them in the proper way.

9. "The apostles, in verse 20, performed signs which were the fulfillment of the promises of verses 17 and 18; therefore, the promise was to them." Answer: This would not prove that the apostles were the only ones who performed signs in fulfillment of that promise. Others, under conditions we have pointed out, did work such signs, so they might have done so in fulfillment of that promise too. This objection would mean nothing, even granting that what the apostles did in verse 20 was in fulfillment of verses 17 and 18, unless they were the only ones who ever had miraculous powers.

It is not necessary to say that the signs done by the apostles in verse 20 were in fulfillment of the promise in verse 17. The events of verses 19, 20 were not next in order after the commission was given—that is, they were not immediately after the speech in verses 15-18. Some time after the commission was given (just how long after, we do not know) Christ appeared again to the apostles, either in Jerusalem or on the Mount of Olives, and gave the discourse in Acts 1:6-9. This speech closes this way: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judaea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Immediately after this speech Christ ascended. (Acts 1:9.) So

Mark 16:19, 20 must be read this way: "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them (the instructions and promise in Acts 1:6-8, not immediately after the commission in verses 15-18), he was received up into heaven. . . . And they went forth (after they had tarried in Jerusalem ten days—that is, after Pentecost), and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."

The event in Mark 16:20 (working of signs by the apostles) was removed several days from the speech in verses 15-18. Another speech was made and another promise was given (Acts 1:6-8), before these signs were performed. The apostles did these signs after, and in fulfillment of, the promise of miraculous power in Acts 1:8, not immediately following, nor necessarily in fulfillment of, the promise in Mark 16:17. Some people mistake proximity of statements for proximity in time of occurrence.

Why Limit This to Apostles?

Why did anybody ever think of restricting this promise to the apostles? Obviously, to escape a promise of miraculous powers to baptized believers. Well, suppose their case is established, and Mark 16:17 is not a promise to baptized believers. The fact remains that early Christians did have miraculous powers, and we must still face the main issue: Does the fact that miracles were done in the early church prove that they can be done now?

It may be said that if we apply Mark 16:17 to baptized believers, the Holiness have a strong case in contending that it is a promise to believers for all time. To me, to show that the promise, even when applied to baptized believers, was not general and unlimited—that it is not a promise to believers today—is much easier than trying to prove that it refers exclusively to the apostles. About the strongest argument the Holiness can give to make it general and unlimited is the one on parallel passages (comparing Mark 16:17 with Matt. 2:20), but we have seen that this argument must be offset just the same if the promise is limited to the apostles.

Learn the facts as to how long, how, and when believers did possess miraculous powers. These facts must be explained, even if Mark 16:17 is restricted to the apostles. Having understood these facts, what could be plainer and simpler than to understand Mark 16:17 as a promise of such powers under all these conditions?

Of course, if the Holiness could establish the fact that the promise in Mark 16:17 must be, by its very nature and content, a promise for believers of all time, then nothing else could be interpreted to conflict with that. But the wording of that promise and the

context, as already shown, do not demand that it be for all time—that is, as far as the wording of the promise is concerned, one cannot tell whether it was for all time or for a limited time. It could be either way, so far as the promise itself is concerned. But when other passages teach that such gifts actually ended at a certain time, then the promise cannot be interpreted as one for believers of all ages. The promise must be interpreted by the facts, but the facts cannot be twisted or ignored just to fit an interpretation that is arbitrarily placed upon the promise. The promise is subject to two interpretations, but the facts are stubborn and immovable. And in view of the facts, the promise becomes subject to only one interpretation, and that is that these signs were promised to believers for a limited time only.

MORE ABOUT SIGNS FOLLOWING

Frank Van Dyke

Oftentimes some very interesting, even though unexpected, developments result from the discussion of main issues. Several months ago two articles by this scribe appeared in the Gospel Advocate, setting forth the idea that the promise of miraculous powers in Mark 16:17, 18 was to baptized believers. It was shown, of course, that this does not necessitate the conclusion that such miracles can be performed today.

Two points raised in reaction to these articles deserve some attention.

Interval Between Verses 14 and 15

It was shown that there was an interval of nearly forty days between verse 14, when Jesus upbraided the apostles for their unbelief, and the giving of the commission, verse 15. Many brethren assume that Christ spoke the words in verses 15-18 at the time he upbraided the apostles in verse 14. They give an exegesis like this: "Christ rebuked the apostles for not believing and told them (at the same time) that if they would believe, then they could perform miracles." This connection between verse 14 and verses 15-18 is wholly unwarranted, and the explanation based upon it collapses, if it is true that two different events—events separated by nearly forty days—are here recorded; for this being true, it is easy to see that the faith of the apostles is not under consideration when Jesus says in verse 17: "These signs shall follow them that believe."

One brother from Arkansas wrote: "To take your position and

say that there was an interval of time between verse 14 and verse 15 of Mark is merely speculative and only serves to bolster your position." Well, the brother did feel the force of this point, if it is true!

It is in order to quote some scholars on this matter. Gray and Adam's Biblical Encyclopedia, commenting on "afterward" in verse 14, says, "Still later in the same day," putting the event on the evening of the day Christ arose. B. W. Johnson likewise identifies the incident of verse 14, and then on the quotation beginning in verse 15 he says: "Probably not at the time referred to in verse 14. . . . These words may have been spoken at the great meeting in Galilee. (Verse 7; Matt. 2: 18-20.)" McGarvey, in his commentary on Matthew and Mark, after identifying the event in verse 14 with the appearance on the evening of the resurrection day, says this about verse 15: "Here there is a silent transition from the interview on the evening after the day of the resurrection, which is the subject of verse 14, to one which occurred on the day of the ascension (verse 19), forty days later (Acts 1:3). From Mark's narrative alone we would not be able to discover this transition, but would suppose that the words of Jesus in verses 15-18 were spoken at the time of the appearance in verse 14: but this is only one among many instances in which details not essential to the understanding of the chief thought to be conveyed are omitted from one narrative, but found in another."

This "speculation" about an interval between verses 14 and 15 may not be as new to some people as it is to the brother from Arkansas!

When Was Mark 16:15-18 Spoken?

It was also stated that Mark 16:15-18 was spoken on a mountain in Galilee—the same time of Matt. 28:16-20. Word has come to me that some brother (I know not who he is) complained thus: "Van Dyke says that the three accounts of the commission—Matt. 28:19, 20; Mark 16:15-18; Luke 24:46,47—are just different versions of the same speech; therefore, Van Dyke has denied verbal inspiration."

