

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

3-12-1927

The Gift of Tongues according to the Bible. An Investigation.

Frederick F. Breuer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Breuer, Frederick F., "The Gift of Tongues according to the Bible. An Investigation." (1927). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 595.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/595>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

The Gift of Tongues according to the Bible.

An Investigation.

Frederick.F.Breuer.

March 12, 1927.

Op. after Table of Contents.

Contents.

Introduction.	1.
1) The Purpose.	1.
2) Two Prefaced Remarks.	1.
a) Each passage will be considered.	1.
b) Relation of different parts.	1.
3) Arrangement of paper.	1.
4) Pertinent passages.	2.
I. I. The gift is of foreign tongues.	2.
1) Description of the gift.	2.
2) A gift of the Holy Spirit.	3.
3) To some of the disciples.	3.
4) Of foreign tongues.	3.
a) Terminology agrees.	3.
b) Situation agrees with view.	4.
5) Before unknown to them.	5.
6) Fluent, not broken.	5.
7) Intelligible.	6.
8) Purpose.	6.
9) Full control.	8.
10) Limitation of the speaker.	8.
11) Conclusion of I.	9.
II. Foreign languages in Act.2 but otherwise ecstatic speech	9.
1) Description.	9.
2) By whom held.	9.
3) Proofs of the theory.	10.
Examination of proofs.	
4) Foreign tongues unnecessary.	11.

5) No trace of use in foreign missions.	13.
6) No mention of Paul having the gift.	13.
7) Papias and Jerome.	13.
8) No writings in these tongues.	15.
9) No mission activity in Act.10:46,19:6.	15.
10) Paul at Lystra.	15a.
11) 1 Cor.14 would not suggest foreign ton.	15b.
12) Paul did not command preaching in f.t.	16.
13) Lack of worth of gift.	17.
14) Language not understood by people.	18.
15) Interpretation always necessary.	18.
16) Prophecy vs. Tongues.	19.
17) Insanity accusation.	19.
18) Terminology.	20.
a) Terms used.	21.
b) Mk.16:17.	21.
c) Other passages.	23.
19) The Comparisons.	25.
a) The Difficulties.	25.
b) Glosse in v.9.	26.
c) F.L.imcompatible with indistinct, musical sounds.	26.
d) Naturlaute.	27.
e) Comparison of likes.	28.
20) F.T. not like gift of healing.	28.
21) Not with intelligence.	29.
22) Conclusion of exanimation of proofs.	31.
23) Remaining points.	31.
24) Use of the gift.	31.

25) Purely personal.	32.
26) A sign to unbelievers to damnation.	33.
27) Act.2:1-11.	33.
28) 2 Cor.12:4.	34.
III. Act.2:1-11, as ecstatic speech.	34.
1) The view.	34.
2) Reasons.	34.
3) Why foreign tongues.	35.
4) Anti-inspirational arguments.	36.
5) Other proofs.	37.
IV. Value of Early Christian Literature.	38.
V. Other Views Championed.	39.
1) The Christianly possible.	39.
2) Anti-Christian Views.	40.
Bibliography.	41.

The Gift of Tongues according to the Bible.

An Investigation.

A Thesis

presented to the faculty of

Concordia Seminary,

St. Louis, Mo.

by

Frederick Francis Breuer,

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Master of Sacred Theology.

The Gift of Tongues according to the Bible.

An Investigation.

The purpose of this paper is to prove, by basing all exposition and proof upon pertinent Scriptural references, that the gift of tongues, spoken of in the Bible, is, in every case, the gift of foreign languages.

In order to avoid any hasty judgement of this paper two things must be borne in mind. To obviate the necessity of repetition as much as possible each passage will be considered in its proper connection, as fairly as possible, and no important passage will be omitted. Again, parts one, two, and three are related, as will be seen, in such a way, that part one is proved alone valid by the refutation of the view in parts two and three and not by any special proof in part one, and the unproved section of part two, Act 2:1-11, as foreign languages, is proved by the refutation of view three. The basis of this remark is that there are but three major views of the gift of tongues which are considered possible by prominent, respectable exegetes and if two and three cannot be held with any show of evidence, view one is, then, logically the view which ought to be held.

This arrangement will be observed. First, that view will be stated which holds that the gift of tongues is, throughout, a gift of foreign languages and it will merely be shown that it is possible according to the language of the New Testament and the explanation of the parts of Scripture in question to hold this view. Secondly, that view will be presented which takes for granted that Act. 2:1-11 deals with foreign languages

but considers all other passages as referring to ecstatic speech. Here all passages but Act.2:1-11 will be considered fully which are used to support this theory in these particular instances. The arguments will be stated, and, if possible, refuted. Thirdly, the view that all passages deal with ecstatic speech will be considered, and, since all but Act.2:1-11 were fully discussed, Act.2:1-11 will be especially examined in regard to its validity in supporting this difference from the first and second view, namely, that Act.2:1-11 refers to ecstatic speech. Fourthly, the position of the earliest Christian writers outside of Scripture will be taken up and the value of their opinion discussed, and, finally, various other views will be presented, some of which may be held, not logically, but, at least, not heretically, and other views, neither logically nor from a sound Christian viewpoint.

The following are the passages referring to the gift of tongues: Mk.16:17; Act.2:1-11; 10:46; 11:15-17; 19:6; 1 Cor.12:10, 28,30; 1 Cor.13:1; 1 Cor.14. There are also other passages which are related to the gift of tongues but merely by implication as 1 Thess.5:19, but since they shed no light upon the gift, either for or against any of these views, they have been omitted from the list.

3.

The gift of tongues is a gift of the Holy Spirit, to some of His disciples, of foreign languages, before unknown to them, whereby the recipient of the gift can speak fluently and intelligibly in the tongue which he has for purposes of teaching, singing, praying, declaring the mysteries of God, and for proclaiming the Gospel. He has full control over himself so that he can speak or cease to speak as he will but, unless he have the gift of interpretation, he cannot change from the

foreign language and express himself equally well in the language of the people if he have not naturally this ability.

It is the gift of the Holy Spirit. This follows from the entire idea of the spiritual gifts. Before His ascension, Christ assured his disciples that He was going to give them signs which were to follow them and mentions this as one. In Act.2:1-11 we read that "they were filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance", and St. Peter remarks that this was a fulfillment of Joel 2:28, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh." Act.2:17 In the home of Cornelius "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word," Act.10:44, and concerning this Peter reports that "the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning!" Act.11:15. In Act.19:6 "the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied". In 1 Cor.12-14 the entire discussion is of spiritual gifts in general, including this gift of tongues, and 1 Cor.12:11 states that "all these worketh that one and the selfsame Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will".

This gift was given to some of Christ's disciples but not to all as the above passage shows, to each one individually as He desired. That some possessed ^{the} the gift and others not is also manifest from the abuse of the gift in 1 Cor.12:3, where it is stated that "no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, out by the Holy Ghost," and if even this cannot be said by a man without the Holy Spirit, how much less can he speak in tongues, a special, supernatural gift of the Spirit, and above all, the Holy Ghost dwells in no unbeliever, 2 Cor.6:14-18.

The tongues spoken of are foreign languages. The terms

used in this connection are: glosse, 1 Cor. 14:2, 4, 9, 13, 14, 26, 27; the plural, glossai, Mk. 16:17; Act. 2:4, 11; 10:46; 19:6; 1 Cor. 12:10, 28, 30; 1 Cor. 13:1; 1 Cor. 14:5, twice, 6, 18, 19, 22, 23, 39; dialektos, Act. 2:6, 8; phone, 1 Cor. 14:10; plural, 1 Cor. 14:11.

Every one of these terms can be used as denoting language and the connection must denote what kind of language it is, native or foreign or otherwise. Glosse is just as the corresponding Hebrew word, lashon, Gen. 10:5; Dan. 1:4, and there can be no objection to this view on the score of any word in use for language in Scripture in this connection.

The real difficulty arises in the explanation of each passage and these will be considered more fully later. In Mk. 16:17 the adjective, kainais, makes no difference because it is possible, as everyone must admit, that a new language may be a language never before known by the speaker just as today we speak of acquiring a new language, French, Italian, etc., if we never knew them before. In Act. 2:1-11 the entire context and story shows that foreign languages are indicated. In 1 Cor. 14, and 12 and 13 are the same, Paul shows that a speaking of foreign tongues is absolutely of no avail, "for ye shall speak into the air", and the entire chapter shows a contrast of speaking in the native language of the people and of speaking in foreign languages. The noun, gene, (genos), can make no difference because a kind of language and kinds of language may surely mean foreign languages just as one may have kinds of grain; wheat, rye, and barley and still have all grain, so also here kinds of languages may mean: Greek, Polish, Russian, and still all be foreign languages. Thus in regard to the terminology and situation there can be no question as to the possibility and as to the reasonableness of this view and if there is an

Objection it will be considered later on.

These languages were before unknown to the disciples. Mk.16:17 shows this to be the use of koinais, new languages to the speakers before they were known to them, and in Act.2:7-8 the people knew of their ignorance in this respect and were, therefore, all the more surprised, and in all other passages the obvious fact remains, that, if there were a tongue spoken which had been known before and learnt in the ordinary way, where would be the miracle, since no Christian denies that the charismata are miraculous gifts?

The disciples speak these languages fluently. This follows naturally from the fact that it is a gift of the Holy Spirit. Take the gift of healing which He gave to His disciples. Did He give them the gift in a half-hearted way so that they might make a blind man at least myopic, a hopelessly bed-ridden cripple at least a crutch-supported cripple? Why should He give His disciples a broken speech in a foreign language instead of a fluent speech? It was to be a sign! It is a miracle to give a person even a broken speech in a foreign tongue but why in all the world should He? Did anyone ever make the complaint or sarcastic remark that the disciples spoke in a broken, foreign language? As a sign of the Spirit, isn't it much more reasonable to expect a perfect gift just as the gift of healing? In Act.2 we hear of no mention of a broken tongue but the indications are of a perfect use. If it were not so would not the people have imagined that the languages were naturally acquired from the very fact that they were imperfectly known and would they have marvelled so exceedingly at a series of half successful attempts at the use of the various languages? A fluent speech is indicated.

The languages were spoken intelligibly, that is, the speaker knew what he said and so did his hearers. There is no denial possible in Act. 2 " because that every man heard them speak in his own language, speak, not recite a series of words of no connection. This is also clear from an unbiased reading of 1 Cor. 14. In verse four, in antithesis to verse two, that men do not understand the language, the contrast shows that the speaker himself understands and edifies himself. Can anyone really believe that a person is edified, built up, in spiritual matters, if he himself do not understand, as far as they may be spiritually understood? Isn't it at least possible that he understand, since the intention of this part of the paper is merely to show the possibility and probability? Look at verse five of this chapter. The speaking in tongues is equal in value to prophecy if there be interpretation. The words must have meaning if it be rated as on the level with prophecy, preaching, and certainly, since the gift is for the edification of all in the church as 1 Cor. 14:26 states, is it not likely that the languages spoken to these people to whom the tongue is native are intelligible?

The purpose of the gift is for a sign, Mk. 16:17, but primarily for teaching, singing, praying, declaring the mysteries of God, and for proclaiming the Gospel. That it was used for teaching follows from 1 Cor. 14 where St. Paul expressly states that it is for the edification of the people who understand it and this is, naturally, a teaching, and proclaiming of the Gospel is teaching, and, as will be shown, that, too, is indicated. Singing and praying and speaking mysteries of God, things before unknown or hidden to the intellect of man, are mentioned in verses fifteen and two respectively. Verse three speaks of exhortation,

comfort, and edification by prophesy and, since it is used to show that these things can be of benefit only in the known tongue, the natural conclusion is that they were present in the unknown, although, since in the Corinthian congregation, these languages were not understood, they were of no benefit. That the Gospel was proclaimed in these foreign languages follows naturally from this fact. Every gift of the Holy Ghost is to be used. In Mk. 16:17 we read that it is a sign which is to follow after them, We have seen how it was used, the conclusion, therefore, is that it was used wherever they went to preach since they had with them the gift as a sign. In Act. 2:12 the great things of God were spoken of by the disciples newly endowed with this power and what else is the speaking of the great things of God but a proclaiming of the Gospel? Look at Corinth! A great merchant city, a cosmopolitan population! Behold the great possibilities of speaking in foreign tongues to foreigners and yet the gift, used for this purpose, is abused in the church, the mother of these missions! But the very abuse connotes constant use! Who heard of linguistic difficulties in preaching in foreign lands? It is a fact that Greek and Latin were wide-spread but one may seriously doubt whether, in every town most of the inhabitants spoke these languages fluently, if at all. It is difficult to this very day to do away with "Sprachinseln" in this country, in spite of a lively traffic and travel, and, in spite of the vast trade and travel of the Roman days, who will dare to say that the chance of universal language was as great then as now? When Paul was in Lystra, Act. 14, the people spoke in the speech of Lycaonia and Paul and Barnabas readily understood them. It is not stated in which language the Apostles spoke. It is

no absolute proof but it surely is likely, for, Paul says, 1 Cor. 14:18, "I thank God, I speak with tongues more than ye all". Paul is the greatest missionary of the Gentiles, and he had, as far as we know, no difficulty in speaking in his vast journeys and he spoke with tongues more than all of them! It is no absolute proof but it is highly probable. Look at the universal commission of Christ to the disciples. Was it to the Church of all ages and not immediate? That too, but will anyone set any limit to the activities of the missionaries in the Apostolic age? There are indications that the entire world was soon in potential possession of the Gospel and strange discoveries are made in this respect now and then. The possibility and probability is certainly in the words of Scripture as Luther says, X:229, "So ~~that~~ aber der Heilige Geist nicht im Anfange. Er harrete nicht bis alle Welt gen Jerusalem kaeme und lernte hebraeisch sondern gab allerlei Zungen zum Predigtamte, dasz die Apostel reden konnten, wo sie hinkaemen".

The speaker had full control of himself so that he could speak or remain silent as he desired. If it were not so, how could Paul justly tell him to keep still, v. 28, if no one understood the language? If they could not control themselves, how could he command them to take turns? If Bedlam should ensue, what right did he have to hold them responsible if they, due to the nature, or affliction, in this case, of their gift, could not refrain from speaking?

There was, however, a limitation, not in the gift, but in the speaker. Unless the speaker had the gift of interpretation, he could not change from the foreign language and explain or express himself equally well in the language of the people

or in his native tongue, if he had not, naturally, this ability. This follows from 1 Cor. 14:15 where spirit and understanding are in antithesis. When he spoke in tongues, not he spoke, but the Spirit gave him utterance. When he spoke without the use of the gift, his human frailty became manifest. Both may have been combined but evidently both were not here in Corinth. This, by the way, speaks for a clear, intelligent speech in the languages, (vid. # 7), otherwise there could be no real contrast.

If there be any doubt as to the plausibility and probability of this view, which is all that was to be shown, if there be any objection, it will probably be met in the following two parts of the paper. This has merely been a statement and endeavor to show the possibility of the view with no special attempt at proof.

II.

The second chief view claims that the gift of tongues is a gift of the Holy Spirit of ecstatic speech expressed in stragge, dark, unintelligible, disconnected utterances, independent of the intellect, pouring forth the spiritual emotions ~~alone~~ in praise and adoration, directed to God and not to man, purely personal, always needing interpretation, unfit for teaching, unedifying to the church, a sign to unbelievers to damnation. In Act. 2:1-11, however, the gift assumed a unique and temporary form of foreign languages.

The question arises, "Who held this view?" It is a composite of various and related views which may differ in one or more particulars but the general view is the same. Anyone who has studied the subject will see the reason for this when he finds that almost every writer has an opinion,

sometimes widely, sometimes slightly, different from the other. Zahn, Thayer, Bengel, Stoeckhardt, Wm. G. Moorehead might be mentioned among others, but, in this subject, names are of no importance, they may be prejudicial. An argument for or against a view is a deciding factor and not the personality who produces the view or argument. Logic and reason are subservient to no one in particular but servants to all. A brilliant thought is not always brilliant for accuracy, as many aphorisms show. The statements were made and they are, by no means, the most extreme, but the most conservative. Let each one examine, not persons, but arguments, especially points accepted in one's own view.

That the gift consisted of ecstatic speech expressed in strange, dark, unintelligible, disconnected utterances, independent of the intellect is based upon the following arguments or assertions. There was a lack of the necessity of the gift of foreign languages. There is no trace of its use for missions. No mention is made of Paul having foreign tongues. Papias (1) claimed that Mark was the interpreter of Peter and Jerome, (2) quoted by Estius, claims the same of Titus in regard to Paul. There are no writings in foreign tongues. In Act. 10:46 and 19:6 it was not used for missionary purposes. At Lystra, Act. 14:8-15 Paul's interference was too late to indicate an understanding of the language. In 1 Cor. 14, if that had been the only source on information, one would never have thought of foreign tongues. Paul did not tell the Corinthians to preach in foreign tongues. He shows the lack of worth of the

(1 Eus. III:39

(2 Estius, on 2 Cor. II McC & St.

gift in 1 Cor.14. The language was not understood by the people. Interpretation was always necessary. In 1 Cor.14:5 there is a direct contrast to prophesy. At Corinth the unbeliever would have thought them insane because the speech was incoherent and ejaculatory but this would not have happened if it had been foreign tongues. The terminology offers serious difficulties because kainais is used in Mk.16:17 and heterais in Act.2:4 where there really is foreign tongues and, in other places, no adjective is used. In 1 Cor. 14:10-11 there is a comparison of ikes and one foreign language would never be compared with another. The gift would, if it were foreign languages, be absolutely out of the same category of other charismata, as the gift of healing. The speaker spoke not with the intelligence but with the spirit. Let us examine the validity and argumentative force of these assertions.

"There was a lack of necessity of the gift of foreign tongues because the entire world was impregnated with Greek and Latin." To obviate this difficulty in regard to the acceptance of the view of foreign tongues and to refrain from repetition, see paragraph eight of part one. But in addition consider this. The world was not thoroughly Greek and Latin--and Aramaic, if you will. The great men of Rome of that day studied Greek and the universities and the Greeks despised the Roman tongue and Aramaic was surely not as widespread as these two. If this were the condition of the learned, of the elite, what of the homines rusticani? Did they who followed the plow, did they, who were slaves, did the humble tradesman acquire a sufficient command of these languages, so sufficient that their vocabulary extended not only to their occupation, if they did acquire them at all, but also to religious ideas? When Paul addressed the

Yes, see the notes - p. 100

mob at Jerusalem and reverted to the Hebrew remember the impression made, There had been silence before but this deepened it. If Greek were the common language of trade it was not the language of the home, of the people, as Act. 2 indicates, "How hear we every man in our own tongue?" They were chiefly Jews and it is to be supposed that they spoke Aramaic in their house. What, then, was the position of these other languages, if not that of common usage among the people? Why did the people at Lystra revert to their native Lycaonian language? It certainly was not a language in common use in all of these countries and they were many. There were newly conquered lands where Latin was not known well and where Greek was known not at all. Why should a barbaric prince ask Nero for a mime who could, by gesture, make people understand even when words failed? An absolute necessity? No, just as there is no absolute necessity in China or in India. Are not English, German, and French widely distributed? Would anyone declare them insufficient for all the world of missions? The times were, however, different. The need was there, but, in addition, it was an age of the birth of the Church, an age of miracles worked thru the Holy Spirit, an age of a supernaturally rapid spread of the Gospel. The gift was, moreover, a sign to follow them, Mk. 16:17, and, 1 Cor. 14:23 will certainly undeceive anyone who thinks that ecstatic speech is a sign to the heathen if an unintelligible language is to make a good impression upon them. It was no absolute necessity but it surely was an efficient help in spreading the Gospel. Look at the other charismata! At a gift of healing! There was no absolute necessity. God's Word needs no miracle to substantiate it. Will anyone doubt a miraculous healing on this score?

" There is no trace of its use for missions." Just as many an argument advanced this, too, may have exactly the reverse force. When we read of a William Carey, of a John Eliot, we read of a conquest of languages for purposes of missionary work but here it is lacking. Why? Evidently there was no necessity of studying the languages. This is, of course, an argument from silence, but, if it can be shown that such a thing should have been mentioned, then, too, the reason why it was not mentioned is cogent. Yet, if the gift be of foreign tongues, each reference, from Acts to Corinthians, shows a trace. Consult, in addition to these things, paragraph eight of part one for traces of the rapid spread of the Gospel, etc. Remember Mk. 16:17, this sign shall follow them and, 1 Cor. 14:23, for a reason why ecstatic speech could not have followed. The speaking is not to be by the heathen, converted, as a sign but ^t they, the missionaries themselves, are to speak as Mk. 16:17 shows. If these things be considered, foreign languages appear to be fully referred to and alone sufficient.

" No mention is made of Paul having foreign languages." The above paragraph shows the lack of validity of this argument in regard to all missionaries and, of course, it applies to the individual of the class as well. This argument, moreover, takes for granted that the gift of tongues is really ecstatic speech but if it be not, if it be of foreign tongues, then certainly, Paul's statement, 1 Cor. 14:18, " I speak with tongues more than ye all", is applicable as an affirmation of the fact and as far as hints and indications of the fact are to be considered, see again I:8.

" Papias claimed that Mark was the interpreter of Peter and Jerome, quoted by Estius, claims the same of Titus in regard

to Paul." This is to prove that there was no gift of foreign tongues in the case of Peter and of Paul but from Paul's statement the indications are, that, since, taking for granted that foreign languages were meant, he spoke with tongues more than they all did, some had one tongue, and others, another tongue, and still others, more than one. The argument would thus not be at all contrary to the view of foreign tongues because Paul or Peter may have lacked some language in their individual gift in this regard. But, here we must indulge in a slight investigation of the two quotations, not at all doubting the sincerity of those who quote. Who was Papias that his statement should be of any real account in deciding so troublesome a question? Our eminent church historian, Eusebius, gives us the opinion that he is, " sphodra gar toi smikros (on) ton noun". Is it mere prejudice on account of chiliastic views? One might at first think so but Mc Giffert, in his note, says, " A perusal of the extant fragments of Papias' writings will lead anyone to think that Eusebius was not far wrong in his estimate of the man". In fact, in the very infancy of our theological youth we meet an expression such as " eine Aussage des unzuverlaessigen Papias".^{ka)} This reference of Papias thus, proves nothing and is based on very slim authority, if any. What of Jerome who says, " Quia non potuit divinorum sensuum majestatem digno Graeci eloquii sermone explicare," he needed a Titus?^(b) All that this indicates is that Titus assisted Paul in speaking Greek and the value of such a comment may be judged according to the individual's estimation of Paul's ability to speak Greek.

a. Einl. in d.N.T. Fuerbringer. p. 24. b. McClintock & Strong.

" There are no writings in foreign tongues." This, at the first blush, seems strange to us but is it of any special import to our topic? With us the learning of a new language generally means a certain amount of writing in that language, of exercise in grammar, etc., but there are thousands who know a language well, can tell when an abnormality in speech occurs, but still cannot write at all. Think of attempts of letter-writing by one not at all accustomed to the pen though he may be able to write. Think of your people in the Middle Ages, both knight and peasant, of your thousands of modern illiterates, and you will readily understand a possibility of speech without writing. But who ever said that a gift of tongues was a gift of writing and surely the one doesn't presuppose the other? In missionary work the main difficulty is in speaking to the people, especially to people who cannot write, and there is no reason for rejecting the view of foreign tongues on that account. Why, in fact, granted that there should be writings of these missionaries in their respective tongues, have we no writings in Aramaic, in Latin, since some could surely write these? Why have we no writings of all other Apostles? Should we conclude that they never preached in Aramaic or Greek or Latin because we have no writings of any but a few? Such a conclusion would be peculiar!

" In Act. 10:46, and in Act. 19:6, the gift was not used for missionary purposes," but why expect an impossibility? All that we hear of the story or episode is that Cornelius, his kinsmen and friends, received the gift, that certain disciples of John received the gift and there ends the brief and scant narrative. Are we to expect them immediately to have an assembly of foreign peoples before them, if the thought be intended

as a suggestion of this, or, to be more charitable, ought we not be satisfied with leaving them in happy possession of their gift and thankful for the knowledge that they were blessed by the Holy Spirit rather than expect their following activities to be fully discussed, especially in so condensed a narrative as Acts? Truly, if we were to proceed in this fashion we might expect Luke's book to swell into a stupendous Schroeckh! Of what value is such an argument from silence? How can anyone make such a bold statement that, because it was not used at the moment for missionary purposes, it was never so used? It surely is more reasonable to believe that they did make use of it because they certainly had plenty of opportunity in a Caesarea and in an Ephesus, the one, the Roman capitol of Palestine and a good sea-port, and the other, the Roman capitol of the Asian province and situated in the natural trade-routes of the country. The argument takes for granted, of course, that foreign tongues could not be in place here and it is merely necessary to undeceive anyone holding such an opinion to disprove the argument.

" At Lystra, Act. 14:8-15, Paul's interference was too late to indicate an understanding of the language." A little study of the story would easily enlighten anyone in regard to this point. Did Paul understand or not understand the language of Lycaonia? After Luke tells how the people marveled at Paul and Barnabas and called them gods and prepared to sacrifice to them, there is no indication at all that only the sight of the preparations of worship made Paul take note of the intended idolatry but a mere " akousantes ", no " idontes " at all. Paul had been engaged in preaching and what is more likely than that he continued, after he had healed the cripple, to preach, showing

that this sign was an affirmation of the truth? Yet the people became more and more excited and gather together from all parts of the city and prepare to pay homage to the gods until the disturbance is too great and Paul listens and finds out the occasion. This, would be a more likely situation. A hushed, attentive audience and an oncoming crowd that has neither, as yet, seen or heard Paul and gives vent to ejaculations of adoration to the newly discovered gods. Isn't it more natural for the circumstance to occur thus, from a low murmur, perhaps, which increases in volume and audibility than to expect the people to shout with one accord, "Zeus and Hermes"? The idea certainly must have had time to develop. The tardiness of Paul and Barnabas, if it be tardiness, proves nothing, and an "akousantes" rather inclines one to think that they heard and understood the foreign language. And, as for speaking the language, there is nothing against a supposition that they spoke in the Lycaonian tongue though, before, they may have spoken in Greek. It may be that the gift of tongues was not used here but if this be taken as proof against it by those holding ecstatic speech as correct, it surely is not impertinent to show that it may readily apply.

"In 1 Cor. 14, if that had been the only source of information, one would never have thought of foreign tongues." This is purely subjective and depends upon the point of view of the person holding the view. It happens to be a fact in the case of a Hayes or of an B.C. Conybeare, and who knows of how many others, that these people come to the question with a preconceived notion of a gift of ecstatic speech on the assumption that the gift in the early church was nothing more than the ravings of a pythoness, of a thirteenth century friar, of a

10.

Quaker, of an Irvingite, of a Huguenot of Cevennes, of a Sandwich Islander under the influence of the god, Oro, of a revivalist, but, me genoito, that such things should be read into the sacred text anymore than the antics of a whirling dervish be ascribed to an Old Testament prophet. The best statement of the case is, that, had we the New Testament alone, no one would have thought of anything else but of foreign tongues. Why ascribe the palawering of a neurotic patient, of an hysterical fanatic, of a demon-possessed subject, of a fraud, to a person under the influence of God, the Holy Spirit? This is the chief bias in this view of the subject, the main misleading prejudice to the clear words of Scripture, the chief argument of "scientific investigation". Madmen, especially madwomen, who have no control of themselves under the influence of sickness and Satan and could not, if they desired to, obey Paul's command to behave in church, have succeeded fairly well in darkening a 1 Cor. 14, clear in itself when eyes are free from the prejudice of others. "Why did Paul not mention the fact of an introduction of foreign languages into Corinth", some one says. For the main and simple reason that he happened to be writing to people who were fully aware of the fact and abused it where it should have been used, that is, where no one understood and no one interpreted it, in the church of Corinth. Does he ever mention an Agape being introduced into the Corinthian church? And, yet, as ^e ^{14 ch} this very chapter, as almost every commentator understands, it was abused and the abuse reprov'd. Does he mention an introduction of an Eucharist? Why overwork Paul who surely had enough to do?

"Paul did not tell the Corinthians to preach in foreign tongues." Here, again, Dickens could have written another "Great

Expectations". Silence on this point merely indicates that it was taken for granted that the gift was used and not only abused, and here Paul evidently, ---will anyone deny it?---treats only of the abuse. