

CHAPTER D30

TONGUES

Ti 1:10-13: For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision: Whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith;

In this chapter I will let the Scriptures tell you what miraculous tongues is, that is, how to *recognize* Scriptural tongues, so you'll know anything different from it is fake. I am going to show you the pretentious gibberish passed off as "tongues" today is a deliberate hoax. I say *deliberate* because if the Scriptures actually do reveal today's tongues to be unscriptural, that means the Holy Spirit has done *nothing* to these people; their utterances are *voluntary and completely controlled by them*. That means they *know* they are faking it.

Back in the sixties and seventies when the modern "tongues"/gibberish movement was new to everybody, almost no one knew it was fake. Therefore each individual thought *he* was probably the only one in the group faking it, and he hoped and prayed he'd eventually "get the blessing" if he just kept "practicing." In the meantime, these fakers passed out literature promoting gibberish to family, friends, and neighbors, and repeatedly lied even to family members and Christians about God causing their utterances, and often had their consciences seared as with a hot iron and became habitual liars, reprobates in the faith.

Those who have been faking it for years know what is going on in the "full gospel" churches, and many know how to take advantage of the situation. The preachers and denominational officials under the banner of the "diving dove" realize how easy it is to manipulate a group of people who harbor a common sense of guilt and inadequacy. Some churches became successful because they found a niche catering to the insecurities common among people who lack emotional fulfillment in their lives. These churches were thought to be more "caring" because they provided their members with an affectionate social base. The churches also improved the self-esteem of their members with assurances that gibberish meant God viewed them as elite Christians and would reward them materially by making them abundantly prosperous in this life.

However, a number of fakers *did* have consciences because their deliberate deceit and that of those around them began to bother them, so they quietly shut their mouths and began attending "partial gospel" churches. I say *quietly* because these same people who used to fake gibberish and tell other Christians they needed to receive the "second blessing" were and are too ashamed to tell anyone the false gospel hoax they participated in and perpetuated was all immature fakery.

"Full gospel" preachers watched their income shrink as more and more tithers left. So they quietly de-emphasized tongues and became more like the "partial gospel" churches. That has resulted in more "non-talkers" in their congregations – and more tithers.

Two of the usual charades that accompany the gibberish hoax are the healing hoax and the "slain in the Spirit" hoax. "Miracle"-working preachers realize nobody who has for years been *lying about the Holy Spirit of God* and about gibberish is going to admit his back still hurts when he is "healed", and no Cretian is going to just stand there instead of falling down when his preacher touches his forehead; because to do so would expose this insecure saint who has been faking "faith" for years as not really having it.

That's why "healings" are never done like they were in the Bible – at random while walking down the street among normal people; they are always done in carefully controlled environments.

The carefully controlled environment manifests itself every church service when some liar jumps up and says God has given him a message in gibberish. *Anybody* with "the gift of tongues" in the congregation can do that. Interestingly enough, however, *only a handful* of carefully chosen Cretians – who can be trusted not to get too inventive with their lies – is designated by the preacher as having "the gift of interpretation." So, when a liar jumps up and fakes some gibberish, one of the lying interpreters says, "I have the interpretation!" And it is *always* some bland, boring, generic "message from God" they all already know, such as, "We need to be more earnest in our prayers" or "We should love each other more." These "messages from God" are never taken seriously by the Cretians because they know they are lies. Not one of the fakers has ever been exposed by having an "interpreter" say, "That wasn't angel talk; it was just gibberish. Why did you try to deceive us, you Cretian?" That's how the congregation gradually learns that *all of them*, even the exalted, handpicked "interpreters" are fakes: When a pewster does his gibberish he knows he is faking. And then he finds out the "interpreter" is also a fake when he gives the "interpretation" of the pewster's fakery. That's why the "interpretations" are never collected and published as, "*Instructions from God to His Twenty-First Century New Testament Church.*" In fact, the Cretian preachers and pewsters have such a low opinion of these "divine utterances" that none of them even bothers to remember these "direct messages" from God from one week to the next. That obvious contempt for the "word of God" is a far cry from the old Hebrew scribes who tirelessly labored to preserve every utterance of the Lord, and is a disdain shared by all Christians who think God is an incompetent liar Who did not or could not preserve His word – and therefore today we have nothing but leavened, unclean "translations" and "versions" that exist to be ignored, corrected, used, abused, wrested, and twisted in compliance with what the carnal mind thinks is right and good.