The brother should read more carefully. There is not a word in these articles about when Luke 24:46, 47 was spoken. It was not put with Matt. 28:19, 20 and Mark 16:15-18. To put Mark 16:15-18 at the time of Matt. 28:19, 20 and speak of that as the time the commission was given (when it was first and formally given) does not forbid the idea held by some scholars that Luke 24:44-47 is a record of a subsequent conversation. It was stated that some time

after the commission was given—after the meeting in Galilee, with which we connected Mark 16:15-18—Jesus appeared again to the apostles and spoke the words in Acts 1:6-8. This was not intended to mean that Acts 1:6-8 was all that was spoken at this subsequent appearance. Luke 24:44-48 may have been spoken at this time. This was not under consideration, so no effort was made to place this passage. The brother just assumed something here that was not stated in the articles.

Furthermore, the brother has inadvertently put himself in the position of denying verbal inspiration. Regardless of whether or not the three accounts of the commission are different versions of the same speech, or give different parts of the same discourse, or are records of speeches given at three different times, there are variations in different quotations of certain speeches in the Bible. Take Acts 9:6 and Acts 22:10 for example. In Acts 9:6 Luke quotes Jesus as saying to Saul: "Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." Acts 22:10, where Paul related the same thing, says: "Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do." This is just one among several variations in the different accounts of this conversation. But our brother's premise is that if the same speech is quoted differently by two or more writers, this disproves verbal inspiration. Is he prepared to accept the consequences of his criticism? Verily, as he is reported to have said, one should watch things like this! (The purpose here is not to discuss how to harmonize, or explain, such variations in the light of verbal inspiration. Let the brother do this, and then he should see that his criticism would be groundless even if the three accounts of the commission were different records of the same speech.)

Scholars are not agreed on whether Mark 16:15-18 was spoken at the time of Matt. 28:19, 20 or in the conversation immediately preceding the ascension. B. W. Johnson, as already quoted, says: "These words may have been spoken of the great meeting in Galilee." "The Fourfold Gospel," by McGarvey and Pendleton, also puts Mark 16:15-18 and Matt. 28:19, 20 together on the mountain in Galilee. In his commentary on Matthew and Mark, an earlier work, McGarvey has Mark 16:15-18 as a part of the conversation just before the ascension with Luke 24:46-48 and Acts 1:4-9.

In the previous articles the chronological order of "The Fourfold Gospel" was followed, and this, to me, seems to be the more satisfactory arrangement. Anyway, if it is incorrect to put Mark 16:15-18 at the same time as Matt. 28:19, 20, this is only an error

in chronological arrangement—it most certainly is not a denial of verbal inspiration to do so.

McGarvey on "These Things Shall Follow"

Commenting on the promise of miraculous power in Mark 16: 17, McGarvey says: "The promise is, not that these signs shall follow for any specified time, nor that they should follow each individual believer; but merely that they shall follow, and follow 'the believers' taken as a body. They did follow the believers during the apostolic age—not every individual believer, but all, or nearly all, the organized bodies of the believers. This was a complete fulfillment of what was promised." My ideas to a nicety! The exegesis given in the previous articles may not be as strange among reputable Bible scholars as some think it is.

APPENDIX II

EXCERPTS FROM "THIS IS THAT"

Aimee Semple McPherson published a book called "This Is That" (Los Angeles, Calif., The Bridal Call Publishing House, Sept. 1, 1921). I have copied the following "interesting" items from this book.

1. Abandoning her husband

One of the conditions under which she entered one of her marriages was that if she got the call "to go to Africa or India, or to the Islands of the Sea, no matter where or when, I must obey God first of all. To this he agreed and we were married under these conditions, and settled down in a furnished apartment." (p. 80). Paul taught that "the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while he liveth" (Rom. 7:2).

At the time she left this husband there were two babies in the home and the "husband, who has not the baptism and is not even seeking it." (p. 82). Paul said "the woman that hath an unbelieving husband, and he is content to dwell with her, let her not leave her husband." "For how knowest thou, O wife, whether thou shalt save thy husband?" (1 Cor. 7:13, 16). "Art thou bound unto a wife? seek not to be loosed." (1 Cor. 7:27). The same, of course, would apply unto the woman. This is the word of God and any call that pretends to be from God which violates this teaching is not from God.

Aimee Semple McPherson received a call, she said from God, and she left her husband. "Mother now being in Canada, I tele-

graphed there for money; and when alone in the house one night, 'phoned for a taxicab, and at eleven o'clock bundled my two babies inside while the chauffeur piled the two suitcases on top, and away we sped to catch the midnight train for home and mother. To make a new start and begin all over again it seemed the most natural thing in the world to go back to the starting place from which I had set out before. God was with me and I was conscious of His leading and support at every step." (p. 87). This was her obedience to the call to preach the gospel (p. 87). "Setting forth alone—at midnight—almost running away" (p. 88). "I was still in the darkness of the tunnel, but I saw the door, and beacon light of God's dear sunlight—His smile of approval, and I was running toward it." "I was obeying God . . ." (p. 89).

II. Having the Holy Spirit while in disobedience

Peter and the apostles said that "we are witnesses of these things; and so is the Holy Spirit, whom God hath given to them that obey him." (Acts 5:32). They did not intimate that God gave the Holy Spirit to the disobedient.

Mrs. McPherson wrote "All through the months of my disobedience to God, the Holy Spirit never left me, but had prayed through me in tongues many times, and was indeed an abiding Comforter." (p. 92).

III. Power of "the Spirit"?

Doubtless people in her meetings received something but the descriptions given of the effect on them indicates that it was not the Spirit of God.

"Before I knew it I was on my back in the straw, under the power" (p. 93). "I was laughing and weeping and shaking." (p. 93). "Immediately the brother fell to the ground and was speaking in tongues before he reached it." (pp. 93-94). "As they spoke the power of God struck them both; one fell one way, and one the other, and lay stretched out under the power shouting and glorifying God." (p. 95). "At that instant the power of God struck the aunt, and sent her reeling to the floor. Who was she that she could withstand God?" (p. 156. This one was being punished). "Another little tot of six years, suddenly filled with the power, began to dance in a pretty, childish way." (p. 157). "Two young ladies had fallen prostrate under power". Again: "Hastening back to see what it was, I found this same Methodist class leader lying on his back under the power—no, I should hardly say on his back, either, for he was really just on his head and his

heels, his body raised up from the ground by the power and his feet going round and round." (p. 159).

God is not the author of such confusion.

APPENDIX III

Was It a Lack of Faith?

