

MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION
COVENANT WITNESS STUDY

SPEAKING IN TONGUES: WHAT PENTECOSTALISM GOT WRONG

*A Covenant Examination of the Tongues Doctrine and the Pentecostal Misreading
in Response to the Catalog of David K. Bernard and the UPCI*

ELDER KEPHA ARCEMONT • MIQDASH BETHEL COVENANT INSTITUTION

Pearl River, Louisiana | Tuscola, Texas | Clyde, Texas

Among all the doctrines in David K. Bernard's catalog — and in Oneness Pentecostalism broadly — none is more central, more defining, or more zealously guarded than the doctrine of ***tongues as the mandatory initial evidence*** of Spirit-reception. It is the doctrinal cornerstone upon which UPCI membership is largely adjudicated, the test by which the “new birth” experience is confirmed, and the experience around which entire worship cultures are organized. To challenge it is, in the experience of most Pentecostals, to challenge the reality of the Spirit's presence in their lives.

This covenant witness does not challenge the reality of the Spirit of Yahweh, nor the genuine spiritual experiences of sincere Pentecostal believers. It challenges a specific doctrinal construction: that tongues-speech is the required, definitive, mandatory evidence of Spirit-indwelling — and that this requirement is established in Scripture. We will demonstrate, across multiple lines of evidence from both the Tanakh and the Apostolic writings themselves, that this doctrine is not established — and that the Pentecostal reading of the relevant passages is built on a series of compounding interpretive errors.

"To the Torah and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, there is no light of dawn in them."

Yesha 'yahu (Isaiah) 8:20

I. THE HISTORICAL ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE

Before examining Scripture, it is essential to understand *where this doctrine came from historically, because its origins reveal something important about its foundation.*

The doctrine that speaking in tongues is the mandatory initial evidence of Spirit-baptism did not exist in Christian theology before the twentieth century. It was not the position of the early church fathers. It was not the position of the Reformation. It was not the position of John Wesley, whose Holiness movement directly preceded Pentecostalism. It did not exist as formulated doctrine anywhere in eighteen hundred years of church history.

It originated at Charles Parham's Bethel Bible School in Topeka, Kansas in January 1901, when a student named Agnes Ozman reportedly spoke in tongues. Parham systematized this into the "Initial Evidence" doctrine. It spread through the Azusa Street Revival (Los Angeles, 1906) under William J. Seymour — less than 125 years ago. The UPCI itself was not formed until 1945. The tongues-as-mandatory-evidence doctrine is one of the youngest major doctrinal inventions in the history of Christianity.

The covenant's standard for testing doctrine is not novelty alone — but *age* matters when it comes to claimed restoration of ancient truth. If this doctrine represents a genuine recovery of Apostolic practice, why was it absent from 1,800 years of church history? And more importantly: why does the Tanakh — the foundational covenant document — provide not a single instance of it?

II. ACTS 2 AND THE SHAVUOT CONTEXT: WHAT THE EVENT ACTUALLY WAS

A. PENTECOST IS SHAVUOT

The English word "Pentecost" is a Greek transliteration of *pentekostē* (πεντηκοστή), meaning "fiftieth." It refers to the covenant feast of **Shavuot** (שבועות — Weeks), the seventh and final feast of the spring cycle, commanded in **Vayikra (Leviticus) 23:15–22** and **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 16:9–12**. The disciples of Yeshua were in Jerusalem not because they invented a new celebration, but because they were observing a covenant feast commanded by **Yahweh** in the Torah. They were doing what covenant people do: gathering before **Yahweh** at the appointed time.

By the first century, Shavuot had become inseparably linked in Jewish memory with the giving of the Torah at Sinai — the day **Yahweh** descended on the mountain in fire, wind, and thunder and spoke His covenant to the assembled nation of Yisra'el. This is the interpretive framework that every Jewish person in Acts 2 would have carried with them. When fire descended and the assembly spoke in the languages of the nations gathered in Jerusalem, the people watching were not confused about the category of the event. They understood it as a *Sinai echo*: **Yahweh** was again manifesting His presence in fire, wind, and speech — but now not to one nation in one language, but through covenant people to all nations, in every language.