Speaking in tongues is in the Bible, so it is Scriptural. But what is tongues? Is it gibberish? Is it the language spoken in heaven? Are the Cretians really liars?

If you ask a Cretian preacher, "According to the Bible, what is miraculous tongues; how do I recognize it?" she will never directly answer your question. She will tell you it's the "second blessing", it's "evidence that you're saved", the "baptism of the Holy Ghost", "receiving power from on high", that "you'll know it when you feel it", etc. But she won't point to anything in the Bible that *describes* tongues so you can recognize it. She relies on the traditional and well-known deception that tongues is gibberish. Therefore, when she points to Scripture that does not answer your question (such as **Ac 10:44-47** and **19:6**), she will *depend on you to assume*, since tongues is Scriptural, her *gibberish* must be the same tongues of the Bible. When you then point out that Moslem women in the Middle East make the *same* tongue-trilling utterances and ask if those, too, are caused by the Holy Spirit, she will say, "No, that isn't tongues; they are doing that voluntarily. But if I preached to them and got them saved the Holy Ghost will take over their bodies and cause them to involuntarily make those exact same utterances they voluntarily made as Bible-rejecting pagans." And when you question the Scriptural validity of certain practices in gibberish

2 D30 TONGUES

churches, she will assure you it is perfectly plausible to assume Peter in Ac 10:44-47 and Paul in Ac 19:6 also advised their eager listeners, “It will happen if you just relax and stop overpowering the Holy Spirit’s control of your body. It will also help if you make slow, fake miraculous prayer language utterances. And then try to get faster and faster – as practice – so your tongue can get used to the rapid trilling the Holy Spirit has so far failed to get you to do.”

During the modern Cretian conversion process the converts are shown Scripture that validates *tongues*, but are never shown what *tongues* is. So the ignorant converts assume the Moslem trilling, when done by a Christian, is the same miraculous tongues of the Bible. They are eager for a positive, physical manifestation of God, so they naïvely comply with the extra-Biblical encouragement they receive to “help it happen.” They just want to fit in, to be accepted by “full-gospel, diving-white-dove, Holy-Ghost-empowered saints.”

It is no big secret in Christianity what real tongues is. The fact that many Christians don’t know what it is reflects poorly on their interest in doctrine, and on their churches. And many Christians who do know what tongues is cannot open the Bible and prove it because they, like Cretians, really don’t care about Scripture. Today the authority of God’s word has been replaced by the democratic concept of the authority of the individual. Therefore, instead of learning the Bible, most Christians just want to “get their story straight” so they know what to say to “defend” their denomination’s doctrinal position. Instead of a serious discussion of Scripture when Christians get together it is considered acceptable to say, “Well, I think the star of Bethlehem was a super nova.” “I think” “I think” “I think” is all you hear Christians say these days. “I think” has replaced “Thus saith the Lord.” (If you keep saying “I think” rapidly enough you’ll be helping the Holy Spirit give you “the Power.” Or, if you prefer, you may practice your gibberish prayer language by using Goofy’s laugh: “Ah-hyuck! Ah-hyuck! Ah-hyuck!” It’s all acceptable because there are no official guidelines.)

What is tongues? Biblical, miraculous tongues is when a person speaks a normal human language (such as English), and the Holy Ghost changes the sound in mid air so the various listeners hear only their native language (such as Spanish or Vietnamese). That comes from **Ac 2**, which is the only place in the Bible that deals with – rather than just mentions – tongues. But, you ask, doesn’t **1 Co 14** also deal with tongues? No, 1 Co 14 most certainly does not deal with Biblical, miraculous tongues; it deals with common, everyday unknown tongues. There’s a big difference between “tongues” and “unknown tongues” in the Bible.

Let’s quickly compare the two chapters:

Acts 2

- Holy Ghost present and working
- “Tongues” are spoken
- The subject is a miraculous sign
- Interpreters are never needed
- “Tongues” cannot possibly be abused

1 Co 14

- Holy Ghost uninvolved
- “Unknown” tongues are spoken
- The subject is edifying the church
- Interpreters are always needed and required
- “Unknown” tongues can be abused

Now let’s look at those chapters in detail:

Ac 2:4: The Holy Ghost made them speak “other” (not “unknown”) tongues.

Ac 2:5,9,10,11: Lists some of the native countries around the world of some of these Christians.

Ac 2:6: These individual Christians were perplexed when they heard the Galilean apostles speak the native tongue of the individual listeners.