We regret that Mrs. Aimee Semple McPherson passed on without renouncing, in so far as we know, the false doctrines which she had so long and widely taught. The circumstances of her death, if the newspaper reports are true, are such as to argue for an abandonment of her false doctrine of "divine healing". The "modern healers" frequently quote, and apply to believers today, the promise in Mark 16:17-18. And this passage says that "if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them". And yet, Mrs. McPherson's death was due in part to the effects of sleeping tablets. The fact that this took place, as well as the fact that she should need sleeping tablets, is an argument against her position as a "divine healer". It is more than an argument. It is a demonstration. Mark 16:18 certainly did not apply in this case. Furthermore, God could cure a person of anything that caused sleeplessness if He so desired. "Healers" have told some poor people, who were not cured by them, that their trouble is a lack of faith. Did a lack of faith have anything to do with her death? We bid her followers to think on these things. Our prayer is that they will turn from false doctrines to the truth.

APPENDIX IV

A CHALLENGE

The apostles had the power to raise the dead and if these "healers" have miraculous power as did the apostles they should be able to raise the dead. We are willing to raise as many as they can. Let us go to such tombs as that of Lazarus, and if they will raise the first one we shall raise the second one, and so on. This challenge is not as foolish as it may sound, for if they have the power they claim to have they can raise the dead; put us to shame and defeat; and convince us and others of their power.

A. J. Pollock well wrote the following challenge and invitation, which we endorse: Let any of the healers ask some Christian gentlemen and doctors to follow up and investigate the cases of healings which they performed a year ago. And let "all of us abide

by the result. If this work is the mighty testimony to the power of God, surely such a test should not be shrunk from. If it is not forthcoming, we may well draw our own conclusions." (A. J. Pollock, *Modern Pentecostalism*, p. 50). If the healers complain that the test would not be fair because it might be conducted by men who did not believe in the doctrine of healing taught by the "healer", we reply that if they really wrought miracles anyone, both believer and unbeliever, could see that they had done so. The enemies of Jesus did not deny His miracles, they attributed them to the power of the devil. Peter told the Jews, who had had a part in the crucifixion of Christ, that they knew that Jesus had worked miracles (Acts 2:22). The enemies of the apostles could not deny that the lame man had been healed (Acts 3:1-12). "And seeing the man that was healed standing with them, they could say nothing against it. But when they had commanded them to go aside out of the council, they conferred among themselves, saying, what shall we do to these men? for that indeed a notable miracle had been wrought through them, is manifested to all that dwell in Jerusalem" (Acts 4:14-16). So even perverse enemies, as well as the Christians, could see that a miracle had been wrought.

APPENDIX V

DR. BEBE PATTEN'S WITNESS AGAINST THE HOLY SPIRIT

Dr. Bebe Patten has been conducting in Oakland, California a series of services which have been widely publicized.¹ She claims to be sent of God and baptized in the Holy Spirit. Since she is before the public the public has the right to examine her credentials to see whether or not she is sent of God. This brief examination is conducted with malice toward none and with love for all who are entangled in error. Have the courage to examine the claims of all religious teachers by the Bible. Instead of regarding us as an enemy because we tell you the truth, search the Scriptures daily whether or not these things be so for only the truth brings freedom (Gal. 4:16; Acts 17:11-12; John 8:32). The truth has nothing to fear from either public or private investigation. In fact, those who fear such an investigation, even when conducted on a Christian plane, are not of the truth for the truth courts investigation and comes to the light. Speaking of public investigations, we would be glad to engage in such an investigation with those

¹This was written in 1944. She was still in Oakland the last I heard of her.

who claim the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit. If they will affirm the following in a public discussion we shall deny it. Resolved: The miraculous baptism of the Holy Spirit, with manifestations such as tongues and healing, should be enjoyed by Christians today. Paul was not afraid to publicly discuss the truth and defend it. Jude said to contend earnestly for the faith (Jude 3). Such a public discussion would be a fine way to help others in their search for the truth. We are willing to engage in such a discussion in which principles, not personalities, are discussed.

We shall briefly examine the claims of Mrs. Patten. We shall consider some of the things which she has written as well as examine one of her miracles. In a meeting which we attended, Mrs. Patten said that she did not go to a city to hold a revival unless the Spirit told her to go. If she is so careful to wait for the Spirit's leading with reference to this, it is hardly likely that she would write a book, or books, without the Spirit leading her to write. Then, too, if she has the baptism and miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost and if she is moved by the Spirit to write, what she writes should be in harmony with the teaching of the Spirit as revealed through the Bible.

I. The Baptism of the Holy Spirit and Miraculous Manifestations

"There is just as great a need today for the Baptism of the Holy Ghost as in the days of the disciples, perhaps an even greater need." (Bebe H. Patten, *This is That*, 3). She claims this baptism (p. 39). She claims believers have the miraculous gifts today (See her book, *Healing Power in Jesus' Name*). If she has the baptism of the Spirit and the miraculous gifts today it must be for the same purpose as the apostles had them in the first century. Are such gifts needed now as they were then? No!

The baptism and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit enabled the apostles, and other inspired men, to reveal and to write the New Testament. Jesus promised the apostles that the Spirit would come and bring to their remembrance all that He had taught them (John 14:26). They did not have the written New Testament and they received the Holy Spirit that they might be guided into all truth (John 16:7-13) and thus be enabled to give the revealed will of God in writing unto the church. Thus it is evident that: First, if Mrs. Patten has the baptism and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit she should be able to give at least part of the teaching of the New Testament without having studied the written New Testament. The Spirit brought all that Jesus taught to the remembrance

of the apostles. Does the Spirit do that for Mrs. Patten? No, whatever she learns about God and Christ the Lord must be learned through following that which was revealed through the inspired men of the first century. If she has the baptism and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit she should be able to remember, and to quote to us, a large portion of the teaching of Jesus. Let her try it and her failure will reveal that she does not have what Christ promised the apostles. Second, since the apostles were guided into all truth anything that contradicts their doctrine is not a part of divine truth. Anyone who teaches something else, and who claims to be guided by the Spirit, is to be rejected (Rev. 2:2).