B. THE MIDRASHIC TRADITION OF THE SEVENTY LANGUAGES

This is the detail that Pentecostal interpretation almost universally misses, and it is critical to understanding what Acts 2 actually means.

Jewish midrashic tradition — rooted in the Tanakh’s own framework of the seventy nations descending from Noach’s sons in **Bereshit (Genesis) 10** — held that when **Yahweh** spoke at Sinai, His voice divided into seventy languages so that every nation could hear the covenant in its own tongue. The *Mishnah Sotah* 7:5 records: “*On the stones of the altar on Mount Ebal were inscribed all the words of the Torah in seventy tongues — the languages of all mankind.*” While post-biblical, this midrash reflects a much older tradition embedded in Jewish understanding of the Sinai event.

Acts 2 records that people from fifteen distinct language groups — representing the nations of the known world — heard the disciples speaking in their own languages (**Acts 2:8–11**). This is not random or incidental. It is a deliberate Sinai parallel: Yahweh’s covenant word is being proclaimed, again, in the languages of all nations. The event is a covenant proclamation to the nations — not the institution of a private prayer language.

C. THE GREEK TEXT: GLOSSA AND DIALEKTOS

The Greek word used in Acts 2:4 is *glōssais* (γλώσσαις) — the dative plural of *glōssa*, which in every standard Greek lexicon (BDAG, Louw-Nida, LSJ) carries as its primary meanings: (1) the tongue as a physical organ, (2) *language*, (3) a specific people group identified by their language. The word does not inherently mean ecstatic, unintelligible utterance. That reading is imposed on the text, not derived from it.

Acts 2:6 uses a second Greek word to describe what the crowds heard: *dialektos* (διάλεκτος) — a *dialect* or *native language*. This is the word used again in Acts 2:8: “**How is it that we each hear them in our own native language?**” Luke uses two different Greek words to make the same point twice: these were known human languages, intelligible to the hearers, recognized as the birth-languages of the speakers’ audience. The modern Pentecostal concept of ecstatic, unintelligible “private prayer language” is not in this text. It is *absent* from this text.

Academic scholarship distinguishes between *xenolalia* (speaking a known foreign language one has not learned — what Acts 2 describes) and *glossolalia* (ecstatic unintelligible speech — what modern Pentecostalism practices). Acts 2 is unambiguously *xenolalia*. The word *glossolalia* itself — the term used to describe modern Pentecostal tongue-speech — does not appear in the Tanakh or the Apostolic writings at all. It is a modern coinage built backward from the Greek.

III. JOEL’S PROPHECY: WHAT YAHWEH ACTUALLY PROMISED

Peter’s sermon at Acts 2 grounds the entire event in a quotation from the Prophet Yo’el (Joel): **“This is what was spoken by the prophet Joel.”** This is the Tanakh’s own interpretive key for the event. So the question is decisive: what did **Yahweh** actually promise through Yo’el?

“And afterward, I will pour out My Spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions. Even on My male servants and My female servants, I will pour out My Spirit in those days.”

Yo’el (Joel) 3:1–2 (Hebrew chapter; 2:28–29 in English)

Yahweh’s own prophetic word through Yo’el names three Spirit-manifestations: **nevuah** (נְבוּאָה — H5016, prophecy), **chalom** (חֲלוֹמִים — H2472, dream), and **chazon** (חֲזוֹן — H2377, vision). Prophecy. Dreams. Visions. These are the three categories **Yahweh** names as the evidence of His Spirit being poured out.