Ac 2:7-12: Everyone there was amazed because *every single one* of the listeners – no matter what country he was from – heard the words in his own native tongue. Two men standing next to each other, for example, one from France and the other from Germany, communicated with each other in Hebrew because it was the only language they had in common. They also *expected* the Galilean disciples to speak to them in Hebrew – as usual. Therefore, when the Frenchman heard the Galileans speak *French* it was quite a surprise. The Frenchman, knowing his German friend didn’t understand French, spoke to him in Hebrew to express his amazement that Galileans spoke French. The German then laughed at his French buddy and replied in Hebrew, “Yeah, you wish they were speaking French so you could understand it! But, seriously, how do you suppose they all learned to speak German? And why would they speak German when most people here don’t speak it and when everybody does speak Hebrew? Do you suppose those little flame-like things sitting on the twelve has something to do with this?” The two began to challenge each other about what had been said by the Galileans in their native tongue and found they both *really did* understand what had been said! How was that possible?! They questioned others and found other brethren had heard neither French nor German; each listener had heard the language of his native country! This caused quite a stir and the confused amazement was quickly replaced with exultation as Christians realized God was giving them a sign because this was unquestionably a miracle. Nobody heard Goofy’s laugh and nobody heard Moslem tongue trilling.

Ac 2:13-15: Other Christians, more disciplined and therefore unwilling to rudely interrupt the speakers by talking with their neighbors, patiently waited for an explanation of why the Galileans were speaking their native Egyptian or Libyan. They were offended at the boorish outbursts of people laughing and shouting, “It’s French!”, “No, it’s German!”, “It’s both – it’s a miracle!” They assumed the rowdiness meant the people had been drinking. But Peter assured them the people were excited about the miraculous doings of God.

Acts 2 is the only place in the Bible that explains *what tongues is*. It is not the incomprehensible gibberish common to Moslem women and “full gospel” Cretians. Nobody ever listens to Cretian gibberish and says, “How hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?” like they did in the Bible when the Holy Spirit was at work. Therefore, if you know anyone who speaks gibberish, you know he is either a deliberate fake who is so apostate he doesn’t mind repeatedly lying about the Holy Spirit, or he is possessed by a devil. Either way *he couldn’t care less what the Scriptures say*.

Let me illustrate the truth of what I say: If you ask Cretians if the gibberish they speak is Scriptural, they will point to Acts 2 and reply it most certainly is. When you then point out that the languages in Acts 2 were all recognized by men as their individual native tongues, and contrast that with the fact that no gibberish-triller in the Cretian churches speaks human native languages, and that nobody ever asks the Acts 2 question, “How hear we every man in our own tongue wherein we were born?”, they will respond by taking you to **1 Co 13:1** and explain that they are not speaking anybody’s native tongue because they are speaking the “tongues of angels”! Do you see what I mean? You asked what their incomprehensible gibberish is and were taken to Acts 2. But if you know Acts 2 is about human, understandable native tongues – *not* about incomprehensible gibberish, the

lying Cretians will scamper from Acts 2 to 1 Co 13:1! So, why did they attempt to deceive you by taking you to Acts 2 when you asked about gibberish? Because the Cretians are always liars. They are not interested in the truth; if they were they wouldn't have faked gibberish the first time they were told, "Let go and receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost!", and they wouldn't be attempting to prey on your ignorance of the Scriptures to get you to think their gibberish is the understood human languages of Acts 2. *If* they were honest, and *if* they knew the Scriptures, and *if* they thought their gibberish really was "angel talk" (I know, those three *ifs* cannot coexist), they would have initially answered your question by saying, "Acts 2 is about human languages that are understood by everybody. Obviously, we aren't speaking Acts 2 tongues because nobody is ever going to walk into our church and say, 'Wow! I grew up in a remote part of Bulgaria speaking that language! How can you Americans all be speaking my native gibberish?' We are speaking a heavenly language. Let me show you 1 Co 13:1 to show you there is such a thing as 'tongues of angels', and it, unlike Acts 2, is a language not native to earth." Only in that case would you think it might be worth listening to their explanation and might have some chance of having a Scripture-based conversation. (But the three *ifs* mean this case is not possible.)