Mrs. Patten contradicts the teaching of the Spirit as it is revealed in the Bible. She has either borne false witness concerning the Spirit, by testifying that the Spirit taught something when the Spirit did not teach it; or if she is right the Holy Spirit has borne false witness concerning Himself, for if she is right the Spirit has taught contradictory doctrines! The Holy Spirit has revealed in the teaching of Jesus Christ that religious division is wrong. Jesus prayed for a visible unity of earth of believers and Paul condemned religious division which maintained human names (John 17:20-; 1 Cor. 1:10-12; Eph. 4:1-6). Thus it is evident that the Spirit, unless He contradicted Himself, would not sanction the religious division which exists in the world today. The Holy Spirit which established the church of Christ, the body of Christ, through the apostles in the first century would certainly not sanction the denominations which have been established by man since that time and which cause and perpetuate religious division among professed believers. And yet, if Mrs. Patten is right the Holy Spirit has approved denominationalism in that He baptized people and then failed to guide them into the truth concerning denominationalism. The Spirit, Mrs. Patten correctly wrote, reveals the truth of God (This is That, 32). The truth of God is that believers ought to be one (John 17:20). However, Mrs. Patten teaches that the Spirit baptized individuals in different denominations and left them in those denominations, or started new ones, and failed to inform them that such religious division is wrong. Furthermore, Mrs. Patten claimed that the Spirit baptized and gave miraculous gifts to various individuals who, we find, taught contradictory doctrines. The Spirit is thus made to approve in one what it condemns in another. One of two things is true: First, either the Holy Spirit has borne false witness concerning Himself by revealing one doctrine to one person and a contradictory doctrine to an-

other person. Second, Mrs. Patten has borne false witness, wittingly or unwittingly, concerning the Spirit for she, after claiming the baptism and miraculous gifts of the Spirit, teaches that the Spirit baptized certain individuals although the Spirit did not baptize them. Let us now consider some of the doctrines taught by groups which were guided, in part at least, by men whom she said received the baptism and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit.

(1) Presbyterians

Dr. Patten made some references to the work of the Spirit among certain Presbyterians which indicated that some of them, at certain times, had received the baptism and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit (This Is That, 14). These people remained in the Presbyterian Church, their baptism and gifts of the Spirit (?), did not lead them out of it and thus it sanctioned their doctrine although their doctrine contradicts, in some places, the Bible. Does Mrs. Patten accept the following doctrines? If they are not scriptural, why didn't the Spirit lead these people out of the Presbyterian Church?

(1) Predestination of particular individuals. "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated and fore ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed: and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." (p. 22).

(2) Impossibility of total apostasy. "They whom God hath accepted in His Beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the end, and be eternally saved. This perseverance of the saints depends, not upon their own free-will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father . . ." (pp. 68-69). Mrs. Patten wrote a booklet against this doctrine.

(3) Immersion not necessary. "Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person." (p. 106). But Paul said that we are buried and raised in baptism (Rom. 6:2-; Col. 2:12).

(4) Infant baptism, "Not only those that do actually profess faith in, and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized." (p. 106) (The quo-

tations are taken from The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. Philadelphia: 1894).

(2) Jonathan Edwards

Mrs. Patten referred to Jonathan Edwards, a Congregationalist minister, as being one of the examples of the results of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit in America (This Is That, 15). When the Spirit guided the apostles of Christ He did not guide them into the Congregational Church. However, according to this Jonathan Edwards was baptized in the Holy Spirit but the Spirit left him in the Congregational Church. If he did have the baptism of the Holy Spirit what he and the Congregational Church taught must be approved by God for certainly His Spirit would not guide them into the error if He baptized them. Let us see what the Congregational Church taught.

- (1) They did not believe in women preachers. Mrs. Patten wrote a book to prove that it is scriptural for women to be preachers.
- (2) They sprinkled instead of immersed.
- (3) They sprinkled infants.
- (4) Days of miracles have ceased (Henry M. Dexter, Congregationalism, Boston: Nichols and Noyes, 1865, p. 47. George Punched, A View of Congregationalism, Salem: Dexter, 74).
- (5) Gifts of healing not a permanent element in the church (Dexter, 74).
- (6) Tongues have ceased (Dexter, 76).
- (7) Predestination (Dexter, 163).
- (8) Cannot fall from grace so as to finally perish (Dexter, 163). This directly contradicts the position of Mrs. Patten that it is possible to fall from grace so as to be finally lost. She wrote a book which endeavored to prove this point.

We shall now notice a few of Jonathan Edwards' doctrines which, of course, embraced the above doctrines which were a part of congregationalism.

(1) Jonathan Edwards was a strict Calvinist who taught "the doctrine of absolute, eternal, personal election." (The Works of President Edwards, (New York: Leavitt, Trow and Co., MDCCC-XLIV, Vol. II, 178). He taught that Christ really died for only this pre-determined number. "As appears by what has been now shown, God has the actual salvation or redemption of a certain number in his proper, absolute design, and of a certain number only; and therefore such a design only can be prosecuted in any

thing God does, in order to the salvation of men. God pursues a proper design of the salvation of the elect in giving Christ to die, and prosecutes such a design with respect to no other, most strictly speaking"; (II: 179). Edwards also taught that man had no free will (II:180); the necessary perseverance of the saints for "their appointment to salvation must be absolute" and thus they could not fall from grace (II: 179, 180); and the "innate, sinful depravity of the heart" so that man was born debased and corrupt and even the "one day old" is a sinner (II:309, 326).

(3) Doctrines of John Wesley

John Wesley, Mrs. Patten maintained, was baptized in the Holy Spirit (This is That, 12-13). Let us see what the Spirit had guided him into.

(1) We are born depraved. "And in Adam all died, all human kind, all the children of men who were then in Adam's loins. The natural consequence of this is, that every one descended from him comes into the world spiritually dead, dead to God, wholly dead in sin; entirely void of the life of God; void of the image of God, of all that righteousness and holiness wherein Adam was created. Instead of this, every man born into the world now bears the image of the devil, in pride and self will; the image of the beast, in sensual appetites and desires. This then is the foundation of the new birth,—the entire corruption of our nature." (John Wesley, Sermons, Vol. I:401 (New York: Phillips and Hunt). Remember he is talking about infants being born in such a condition. Does such a doctrine come from the Holy Spirit or from a man miraculously baptized in the Spirit?

(2) Infant baptism (The Works of John Wesley, IX:159-).

(3) Infants cannot be saved in the ordinary way unless their sins are washed away by baptism (IX:159).

(4) Sprinkling (IX:491, 523).

(5) Unscriptural for women to preach (IX:112). John Wesley, according to Mrs. Patten, was baptized in the Spirit and he taught that women should not be preachers. Mrs. Patten also claims to be baptized in the Spirit and she is a woman preacher and maintains that the Holy Spirit approves her in being a public, pulpit preacher of the gospel!

(4) THE IRVING MOVEMENT

Mrs. Patten wrote that "another outpouring of the Holy Spirit in Pentecostal fashion occurred in the 19th Century under the leadership of Edward Irving . . ." (This is That, 11). Mrs. Patten should

know because she also is supposed to have, according to her claim, the baptism and gifts of the Spirit. However, it is doubtful if the spirit in her will accept all taught by the spirit that was in Irving. Notice some of Irving's teaching.

(1) The Roman Catholics a part of the Church (The Collected Writings of Edward Irving, V:499-500) (G. Carlyle, a nephew of Irving, published the Works. London: Alexander Strahan and Co. 1864).

(2) Irving taught that the church today must have living apostles (I.433).

(3) Gift of tongues for all. "That so becoming, there is not any believer in the Lord Jesus Christ who ought not to desire and to pray for, and who may not expect, the gift of tongues for his own spiritual edification; and being received he ought to use it privately and frequently for his own spiritual edification, but not in the meetings of the church, unless there be interpretation at hand." (V:559). ". . . this gift of tongues and prophesying, which is its fruit, are the constant demonstrations of God dwelling in a man, and teaching him all spiritual things by the Holy Ghost, without help of any third thing or third party." (V:558). Paul taught that all did not have the gift of tongues (1 Cor. 12:28-30). Mrs. Patten agreed with Paul on this point (This is That, 35). What spirit made Irving say otherwise? What spirit made Mrs. Patten say that Irving received the Holy Spirit? The Holy Ghost reveals the truth of God ((This is That, 32). How, then, was this revealed to Irving.

(4) Christ to come in 1864.

There are two points in the teaching of Irving which Mrs. Patten should heed. He taught that devils sometimes used the tongues of men (V:461). He also taught, in one of his saner moments, that doctrine, and not miracles, must be the final test of the preacher. There were some who maintained that superhuman works were necessarily of God. "If this were true, why is it that, when the churches are so often told to try the spirits, not the workings of miracles, but the doctrines taught, are given as the tests? This wide-spread error, I perceive, will be a great means of laying the Church open to those great signs and wonders which the false Christs and false prophets, prophesied to appear in the time of the end, shall work." (V:531).

II. Mrs. Patten Versus the Holy Spirit

We have already shown that Mrs. Patten teaches something that the Spirit did not do, when she teaches that the Spirit bap-

ized the persons she mentioned in "This Is That." If He baptized one of them, He did not baptize the others for they contradict each other. However, we are persuaded that He did not baptize any of them since they taught things which are contrary to that doctrine which the Spirit revealed through the inspired men of the first century. We want to notice here some more points in which she contradicts the Spirit.

(1) The Holy Spirit speaking through the apostles of Christ never told any sinner, who was seeking salvation, that he must come to the altar and pray for God to save him. The Spirit always told them what to do and what they did embraced faith, repentance and baptism into Christ. She gives them the altar call, but the Spirit never did it.

(2) The Spirit never indicated that any person was a Christian until they had been baptized into Christ (Acts 2:38; 22:16; Gal. 3:27; Mark 16:16). Mrs. Patten testified that "We are not baptized in water to make us a Christian, but we are baptized because we are a Christian." (This Is That, 29). We challenge her to find one place where the Spirit referred to any individual as a Christian before that individual was baptized. She contradicts the Spirit and thus she cannot have the baptism and gifts of the Spirit.

Mrs. Patten's statement teaches a person is saved before he is baptized for she maintains that one is a Christian before baptism. The Holy Spirit always put salvation after baptism when baptism and salvation are mentioned in the same passage (Acts 2:38; 22:16; 1 Pet. 3:21). If she was guided by the Holy Spirit she would place salvation after and not before baptism. She does not do it, therefore she is not guided by the Spirit. Jesus said that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" (Mark 16:16). Mrs. Patten teaches that "he that believeth and is saved should be baptized." Which statement do you accept? Whom do you believe? You cannot believe them both so you must reject one or the other. The Spirit guided Jesus when He made His statement and therefore the Spirit could not be guiding Mrs. Patten in her statement.

(3) Mrs. Patten teaches that faith is necessary in order to be healed (Healing Power in Jesus Name, five pages beyond the middle of the book). What faith did Lazarus have when he was dead that Christ would raise him? (John 11:43). What faith did the man exercise who was both blind and dumb? (Matt. 12:22).

(4) The Spirit guided the apostles into all truth that they

might reveal and write the New Testament (John 14:26; 16:7-13). The New Testament was not written when they started, they wrote it. If Mrs. Patten has the baptism of the Holy Spirit, if she speaks and writes as the Spirit gives utterance (Acts 2:1-4), what she writes should be considered as inspired Scripture and should be bound in with the Bible. As far as I know, she does not claim to write "more Bible." However, she is inconsistent for the baptism and gifts of the Holy Spirit enabled the apostles to do it, and if she has the baptism she should be enabled. If Mrs. Patten has the baptism and gifts of the Spirit, why doesn't she reveal new truth as did the apostles who had the baptism and gifts? Her argument on the sameness of Jesus should force her to claim inspiration and revelation. She said: "Therefore, that leads us to the conclusion that if Christ healed in the 'yesterdays' when He walked the shores of Galilee, then He heals today and will for ever. Just because He is not here in the flesh does not hinder His working in the body as well as the soul." (Healing Power In Jesus' Name). Why not argue: That if He gave revelations and more Scriptures in Paul's day that He will do it today; and that since the baptism and gifts of the Holy Spirit enabled men to reveal more Scriptures then, that it will do it today? Why not argue that since Jesus was in the flesh in Palestine centuries ago that He must be here today. These statements are the logical conclusions of her argument on the sameness of Jesus. We believe that Jesus is the same but that does not mean that He shall grant revelation, and miraculous powers to confirm revelation, to each generation.

(6) The sick are brought to Mrs. Patten and she anoints them with oil. However, during the days of miracles the elders anointed the sick with oil (Jas. 5:14). Elders are selected from men and not from women (Titus 1:5-6; 1 Tim. 3:1). Where can Mrs. Patten find where any women were told, in the New Testament, to anoint the sick with oil and heal them?

III. The Buddy Baker Healing

The Patten Revivalist, in an issue of April 1944, contained an account of "One of the Greatest Miracles of This Age!" It was the healing of Buddy Baker, age 14, on February 25, 1944. As we examine this miracle we have no hard things to say about Buddy Baker for he is sincere. He thinks that he was healed after the New Testament order, but in this he is sincerely mistaken. Let us examine this case. Brother Edward H. Moore, W. Curtis Porter, Carroll Cannon, and I were all there that night

Buddy Baker was healed. Some two or three weeks after the healing, I forget the exact number of days, Brother W. Curtis Porter and I visited Buddy Baker in his home on 5115 East 14th St., Oakland, Calif. The following are facts which can be checked. Indeed, when one of the members of Elim Tabernacle—where the revival started—told his brother about the case his report was substantially like ours although some of the things we shall mention he may not have known.

(1) The boy had had similar operations in times past and, after a period of time, had been able to walk some without crutches.

(2) Buddy Baker said that on the night he went to Dr. Patten's service "I was unable to walk on crutches, but I could stand with them." We think that Buddy Baker will recall, when we remind him, that before the healing took place he did walk across the stage after the altar call was given and as he went up to be prayed with and to pray.

(3) The doctor, who was treating the boy, told Brother W. Curtis Porter over the phone that the boy would have been able to walk without his crutches the last time that he had seen the boy. The doctor made this statement before he knew that claims had been made that the boy was healed.

(4) Although the boy laid aside his crutches, the night he was healed, he limped off the stage. He was assisted by the hand rail as he came down the steps off the stage.

(5) When we visited the boy, two or three weeks later, he still limped.

(6) His leg had not returned to its normal size.

(7) The place which the doctor had cut open in the operation had not yet completely healed.

(8) The boy still kept a dressing on the leg and also vaseline, or some preparation like that, in order to keep the cloth from sticking to the wound.

We do not doubt the boy's sincerity. It may even be that the boy received, in the healing service, such a psychological stimulus that his recovery has been somewhat hastened; but the point which we emphasize is that it was not a healing like those performed by the apostles of Christ. Two outstanding characteristics of their healings were that they were complete and instantaneous. They were healed the selfsame hour (Matt. 8:13, 3; 9:27-30). It was not a case of gradual recovery. They were completely healed, they were made whole (Matt. 9:21-22). The withered hand was "restored whole, like as the other" (Matt. 12:13). Two or three

weeks after his healing Buddy Baker's leg had not returned to its normal size and become like as the other. A lame man was given "perfect soundness in the presence of you all" (Acts 3:16). This was not the case with Buddy Baker; in fact, weeks later he did not have perfect soundness.

It may be one of Mrs. Patten's greatest miracles, but if it is then we know how utterly unlike the miracles of Christ, are the "miracles" of this age. This all goes to prove our point that people today do not have the power the apostles of Christ had to heal. If they do, they are certainly not using the power! And even if Mrs. Patten had met with perfect success in this healing it would have been a slam on all of the cures which she has not performed for why should she have success in one and failure in another. On that same night of Feb. 25, 1944 one of the men who was anointed with oil, and who had taken off his glasses before the anointing, could not find his way unassisted off the stage and he put his glasses back on after coming off the stage. A girl who supposedly had passed out under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and who was caught by Mrs. Patten as she fell backwards, was lying on the floor and keeping time, with one of her hands, with the music while she was supposed to be "out." Friends, Mrs. Patten may shout and scream but she cannot in that manner cover her failure to heal according to the New Testament pattern or her failure to teach the gospel plan of salvation.

IV. Psalms 103:1-3

David said: "Bless the Lord, O my soul: and all that is within me, bless his holy name. Bless the Lord, O my Soul, and forget not all his benefits: who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction" (Psa. 10:1-4). This Old Testament passage does not necessarily tell us what God will do under the New Testament. We have to go to the New Testament to know of a certainty what He has promised to perform today. Dr. Bingham made some observations on this passage which are worthy of consideration. First, it does not say that God heals just through supernatural means. He could heal through means, natural means, and it would still be God who did the healing. Second, "If we accept the rendering of verse 5 (Psa. 103) in the Authorized Version, 'Who satisfieth thy mouth with good things: so that thy youth is renewed like the eagle's, it might indicate one of God's ways of 'divine healing' for David. God undertook to guide the diet of His people in becoming their Healer, and He had promised, 'He shall bless thy bread and thy

water: and I will take sickness away from the midst of thee.' (Ex. 23:25)," (Rowland V. Bingham, "The Bible and the Body," pp. 48-49). "We can challenge anyone to bring evidence that when David praised God for healing all his diseases he excluded those natural means and methods which we have in our previous chapter proved that God ordained and revealed to His people." (Ibid., p. 49). Third, "inasmuch as the prophets frequently use the terms 'healing' and 'health' in a spiritual sense, we do not think it a strained method of interpretation that when David is addressing his soul, and then refers to its healing, he may have had in mind that spiritual restoration which he had experienced. David elsewhere used it in that sense. No one thinks he was speaking of physical health when he said, 'Heal my soul; for I have sinned against thee,' in the 41st Psalm (verse 4), nor is it necessary to assume physical healing in this the 103rd Psalm." (Ibid., p. 49). Fourth, we have elsewhere shown that pain is one of the "former things" which shall not pass away until God makes all things new (Rev. 20:4).

V. 2 Chron. 16:12

Of Asa it is said that "in his disease he sought not the Lord, but to the physicians." (2 Chron. 16:12). This has been used to prove that God's people today should not use physicians. Of what use, then, was Luke the beloved physician? Bingham pointed out that God, using Asa and his son, once smote the Ethiopians (2 Chron. 14:11-12). In another battle Asa sought help of the king of Syria instead of turning to the Lord; and he lost (2 Chron. 16:7). Asa did not lose because he used means, he had used them in the battle in which he had had the help of the Lord, but because he sought the help of a foreign king and not God. Just so "Asa's sin was not that he used means (in his effort to be healed), but that instead of turning to the priests of the Lord who were the appointed physicians of Israel (Deut. 24:8) he 'sought not to the Lord,' but to the physicians. Anyone who knows what the physicians of heathendom are will know why God would condemn those who turned from the light of His law and the guidance of His priests to such aid. Under similar conditions a later prophet of God remonstrated in his pathetic appeal in the words: 'Is there no balm in Gilead: is there no physician there?' In the same connection he says: 'Is not Jehovah in Zion? Is not her King in her? Why have they provoked me to anger with their graven images, and with foreign vanities.' (Jer. 8:16-22)." ("The Bible and the Body," pp. 50-51).

How can the use of physicians, and whatever natural means they are able to prepare and use for our recovery, be wrong when Jesus said that the sick need the physician (Matt. 9:12); the good Samaritan used medical means (Luke 10:34, 36, 37); Luke was the beloved physician (Col. 4:14); and Timothy took some kind of a wine for medical purposes (1 Tim. 5:23)?

VI. Matt. 10:7, 8; Luke 10:8, 9

These commissions do not teach that Christians today can work miracles. Matt. 10:7, 8 applied to the apostles (Matt. 10:1), and Luke 10:8, 9 applied to the seventy who were sent out. They were under a limited commission which was later superseded by the great commission which embraced the whole world (Matt. 28:18-20). The limited commission was to the Israelites, and they were not to go to the Gentiles, and yet modern "healers" go to the Gentiles. The apostles raised the dead under that commission as well as under the commission which embraced the whole world. Under the limitation commission they were sent out without silver or gold, but many modern "healers" go out well supplied along this line. In fact, they have more success with silver and gold than with healing. Under the limited commission the apostles preached that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. Under the great commission the kingdom is preached as already in existence.