These are also precisely the three categories established in **Bamidbar (Numbers) 12:6**, where **Yahweh** defines how He makes Himself known to prophets: **“If there is a prophet among you, I, Yahweh, make Myself known to him in a vision; I speak to him in a dream.”** Yo’el 3:1 is not introducing something new — it is universalizing and democratizing the already-established prophetic framework of the Tanakh. The Spirit’s coming would not bring a new category of spiritual evidence; it would make the *existing* prophetic categories available to all flesh.

Tongues are nowhere in Yo’el’s prophecy. Not one mention. Peter quoted Yo’el to *explain* the Shavuot event. But the Pentecostal doctrine requires tongues to be the definitive evidence — a requirement the Tanakh text Peter himself cited never establishes. If Peter wanted to say tongues were the prophesied evidence of Spirit-reception, he had the most perfect opportunity in all of Scripture to say it. He quoted the Tanakh instead, and the Tanakh said: *prophecy, dreams, and visions.*

IV. THE TANAKH’S OWN SPIRIT-OUTPOURING ACCOUNTS: NO TONGUES

This is where the Devarim 19:15 standard is most decisive. If tongues were the established evidence of Spirit-reception, we would expect to find it in the Tanakh’s own accounts of the Spirit of Yahweh coming upon individuals and assemblies. We do not find it.

A. BAMIDBAR II: YAHWEH’S OWN PENTECOST BEFORE PENTECOST

In **Bamidbar (Numbers) 11:24–29**, **Yahweh** took of the Spirit that was on Moshe and placed it on seventy elders. The text is precise: **“And when the Spirit rested on them, they prophesied.”** Not: they spoke in tongues. They *prophesied* (*vayitnabbe’u* — from *nava’*, נָבָא, H5012). Two men — Eldad and Medad — were not at the Tent of Meeting, yet they also prophesied in the camp. When

Yehoshua (Joshua) urged Moshe to restrain them, Moshe answered with one of the most profound Spirit-statements in the entire Tanakh:

“Are you jealous for my sake? I wish that all of Yahweh’s people were prophets and that Yahweh would put His Spirit on them!”

Bamidbar (Numbers) 11:29

This is **Yahweh’s** own recorded vision for the Spirit’s distribution among His people: universal *prophecy*. This is what Yo’el echoes 700 years later. This is what Acts 2 echoes 1,300 years later. **The evidence of the Spirit, across all three accounts, is *prophecy* — the speaking of Yahweh’s word with accuracy, power, and conviction. Not ecstatic unintelligible speech.**

B. THE MAJOR SPIRIT-ENDOWED FIGURES OF THE TANAKH

A survey of the Tanakh’s Spirit-filled servants makes the pattern unmistakable. In every case, the evidence of the Spirit is covenantal function, prophetic speech, or divine empowerment for a specific mission:

Yehoshua (Joshua) (Bamidbar 27:18; Devarim 34:9): *Filled with wisdom; led Israel faithfully. No tongues.*

Shimshon (Samson) (Shoftim (Judges) 14:6, 19; 15:14): *Spirit of Yahweh rushed upon him for deliverance. No tongues.*

Sha’ul (Saul) (1 Shemu’el (Samuel) 10:6,10): *Spirit came and he prophesied. No tongues.*

David (1 Shemu’el 16:13): *Spirit of Yahweh rushed upon him. He produced the Psalms. No tongues.*

Eliyahu (Elijah) (1 Melakhim (Kings) 18:12; 2 Melakhim 2:16): *Spirit of Yahweh moved him to prophecy and miracles. No tongues.*

Yesha’yahu (Isaiah) (Yesha’yahu 61:1): *“The Spirit of Yahweh is upon me” — to proclaim covenant. No tongues.*

Yechezk’el (Ezekiel) (Yechezk’el 2:2; 3:24; 11:5): *Spirit entered him and he heard Yahweh’s voice; prophesied. No tongues.*

Mikhah (Micah) (Mikhah 3:8): *“I am filled with power, with the Spirit of Yahweh, to declare to Israel its sin.” No tongues.*

Zekharyah (Zechariah) (Zekharyah 7:12): *Torah and words sent by Spirit through former prophets. No tongues.*

The pattern is absolute. Across hundreds of years of Tanakh history, in dozens of Spirit-endued servants, **Yahweh’s** Spirit manifests as: prophecy, wisdom, physical strength for covenant purposes, revelation, visions, dreams, and moral courage. Not once is ecstatic tongues-speech presented as the normative or required evidence of Spirit-reception. Not once.