But wait! That "angel talk" stuff looks intriguing; maybe the Cretians have a valid point. No. If they did they would long ago have figured out to take you straight to 1 Co 13:1 and would have dropped Acts 2 from their vocabulary. Their churches can only exist if ignorance of the Scriptures continues to breed contradictory confusion about this subject. (Therefore I expect gibberish churches to continue to thrive.) Let's examine the problem with 1 Co 13:1 that keeps Cretians from making it the foundation of their doctrine.

We are going to zero in on the word *though* in 1 Co 13:1 by looking at Paul's use of the same word in **Ga 1:8**. Does the word *though* in Ga 1:8 mean Paul actually was preaching a false gospel? No. Does it mean an angel from heaven was going around with a false gospel? No. (Until the fallen angel Moroni went around with "another testament of Jesus Christ." I suspect a number of good Christians used Ga 1:8 to reject Moroni's false gospel until he finally found a sucker in Joseph Smith.) So what does the word *though* mean? **Ga 1:9** repeats v.8 but it substitutes the word *if* for the word *though*. Paul was not preaching a false gospel. He was using *exaggeration* to make the point that no matter how holy the bearer of another gospel might seem, he was to be accursed.

Because of this, Cretians don't first go to 1 Co 13:1 where Paul is *again* using exaggeration to say no matter what seemingly great stuff he might do, without charity it is empty. Look at his use of *though* in the next two verses to confirm Paul is not saying in v.1 he spoke "angel talk": Did Paul understand *all* mysteries? Did he have *all* knowledge? Did he have *all* faith? Was he burned? No, those are exaggerations to make a point.

Cretians also don't base their false doctrine on 1 Co 13:1 because they know you are eventually going to realize Acts 2 and 1 Co 13:1 can't be what gibberishers teach, because that would mean all angels in heaven are mute until the Holy Spirit miraculously gives them utterance. The "tongues of angels" is just another smokescreen used by hypocrites and vipers to lead the blind into the pit.

When you point all this out to Cretians they generally resort to their "last ditch" verse to befuddle you. That's right, they won't stick with a Biblical discussion of *any* of the Scripture they've already taken you to; they *always* abandon it and move on in an attempt to find some verse you can't explain so they can piously claim it supports their Moslem tongue-trilling as being "overpowered by the Holy Spirit." Let's examine their last-ditch verse by looking at its entire chapter.

1 Co 14:1: You should want to be able to prophecy. Prophecy with an *s* simply means *to preach* (**Am 3:8/Je 20:9; Ezek 37:9**). Prophecy with a *c* as in 1 Co 13:2 refers to a revelation from God (**2 Pe 1:19-21**). It will become clear that the use of the word prophecy in this chapter refers to preaching *in the vernacular* rather than preaching in a tongue unknown to the congregation.

1 Co 14:2: This brings up the subject of unknown tongues, that is, languages unknown to the congregation. This verse says a man who speaks a language unknown to the congregation is not prophesying because, even though he knows he's preaching good stuff in German, the English-speaking congregation doesn't understand him. The only ones in the church who would understand his German are God and himself. ("In the spirit" doesn't mean anything mystical in this chapter. It just means the personal understanding of the speaker as opposed to the general understanding of the others present. We'll have more examples of this in this chapter.)

1 Co 14:3: This verse introduces the purpose of the chapter – *edifying the people in the congregation*. No man can edify the congregation if he is the only one who knows what he is saying. Speaking in an unknown tongue is not prophesying.

1 Co 14:4: He that "speaketh" (Notice it doesn't use the word *prophesieth*, which is always used in conjunction with a *known* tongue and never in conjunction with an *unknown* tongue.) in a foreign language only edifies himself because only he understands German. But he that *prophesieth* (which requires a tongue understood by the congregation) edifies the church.

1 Co 14:5: It would be great if you all spoke lots of languages, but I wish you would prophecy instead: because he that prophesies is *better for the church* than he who speaks lots of languages, unless there is an *interpreter*. Since the purpose is to edify the church, and since the church can't be edified if it doesn't understand the preaching (prophesying), the presence of an interpreter to translate the German into English so the church can be edified makes the foreign language preacher no longer inferior to he who prophesies.

1 Co 14:6: Think about it, what good am I to you if I preach in a foreign tongue? None – unless you can understand the message.

1 Co 14:7: And it's exactly the same with musical instruments: If you don't understand the tune how are you going to know what is being played?

1 Co 14:8: For example, if the trumpet is sounding an urgent call to battle how are you going to know to arm yourself and gird your loins rather than retreat if you don't understand the trumpet's meaning?