VII. Whately on Miraculous Faith

People who believe in Christ today do not have the faith which is mentioned in the verse which Whately quotes and on which he comments. If this speaks of faith in Christ such as one must have to be saved, then no one today has faith, or is saved, since no one today can do to the fig-tree that which was done by the Lord. So evidently it does not refer to saving faith, specially in view of the fact that even in the first century Christians did not all have such power, and yet they had faith in Christ otherwise they could not have been Christians.

This passage from Whately is taken from his "Essays on Some of the Difficulties in the Writings of the Apostle Paul, and in other parts of the New Testament." 5th Edition. London: B. Fellowes, Ludgate St., 1845, pp. 347-355.

"When our Lord said to his disciples, "If ye have Faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig-tree, but also, if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be cast into the sea, it shall be done," it is plain that the Faith, which in this and in several other passages He was inculcating on them, is not to be understood of mere belief in Jesus as the Mes-

siah, or in the doctrines of his religion; or of trust, generally, in divine power and goodness. It evidently has reference to miraculous powers, such as are not bestowed on all Christians; though Faith, in another sense, is required of all. But in this and other declarations of like import, there can be little doubt that our Saviour had in view, confidence in those admonitions and injunctions which his disciples and many others of the early Christians from time to time received, authorizing and empowering them to work certain miracles. Their extraordinary gifts were not (as those of Christ Himself were) at their own command. Even Paul, who performed so many mighty works, and, among others, possessed the gift of healing in a high degree, yet was not always permitted to exert this gift, even in favour of his dearest friends.¹ A special commission seems to have been requisite to enable them to exercise their delegated powers. And this was conveyed to them,—their commission and call to perform miracles, was announced to them,—in various ways. During our Lord's abode on earth in the flesh, He Himself, whose authority they could not doubt, uttered commands to this purpose with his own lips. Besides the general commission given to the Apostles and to the Seventy, we find Him on one occasion giving a precise direction to Peter to cast a hook into the sea, and to take the fish that first came up, in whose mouth he should find the piece of money (a Stater) which the exigency required: in another instance, He, at the request of the same Apostle, commanded him to come and meet Him on the surface of the water. Peter seems to have well understood that his Master's command was at once requisite and sufficient to enable him to tread the waves without sinking. But even after he had begun to experience the efficacy of that command, his faith was shaken by alarm, and he began to sink, and was reproached by his Master for his doubts. The faith in which he was in this instance found deficient, seems to have been precisely that which our Lord on other occasions so earnestly inculcated.

After our Lord's ascension, some other kind of indication must have been given, by which those who were on each occasion authorized to work any miracle, might know that they were thus empowered. A species of revelation, in short, must have been bestowed, informing them what they were enabled and required to perform; and in this revelation they were required to have a full faith. Whatever mode may have been, in each case, employed for conveying this revelation, the indication given must al-

¹See 2 Tim. 4:20.

ways have been something in which they could not be mistaken—something as free from all doubt or suspicion as the words which they heard Jesus utter while with them; since otherwise, this unhesitating faith could not reasonably have been required of them. It must have been something, therefore, which could not possibly be confounded with any suggestions of their own minds.

This is a point concerning which we have no precise statements in Scripture; but the nature of the case puts it, I think, beyond a doubt, that the intimations or signs we are speaking of, must always have been accompanied by, or connected with, something sensibly miraculous. For otherwise we must suppose the disciples to have been left exposed to a double danger; that if mistaking any remarkable dream, or impression on their waking minds, from natural causes, for a communication from the Spirit; in which case they would have given faith to a delusion, and have been disappointed in their expectations, contrary to our Lord's express promise: and that of mistaking, on the other hand, some heavenly communication for an ordinary dream or thought; in which case they would have failed in faith without any fault of their own. God certainly would not leave his servants in any such uncertainty; and they could not possibly be secured from it in any way but by the intervention of sensible miracles.

I have said, however, that the intimation in question must be either accompanied by, or connected with some sensible miracle, because such a proof to the party concerned, of his not being deluded, as would be necessary in the first instance, might be dispensed with afterwards, when some particular mode of communication had been once stamped, as it were, with the signature of divinity, by some plainly miraculous accompaniment.² A particular sort of internal sensation, for instance, or mental emotion, which a man might experience, however strikingly different it might be from his ordinary feelings, he would be very rash in regarding as a signal of inspiration; since he could not possibly tell that it was not a symptom of disease, or of some other natural change; but if he experienced something of this kind in immediate connexion with a miraculous phenomenon, to which senses, and those of others, could testify, the recurrence of this peculiar sensation or perception afterwards, would then be of itself justly regarded by him as a heaven-sent intimation. For instance, a man may dream, or if in an excited state of mind, may fancy, that he

²"Hind's History." &c. p. 187. Vol. I.

hears a voice addressing him, when there is no such thing; but when Paul, on his road to Damascus, was struck to the ground, and blinded by a blaze of light, he thus received the assurance of a sensible miracle; then it was that he heard himself addressed in the awful voice of the Lord Jesus. He afterwards, as he tells us, received from Him, at various times, revelations concerning the Gospel. Now if, as is most probable, this revelation was communicated to him by that same voice,—(even though unaccompanied by the supernatural light)—a voice which could not but be strongly impressed on his memory,—he would be in no more danger of delusion, than any of us, in holding communication with a well-known friend.

Again, when two of the disciples met with their Master lately risen from the grave, as they were going to Emmaus, their senses were at first preternaturally obscured, so that they did not recognize Him; but they seem to have experienced, while He was talking with them, a certain remarkable inward sensation, not noticed by them at the time, which they described by their "hearts burning within them." Now this may indeed have been no more than a natural and ordinary emotion, elicited by the interesting character of the discourse they were hearing: it may, however, have been something peculiar; and the remarkable circumstances of the case (especially their eyes being "holden that they should not know Him,") render this not very improbable. It is certainly not impossible; and therefore at any rate we may frame such a supposition for illustration's sake: suppose then, as is at least conceivable, this were a sensation altogether different from any thing they had ever before experienced; its recurrence on any subsequent occasion, would be justly regarded by them, from the miraculous circumstances accompanying its first occurrence, as a token of their Lord's presence, though unseen, and a notice that they were to regard as a communication from his Spirit, the ideas conveyed to their minds through this vehicle.

Whether in this particular instance the fact were or were not such as I have supposed, makes no difference to the present argument; the object being only to illustrate my meaning. [See "Elements of Rhetoric." Part. I, Chap. III. § 3.] It is worth observing, however, that our Lord must have had some design in thus presenting Himself to his disciples invisible;—invisible that is, as their Master, Jesus:—and his design, or at least part of it, may have been, to teach them the meaning of a certain peculiar internal impression, denoting his presence in the Spirit. If so, the sensa-

tion, and its peculiarity, their own consciousness would testify; its meaning would be explained to them by their Lord's afterwards opening their eyes, so that they knew who it was that had been with them.

But whenever (as has often been the case with those of an enthusiastic temperament in later times) we find a person strongly suspecting that he has received a revelation, or fully convinced of it, from feeling (as they sometimes express it) a certain thought forcibly borne in upon his mind, we may be quite sure that he is deluding himself. God would never leave any doubt, or any reasonable ground for doubt, on the mind of any one to whom He might think fit to impart a revelation; He doubtless never did, nor ever will, communicate any one of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, without attesting, to the person or persons concerned, its reality, by the stamp of some sensible miracle."

VII. FAITH HEALING

William M. Green

On this subject history, observation, and the Bible join in demonstrating conclusions of great practical importance. Faith healing has been practiced among every people, and in every period of the world's history. Among the very earliest written records of mankind are the "pyramid texts" of Egypt. Written long before the days of Moses or of Abraham, these portray the wonders performed by the magician-priests, including the healing of the sick. From the period after 2000 B.C. a number of papyrus books are preserved, which set forth the ritual by which each disease is to be cured. On the margins or backs of the papyrus roll notes were added, relating cases of distinguished persons, such as a prince or a king, who had been cured by the various prescriptions. In the formulæ some twenty odd healing deities are named, among whom the goddess Isis and her son Horus have leading places. In one, the priest laid his hands upon a child, and said:

My hands lie upon this child, and the hands of Isis lie upon him, as she lays her hands upon her son Horus.

In another an appropriate gesture was made over a child, with the words:

Thou art Horus; and thou shalt wake as Horus. Thou art the living Horus; I drive away the malady that is in thy body, and the malady that is in thy limbs.

¹Compare in the October Reader's Digest (1942) "How Your Mind May Make You Ill."

Sometimes a remedy was also to be taken, but its effect was supposed to depend on the formula which invoked the power of the god:

Welcome, remedy, welcome, which destroyest the trouble in this my heart and in these my limbs. The magic of Horus is victorious in the remedy.

The Ebers papyrus, from which the last quotation is taken, declares, "This is a book for the healing of all disease."

In all ancient lands, apparently, there were similar beliefs. Even in Greece, a land made famous by its literature, science, and philosophy, the cults of healing flourished. Hippocrates is today called the father of medical science, but in his time, as before, the sick thronged to the temples of Asclepius to be cured of their ills. Sometimes they would sleep in the temple, hoping that in the night the god would come to them and give instructions for their healing.

Today the visitor can view the remains of the great temples of Asclepius at Epidaurus and at Athens, and may still read the dozens of inscriptions which testify to the miraculous cures there effected. The skeptics, such as the Roman Cicero, might scoff at all this as superstition, but his own countrymen refute his words when they hang up their tablets in the temples, along with those of the Greeks.

These things do not seem so strange or incredible when we compare them with what is being done today. Among the heathen peoples of the world there is scarcely a tribe without its "medicine man" who knows the right charm to cure every disease. And the most enlightened lands are well supplied with cults which carry on the old tradition. Some of these are among the most popular and rapidly growing sects of our time. They are filling a demand which has been neglected both by scientific medicine and by the more conservative religious bodies. In their claims of healing there is much of naive misstatement and some wilful fraud. But their growth can be explained only by a large measure of success in the business they attempt. Dr. William S. Sadler, of Chicago, has declared:

It is my belief that, outside of surgical cases, contagious diseases and accidents, nine-tenths of the people who come to the physician seeking relief for their ailments are suffering only from functional disturbances. The vast majority of them can be relieved by some kind of mind cure.

Dr. Frank B. Wynn writes in the Journal of Indiana State Medical Association:

The whole movement of Christian Science is a natural protest against the materialistic trend of modern medicine. . . . So intent upon demonstrable scientific achievements, the profession has not seen or properly evaluated the mental and moral factors in the cause and cure of disease. . . . Out of the ruins of our failure a medico-religious cult has builded its temples and inculcated its teachings. Nor can it be denied that many of the followers of Christian Science have been greatly blessed and made well; just as it is equally true that many have been grossly deceived.

The obvious conclusion is that a very large part of all sickness can be cured by faith—faith in falsehood, faith in almost any kind of falsehood, pagan or Christian. And the next question forces itself upon us, Cannot the truth do at least as much for its supporters as falsehood? Must one follow after some new healing cult to get the benefits they confer? The answer is given by experienced doctors and psychologists, that one need not follow the cults, but that one must have a genuine faith to get those benefits.

Three Bible rules, it appears, may guide us on the path to healing. The first is that of industry.

Servants, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing the Lord; whatsoever ye do, work heartily, as unto the Lord, and not unto men; knowing that from the Lord ye shall receive the recompense of the inheritance; ye serve the Lord Christ.

The psychologists affirm that an occupation engaged in with enthusiasm is the best antidote for mental and nervous disorders. The one who is busy, who really works heartily, doesn't have time to get sick.

The second rule is closely related to the first:

Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good, that he may have whereof to give to him that hath need. (Eph. 4:28).

For the psychologist thoroughly endorses the Bible doctrine that it is more blessed to give than to receive. There is a familiar type of "ailing" person who is always concerned about himself. One may even find professing Christians whose favorite topic of conversation is their own sickness or other affliction. Christian love "seeketh not her own," and counts "the light affliction which is but for a moment" not worthy to be compared with the more

important goals of living. To seek pleasure in self-indulgence is to court ruin to one's health, but in a place of useful service the very thought of sickness is dismissed.

The third, and most important rule is to trust in God. . . . No one who believes in the power of God can doubt that whenever he is healed from any disease it is God's work. Others will say it is Nature's work, which means exactly the same, but tries to ignore the personal Being who is present in Nature, "in whom we live and move and have our being." If our bodily health is good, thanks is due only to God, who is the giver of every good and perfect gift.

The Bible, to be sure, does not promise that we will not suffer afflictions, or sickness, or death. Jesus himself suffered, and the disciple cannot hope to be above his master. Neither observation nor Bible suggests that pain or sickness can be expelled from this mortal life. It is evident that these are rather intended for our discipline, that we, like our Master may be made perfect through suffering. Those things which are inevitable we will accept with resignation, or rather with thanksgiving, as part of the good which God provides for us. And the suffering will be much lessened by that attitude.

—(20th Century Christian, Oct., 1942)