C. YIRMEYAHU'S NEW COVENANT PROMISE: THE EVIDENCE IS TORAH-INSCRIPTION

The Tanakh's most direct prophecy of the new covenant Spirit-work is found in **Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 31:31–34**, which describes the covenant **Yahweh** would make with the house of Yisra'el after the exile. The evidence of this Spirit-work is not tongues:

"I will put My Torah within them, and I will write it on their hearts. And I will be their Elohim, and they shall be My people."

Yirmeyahu (Jeremiah) 31:33

And in **Yechezk'el (Ezekiel) 36:26–27**, the Spirit-promise is equally specific:

"I will give you a new heart, and a new spirit I will put within you. And I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put My Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes and be careful to obey My rules."

Yechezk'el (Ezekiel) 36:26–27

The evidence of the Spirit's indwelling, according to the Tanakh's own covenant prophecy, is **covenant alignment: walking in Yahweh's statutes and obeying His rules**. Torah written on the heart. A heart of flesh replacing a heart of stone. This is the promised Spirit-work of the new covenant. Pentecostalism's mandatory tongues doctrine is not found here.

V. WHAT PAUL ACTUALLY ARGUED IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12–14

Pentecostalism builds its mandatory-evidence doctrine primarily from the Acts accounts (2:4; 10:46; 19:6) and from 1 Corinthians 12–14. A careful reading of Paul's own argument in 1 Corinthians 12–14 demonstrates that Paul is not establishing tongues as mandatory evidence — he is doing almost the opposite.

A. TONGUES ARE ONE GIFT AMONG MANY — NOT THE DEFINITIVE ONE

In **1 Corinthians 12**, Paul presents nine manifestations of the Spirit: word of wisdom, word of knowledge, faith, gifts of healings, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, *kinds of tongues*, and interpretation of tongues. He makes three critical statements about the distribution of these gifts:

"All these are empowered by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as He wills."

1 Corinthians 12:11

"Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Do all work miracles? Do all possess gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues? Do all interpret?"

1 Corinthians 12:29–30

Paul's rhetorical questions in 12:29–30 expect the answer **NO** for every single one, including tongues. This is a structural argument: the Spirit distributes gifts as He wills to the body as a whole — no single gift is given to every member. This is not a secondary or incidental point. It is the central argument of the entire chapter. The Pentecostal doctrine of mandatory tongues for every believer directly contradicts Paul's own argument in this passage.

B. PROPHECY IS EXPLICITLY RANKED ABOVE TONGUES

In **1 Corinthians 14:1**, Paul opens his detailed treatment with: **"Pursue love, and earnestly desire the spiritual gifts, especially that you may prophesy."** The word translated "especially" is *mallon* (μαλλον), meaning *more, rather, preferably*. Paul is not subtle. He is telling the Corinthians — a congregation that has become doctrinally enamored with tongues — that they have misranked the gifts. Prophecy is greater.

"I would rather speak five words with my mind in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue."

1 Corinthians 14:19

This single verse — from the same apostle, in the same letter that Pentecostalism uses to build its tongues doctrine — should be decisive. Five words of intelligible covenant instruction are worth more than ten thousand words in a tongue. And Paul is not speaking hypothetically: he explicitly says he spoke in tongues more than all the Corinthians (14:18), and he still rates five words of understandable teaching above the entire enterprise of uninterpreted tongues-speech in a congregational setting.

C. TONGUES WITHOUT INTERPRETATION: PAUL'S OWN RESTRICTION

In **1 Corinthians 14:27–28**, Paul establishes a clear covenant boundary for tongues in public worship: **"If anyone speaks in a tongue, let there be only two or at most three, and each in turn, and let someone interpret. But if there is no one to interpret, let each of them keep silent in church."** This is Paul's own rule. In the very passage that Pentecostalism uses to ground its tongues doctrine, Paul says: if there is no interpreter, keep silent.

This is precisely the opposite of what happens in most Pentecostal congregational worship, where entire congregations simultaneously speak in tongues with no interpreter present. The doctrine of mandatory tongues as mandatory evidence creates congregational practices that violate Paul's own explicit instructions in the very passage from which the doctrine is derived.

D. TONGUES ARE A SIGN FOR UNBELIEVERS, NOT BELIEVERS

Paul's own identification of the function of tongues is often overlooked by Pentecostal interpretation. In **1 Corinthians 14:21–22**, quoting **Yesha'yahu (Isaiah) 28:11–12**, he states: **“Thus tongues are a sign not for believers but for unbelievers.”** The function of tongues in Paul's framework is evangelistic witness to those outside the covenant — consistent with the Acts 2 Shavuot picture of known languages being spoken to people of every nation. Tongues are an outward-facing covenant witness tool, not an inward-facing personal evidence of Spirit-reception.

Note also that Paul roots this in the Tanakh: **Yesha'yahu 28:11** — **“For by people of strange lips and with a foreign tongue Yahweh will speak to this people.”** The “tongues” context in the Hebrew prophets is foreign-language proclamation to covenant-refusing Israel as divine judgment and witness. This is not a private prayer language. This is not mandatory evidence of personal Spirit-reception. This is *covenant proclamation!*

VI. THE THREE ACTS ACCOUNTS: WHAT THEY ACTUALLY RECORD

Pentecostalism grounds its mandatory-evidence doctrine in three accounts in Acts where tongues accompany Spirit-reception: Acts 2 (Jerusalem), Acts 10 (Cornelius' household), and Acts 19 (disciples at Ephesus). A careful examination reveals that these accounts do not establish a universal, mandatory pattern.

A. ACTS 2: SHAVUOT — ALREADY ADDRESSED

As established above, Acts 2 is a Sinai-echo covenant proclamation in known human languages to fifteen language groups. It is a unique, unrepeatable, covenant-foundational event occurring on the Tanakh's own appointed covenant feast day. Using it to establish a universal mandatory pattern for individual Spirit-reception requires a level of proof the text itself does not provide.

B. ACTS 10:44–46: CORNELIUS — NOT ABOUT EVIDENCE OF SALVATION

When the Spirit fell on the household of Cornelius, they spoke in tongues. But what is the actual purpose of tongues in this account? Peter's interpretation is explicit: **“Can anyone withhold water for baptizing these people, who have received the Holy Spirit *just as we have?*”** (Acts 10:47). The function of the tongues in this account is *not* to prove Cornelius' personal salvation to himself. It is to convince *Jewish onlookers* — who had never conceived of Gentiles receiving the Spirit — that the Spirit of **Yahweh** had moved. Acts 11:15–17 confirms this: Peter later explains the event to Jerusalem leaders as proof that Gentiles could receive the same Spirit. The tongues served an *apologetic and*

covenantal boundary-crossing function, not the function of establishing personal initial evidence for the individual recipient.

C. ACTS 19:1–07: TWELVE DISCIPLES AT EPHESUS

Paul encounters twelve disciples who had received only the baptism of Yochanan (John) the Immerser. After Paul explains Yeshua and they are immersed in his name, the Spirit came on them and they spoke in tongues and prophesied. Note: Paul says they **both** spoke in tongues **and** prophesied — consistent with Yo’el’s own framework, in which prophecy and Spirit-empowerment are the central manifestations. Even in the one Acts account most often used to link Spirit-reception to tongues, the text itself immediately adds prophecy alongside it.

There are also three major Spirit-reception events in Acts that record *no tongues at all*: the 3,000 converted at Acts 2:41, the Samaritans at Acts 8:14–17, and the conversion of Sha’ul himself at Acts 9:17–18. If tongues were the mandatory, normative, universal initial evidence, these accounts — especially the 3,000 at Pentecost itself — would have been the most obvious places to record it. They do not. Silence is not neutral here: it is evidence.

VII. APPLYING DEVARIM 19:15: THE TWO-OR-THREE WITNESSES STANDARD

The covenant’s own evidentiary standard is established in **Devarim (Deuteronomy) 19:15**: “**A single witness shall not suffice against a person for any crime or for any wrong in connection with any offense that he has committed. Only on the evidence of two witnesses or of three witnesses shall a charge be established.**” This principle applies to doctrinal claims as surely as it applies to legal testimony. Any doctrine claiming to be covenant truth must have two or three independent Tanakh witnesses. Let us apply this standard to the mandatory tongues doctrine:

Witness 1: Yo’el 3:1-2 (Joel 2:28-29)	Spirit-evidence named: prophecy, dreams, visions. Tongues: NOT NAMED.
Witness 2: Bamidbar 11:24-29 (Numbers)	Spirit distributed to 70 elders: they prophesied. Moshe’s vision: all would be prophets. Tongues: NOT NAMED.
Witness 3: Bamidbar 12:6 (Numbers)	Yahweh’s own definition of Spirit-prophetic communication: vision and dream. Tongues: NOT NAMED.
Witness 4: Yechezk’el 36:26-27 (Ezekiel)	Spirit-work evidence: walking in Torah statutes and obeying Yahweh’s rules. Tongues: NOT NAMED.
Witness 5: Yirmeyahu 31:33 (Jeremiah)	New covenant Spirit-work: Torah written on the heart. Tongues: NOT NAMED.
Witness 6: Yesha’yahu 61:1 (Isaiah)	Spirit anointing evidence: proclaiming covenant good news, binding the brokenhearted, setting captives free. Tongues: NOT NAMED.

Required standard	TWO OR THREE INDEPENDENT TANAKH WITNESSES required.
Result	ZERO TANAKH WITNESSES establish tongues as mandatory evidence of Spirit-reception.

The verdict of the Devarim 19:15 standard is unambiguous. The mandatory tongues doctrine has **no Tanakh witness**. Not one. Not even a weak one. Under the covenant’s own evidentiary standard, a doctrine supported by zero Tanakh witnesses cannot be established as covenant truth regardless of how many NT passages are cited in its favor, because the NT passages themselves must be tested against the Tanakh foundation, not the reverse.

VIII. THE DEEPER PASTORAL PROBLEM

The mandatory tongues doctrine creates a specific pastoral harm that the covenant requires us to name directly and honestly, out of genuine care for the people in these congregations.

ASSURANCE HELD HOSTAGE

When tongues become the mandatory initial evidence of Spirit-reception and therefore of salvation, the assurance of every believer who has not spoken in tongues is placed in jeopardy. This is not an abstract theological problem. It is a lived pastoral reality in Pentecostal communities, where sincere, covenant-pursuing people spend months or years in anguished seeking — sometimes accompanied by manipulation, pressure, and coached repetition of syllables — because they have not produced the required evidence. This is not the freedom that the Spirit of Yahweh establishes. It is bondage.

THE FRUIT IS BYPASSED

When a single behavioral manifestation becomes the test of Spirit-indwelling, the Tanakh’s own witness about the evidence of **Yahweh’s** Spirit is bypassed. The Spirit’s presence is known, in the covenant, by covenant alignment: justice, lovingkindness, humility (**Mikhah/Micah 6:8**), care for the widow, orphan, and stranger (**Devarim/Deuteronomy 10:18–19**), Torah-walking (**Yechezk’el/Ezekiel 36:27**), and prophetic covenant proclamation (**Yo’el/Joel 3:1–2**). A person can speak in tongues and have none of these. A person can have all of these and never have spoken in tongues. The covenant knows which one is the true evidence.

THE SPIRIT OF YAHWEH CANNOT BE REDUCED

The **Ruach HaKodesh** (רוּחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ) is **Yahweh’s** own Spirit — sovereign, moving as **Yahweh** wills, distributing gifts individually as He sees fit (1 Cor. 12:11). To require a single specific human behavioral output as the definitive, universal, mandatory evidence of His presence is, at its root, an attempt to put the Spirit of the Sovereign Creator of heaven and earth into a box of human doctrinal construction. Moshe said it plainly: **“I wish all of Yahweh’s people were prophets and that Yahweh would put His Spirit on them!”** (**Bamidbar 11:29**). Moshe’s prayer was for the Spirit’s universal freedom — not for the Spirit’s reduction to a single measurable output.

IX. A DIRECT WORD TO BERNARD'S CATALOG

Bernard's *The New Birth* and *Spiritual Gifts* are sincere, thorough, and well-researched within their doctrinal framework. But that framework has a structural flaw: it reads the Apostolic writings as the authoritative interpretive lens through which to understand the Tanakh, rather than the reverse. When this inversion is in place, a doctrine can be built from a handful of NT accounts (Acts 2, 10, 19) and from 1 Corinthians 12–14 — while the entire Tanakh's witness points in a different direction — and the doctrine still appears sound, because the authoritative standard being applied is the NT rather than the Tanakh.

The corrective is not to abandon the Apostolic writings. It is to read them *in light of* the Tanakh, which means: (1) allowing the Tanakh's Spirit-endued servant accounts to define what Spirit-reception looks like, (2) allowing Yo'el's own prophecy — which Peter quoted — to define the evidence (prophecy, dreams, visions), (3) applying the Devarim 19:15 standard and requiring multiple Tanakh witnesses for any doctrine before it is established as covenant truth, and (4) recognizing that Paul's own ranking of gifts (prophecy above tongues) and his own rules for tongues use (interpretation required, or remain silent) are themselves inconsistent with the mandatory-evidence doctrine that has been constructed from his writings.

X. CONCLUSION: THE SPIRIT'S EVIDENCE IS COVENANT ALIGNMENT

The Spirit of **Yahweh** is real. His indwelling is real. His empowerment for covenant living, prophetic proclamation, wisdom, and mission is real and Tanakh-grounded across a thousand years of covenant history. None of this is in dispute. What the covenant disputes is the claim that **any single human behavioral output — especially one with no Tanakh precedent — can be established as the mandatory, universal, definitive evidence of that Spirit's presence.**

The Tanakh's own witnesses — Yo'el, Yirmeyahu, Yechezk'el, Moshe in Bamidbar — speak with one voice about what the Spirit's presence produces: covenant alignment, prophecy, vision, dream, Torah written on the heart, justice, and lovingkindness. **This is the covenant evidence of the *Ruach HaKodesh*. It requires neither a formula, nor a congregation, nor a specific syllabic output. It requires a human heart fully turned toward Yahweh, walking in His statutes, bearing His Name, and proclaiming His covenant.**

“*And I will put My Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in My statutes and be careful to obey My rules.*”

Yechezk'el (Ezekiel) 36:27

“To the Torah and to the testimony! If they do not speak according to this word, there is no light of dawn in them.”

Yesha'yahu (Isaiab) 8:20

ISSUED BY THE OFFICE OF ELDER KEPHA ARCEMONT

Miqdash Bethel Covenant Institution • Pearl River, Louisiana
985-250-9060 (Ministry) • 402-218-9530 (Cell) • miqdashbethel@gmail.com
PO Box 762, Pearl River, LA 70452 • miqdashbethel.org