1 Co 14:9: And it's the same with congregations; unless you use words they understand (prophesying), you're communicating with no one.

1 Co 14:10: There are many languages spoken in the world and each one has a purpose.

1 Co 14:11: Therefore without that purpose of languages being fulfilled (communication, prophesying, edification) both speaker and listener are as incommunicative barbarians to each other.

1 Co 14:12: So, since you're so interested in being "spiritual", how about trying to edify the church.

1 Co 14:13: To that end (edifying, communicating, prophesying) let him that speaketh only German pray that he will learn English.

1 Co 14:14: This is the last-ditch verse Cretians use in an attempt to end their retreat before Bible believers. They claim it means: “When I speak gibberish, it is my spiritual man communicating with God, but the old-man part of me doesn’t understand what I’m saying.” The problem is their claim has nothing to do with, and is contrary to, the thrust of the chapter as well as the entire Bible. We’ll draw on the fact that this verse begins with *For* as a reference to what has already been said in the chapter in order to produce this paraphrase: “I told you to pray that you’d learn English because (“For”) if I preach in German, I (my spirit) understand what I’m saying, but my own understanding is unfruitful for you; you are not edified, you don’t know how to respond to the trumpet I’m blowing, I’m not communicating, and I’m not prophesying.”

I was talking with the pastor of a gibberish church about all of this one time, and, true to form, he retreated to this verse. I quickly took him through the rest of the chapter to establish the context and then explained v.14. He was so impressed he was caught off guard; his jaw dropped, he looked at the verse and said almost to himself, “That’s the best explanation of that verse I’ve ever heard!” Then he quickly recovered with, “Ah, but my denomination doesn’t teach that view of it.” Gibberish churches do not produce Swordbearers.

1 Co 14:15: So, what is my point? I will preach with both my understanding (the spirit) and the understanding of the congregation.

1 Co 14:16: Otherwise if only the speaker understands, how is the congregation going to be able to agree with him?

1 Co 14:17: Because even though the speaker is truly giving thanks in German, the congregation *is not edified* by something it can’t understand.

1 Co 14:18: I thank God I speak several languages.

1 Co 14:19: But in church I’d rather speak five words that are understood by the congregation than ten thousand words in German that nobody understands.

The rest of the chapter builds on this by establishing rules for interpreters whenever preaching is done in German and other foreign tongues.

1 Co 14:34-38: The whole chapter so far has been dealing exclusively with men because they are the only ones who speak in church. The explanations have been careful, patient, even respectful. But now in a quick five-verse, almost parenthetical change of subject, women are dealt with briefly and decisively. **Women are to remain silent in church.** Period. And just in case that isn’t clear enough for New Testament Christians we are given a *specific example* that has been rejected ever since the “roaring twenties” and women’s liberation: If a woman wants to lean over in church and ask her husband something about the Bible, about the sermon, etc., *she is not allowed to do so* because she is to remain zip lip and ask him later at home! Why? Because it is a shame for any woman to speak in church. It could not possibly be clearer. (“Have you not read?” “Is it not written?” “Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?”) This verse should not be used as a proof text that women shouldn’t be preachers because, by ignoring the strict wording of the example, that would allow people to think it is permissible for women to ask their husband a question in church. In other words, it relaxes the obvious meaning of the rule. This is an excellent indicator of the power tradition has to make the word of God of none effect because when you and your wife read this New Testament commandment *you will not want to believe, accept, and be governed by what it plainly says*. Because you took reading in the first grade you can see it isn’t confusingly written and has no challenging vocabulary words. It is simple and straightforward: V.34 mentions the rule; v.35a gives a specific example of the rule so nobody will be tempted to think the rule applies only to preaching; v.35b says the reason for the specific example is to prevent the shameful breaking of the rule; and v.37 is nothing short of the Bible’s emphasizing its authority by pointing its finger in our impudently-willful faces and challenging us – if we claim to be Christians – to humbly acknowledge that these verses are rules from God. V.37 is a quick jerk on the leash to remind us the Master is watching; it is the Drill Sergeant who has been issuing instructions in a neutral tone suddenly and briefly reminding us of His terrible authority by fixing His gaze on us and demanding, “Have you got that, soldier?!” or “Is that clear?!” in order to force our active, vocal, submissive assent in an effort to prevent passive, silent, rebellious rejection. This verse snaps us back to attention and forces us to take the entire chapter seriously. If you’ve ever been in or under authority you recognize all that goes into this verse. In v.38 the sudden sharp tone of the previous verse begins to fade – but not the veiled threat.

In addition to the obvious literal meaning, there is a figurative meaning of 1 Co 14:34,35 that applies to all Christians of both sexes in the body of Christ, and it has to do with **Ac 17:11; Ga 1:16; Mt 16:17; Ps 81:10; Je 33:3; Jn 14:26**. Understanding and applying this figurative meaning is an important part of maturing as a Christian. The denomination-bound preacher I mentioned in my discussion of 1 Co 14:14 did not apply this to his Christian walk.

Before I leave this unpopular *and almost universally-ignored* (!) commandment by Almighty God that women be silent in church, let me show you the kind of incredulous reactions liberal Christians typically have to this Scripture:

“You have got to be kidding me! Over 99% of Christians think this Scripture only forbids *public* speaking by women in church, which does *not* prohibit a woman from discretely leaning over in church and saying something to her husband in either a whisper or a low tone of voice. How in the world can you claim this says women are to remain zip lip without so much as a whisper or other non-public form of speech? Does this mean you also think women should not sing solos in church?”

Most modern Christians agree with the above liberal argument, and they’d also have agreed with Naaman’s Reasoned, practical, incredulous reaction to God’s literal commandment in **2 Ki 5:10-12**: Naaman *thought* the *overall intent* of the commandment was that he wash and be clean, which meant there should be no need to take the Scripture literally by bathing seven times in the Jordan. And since the waters in Damascus are better than the rivers in Israel, he should be able to satisfy God by taking a good shower in his apartment in Syria. 2 Ki 5 goes on to show that God really did require Naaman (and us) to do *exactly* as He says.

My teachers and professors used to tell us we had to remain silent in the classroom because: 1) It was distracting for other students to see two of their fellows huddled together speaking – even if no one else could hear them. 2) Whispering among ourselves was rude and disrespectful to our instructors. “Len!” my instructor barked at me, “If what you have to say is so important, would you like to come up here and enlighten us all?” When I sheepishly apologized, I’d be told not to disrupt the class again. Any student protests that whispers and low tones did not violate the overall intent of the “silence – no speaking” rule were rejected because even whispered asides among the congregation are, in fact, distracting, disrespectful, and ultimately disruptive.

Now let’s examine two Christian women, Roberta and Linda, standing in line awaiting Judgment. Roberta was one of the 99% who, like Naaman, *thought* seven didn’t mean seven and Jordan really didn’t mean Jordan. She *thought*, “Let your

women keep silence in the churches” really meant, “Neither men nor women have to be silent – as long as their utterances are whispered in low tones, and as long as not too many of them are engaged in these non-public conversations at the same time.” And Roberta *thinks* when the Bible says “it is not permitted unto them to speak”, it really means, “they are permitted to non-publicly speak with whispers and low tones.”

If the word of God turns out to mean exactly what it says, Roberta is prepared to *argue* at Judgment that over 99% of the people she knew (including Naaman) agreed that it was OK to live by “thus meaneth the Lord” rather than by “thus saith the Lord”.

What is the worst thing that can happen to Roberta at Judgment? She can find herself looking up at an angry God who put those words in the Bible the way He did because He meant every one of them, in which case she’ll hear Him say the same frightening words she’d read many times in His Instruction Book: “Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, *and do not the things which I say?*” Roberta could find out – too late – that this spiritual warfare is a struggle between *what we think God means...and what God says.*

Now let’s look at Linda. Linda agreed with Roberta, with one exception: *Linda feared God*. She *thought* it was *probably* OK for a woman to lean over and say a few whispered, well-intentioned things to her companions in church...but she also *knew* what the Bible says: “Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; for it is a shame for women to speak in the church.” She was afraid her Lord might mean *exactly what He says*, and her number one priority in life was to glorify God by faithfully, submissively, and obediently being a doer of His word – without adding to or subtracting from His Scriptures. And she was *afraid* changing “speaking is forbidden” to “public speaking is forbidden” might turn out to be *adding to Scripture* (**Dt 4:1,2; 12:32; Re 22:18,19**). So when her preacher asked her to sing in church because she had a great voice, she politely declined. And when her friends in church all leaned over and quietly tried to get a response from her about various things, she frowned slightly, gently shook her head, and turned away. After church her friends all asked her why she was such a jerk. She replied that she was sorry if she offended them, but she took God at His word – literally, and she expected her friends to respect her religious beliefs...especially because *there is nothing wrong or harmful about women being silent in church*. The only time she actually spoke in church was when she saw smoke billowing out of a closet: she yelled “FIRE!” as loud as she could – because of the doctrine of expediency.

Most of Linda’s friends were offended by her basing her beliefs on the literal word of God. Not because there is anything wrong or harmful about women being silent in church, but because Linda didn’t *agree and go along* with what 99% of the congregation *thought* God *meant* to say...but *didn’t*. (Yes, peer pressure exists among Christians, too.)

What is the worst thing that can happen to Linda at Judgment? She might find herself looking up at God, who, with an understandingly-benevolent smile says: “Linda, when I said you couldn’t speak in church, I didn’t mean you couldn’t speak in *whispers* and *low tones*. And when I said you were to be silent, I didn’t mean for you to be *completely* silent. However, I do not fault you for doing the things which I say; I wish I had more servants with your humility, fear, and strictly-obedient submission to my Instruction Book; for man does not live by bread alone, but by every word of God. Well done, good and faithful servant: Enter into the kingdom I have prepared for those who are doers of my word.”

Of the two women at Judgment, would you rather be Roberta or Linda?

No matter how interesting it might be to do historical research into what kinds of disruptive things may have been going on in early New Testament churches (men pompously speaking in foreign languages, and loudly-gossiping women paying little attention to the preaching), and no matter how tempting it might be to use whatever skimpy evidence we find to speculate about why God laid down these 1 Co 14 laws for men and women, the inescapable, overriding, and only relevant fact is *it is written!* We have our clearly-written orders, and our duty is to carry them out. Nothing else matters; we live and die by *thus saith the Lord*.

Why do so many modern Christians defiantly refuse to take this New Testament commandment literally? (One Christian couple – in outraged indignation – stalked out of my home as soon as they learned I am one of the “1% zip-lip literalists”, and they realized they had no way to get around what the Bible plainly says unless they either *changed what it says* or *added to the word of God*.) And why do liberal Christians argue that church is a completely different, less formal setting than a classroom – and therefore “discrete speaking” should be permitted in the former but not in the latter? Obviously, the usual suspects, *equality* (God should have assigned women the same status and privileges as men), which was spawned by Greek Reason, and *equality-based tradition* (God meant to add the word *public* to speaking, and add *partial* to silence) that have made this commandment of none effect, are big factors. But do not overlook the fact that today’s naïve Christians have *no idea* that a violent, deadly war is going on every day...and therefore our churches are *supposed* to be training us up into dedicated warriors whose Scriptural discernment enables us to see the battle through the obscuring fog of carnality so we can stand in the gaps and hold the line against the onslaughts of hell. Most Christians, in practice, think the main purpose of church is to be a social gathering of ignorant effeminate lightweights who assemble in order to hear and applaud the ear-tickling “thundering” of panty-waisted preachers who teach them to reject and condemn the very God-fearing Biblical literalists they need to hear. The stark reality is that church, where we are supposed to be learning how to live and fight, is *infinitely more important and serious* than school classrooms. Therefore, God’s commandment that His New Testament women be silent in church makes sense...because it underscores the critical importance and deadly-serious purpose of the doctrinal learning that is *supposed* to be going on in church. The modern Enlightened crap that liberals call “praise and worship services” breeds haughty, supercilious Pharisees who wrongly and contemptuously look down their noses at humble Christian women who, because they take the word of God literally, choose to be silent in church. Let them that have ears to hear, hear.

1 Co 14:39: Now the subject has returned to men in order to wrap up the lesson. It says we are to focus on edifying the church by *prophesying*, which includes “tongues” but not “unknown tongues.” Unknown tongues like German become edifying prophesy only when there is an English interpreter.

1 Co 14:40 requires an understanding of much of the Bible and is why Bible believers find the gibberish doctrine not only unscriptural, but also offensive to Godly order. Mature Christians have a deep and clear understanding of Biblical principles concerning authority, hierarchy, master/servant, head/body, carnality, fasting, drunkenness, order vs. chaos, submission vs. independence, having power on your head, and the beauty, peace, and harmony that results when total control meets total submission. They actually identify with those concepts and therefore understand that gibberish is absolutely contrary to everything the Bible wants us to become. How is gibberish so contrary to everything Biblical? Because the head does not rule well over its own body (**Pv 16:32; 1 Co 14:32**). The body is acting independently of the head. Not only does

the head not know what is being said, neither does the body have any idea. (Obviously I'm treating gibberish as if the Cretians are under the external control of devils. If they are not under the control of devils the Cretians themselves *are* in control and *do* know what they are saying – nothing.) The body has risen to a position of dominance over the now meekly submissive head. The very head that was commanded by God to rule the body is now disgraced, which means God is disgraced (**1 Co 11:3**). We are told to rule our tongues in order to carefully govern what we say and to ensure everything we say glorifies God. Gibberishers proudly and foolishly claim to have no control over their mouths and no knowledge of what they say.

The body of a gibberisher has completely usurped the prerogatives of his head. That is robbery, rebellion, trespass, and witchcraft. (Having gotten this far in this book, you should be able to explain why I chose each of those four words.) The man who claims to be involuntarily speaking gibberish is no different from the man who is drunk; he has lost control. The very idea that any Christian would think it was Scriptural when some dopey preacher trying to get him to do gibberish says, "Just go with 'it', let yourself go" is an appalling testimony to the terrifying depths of depravity to which the church has sunk. And when a Swordbearer points out to them how dreadfully unscriptural and anti-Scriptural the whole thing is, he then has to suffer through asinine carnality as these Cretians angrily respond with, "Well, I know how I feel when I'm doing it, and it feels good: It feels like I'm loving Jesus!" That's like a moron who brutally rapes a two-year-old girl and then justifies it by angrily saying, "But how can something that feels so good be bad?" (That comparison is somewhat specious but I'll allow it to make the point that *feelings* mean nothing, and I'll let it underscore how offensive the gibberish cult is to all the Bible teaches us about discernment vs. carnal Reason.)

Let me point out how unimpressed I am when gibberishers try to defend themselves by saying they "don't agree with my assessment" of this topic in the Scriptures. It has nothing to do with the fact that they haven't the capability to coherently and consistently discuss the Scriptures. You see, *they don't need to know any Scripture to know they are faking it!* They know they are deliberately faking it! So when they try to tell me the Holy Spirit has taken control of them when they wag their tongues, I not only know they are lying, I know *they* know they are lying. (Unless they are possessed by a devil.) How do I know this with such certainty? Because the Scriptures determine truth and reality for me; because I know the Scriptures; and because I believe the Scriptures.

They are Cretians.

In closing, I have something to say about **love**. Love and brotherly love are mentioned in **1 Jn 4:7,8** and defined in **1 Jn 5:2,3** and in **1 Jn 3:16**. If we spare the rod and don't rebuke each other we don't really love each other. But as much as the church needs a lot of spanking today, let's be careful about using that fact to justify, excuse, or condone hatred. We are told to love our enemies. And we are told those enemies are fellow Christians (**Mt 10:34-39**). I have a hard time "feeling" like I love lousy, lazy, lying Christians who are defrauding the church. But while I do not trust or base anything on my feelings, I do analyze myself in an effort to discern if I am acting out of selfish pride or Biblical love and compassion. For example, I pray that my anger is a righteous anger motivated by a love of the truth and not by a puffed-up, prideful love of self. I know that even when I am armed with Scriptural truth, if I have not charity I am a tinkling cymbal, I am nothing. I bring this up because I think it is important if the church is to win the war.

Our heart (not our *feelings*) is crucial to the war: The Lord looks for righteous men to stand in the gap. As Abraham's questioning of the Lord shows, if He can find even a handful of righteous Christians He will spare the rest. That's what Christ did for us, for by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. That's what Moses did (**Nu 14:19,20**). I'm not trying to diminish the unique importance and necessity of what Christ did, I'm trying to show why the love in 1 Jn 3:16 is so important. If we ever want to be available to stand in the gap for the church we *must love* the lousy, lazy, lying Christians who are defrauding the church. Without that love we really aren't trying to help (save) them when we rebuke them – we're trying to *condemn* them. Without that love we are not Swordbearers in God's eyes, we are tinkling cymbals.

I think God accepted Moses' plea for the church because He saw the love in him required for forgiveness. Moses' love was not a mere formality; it was genuine. Yes, he got angry at his faithless, lazy, fearful, willful brethren, but his rebukes and his discipline were those of an angry parent whose anger and discipline are made righteous by the underlying motivation of love.

Let us earnestly contend for correct doctrine and let us reemphasize the rod and other forms of church discipline, but let us also humbly ask God to give us love.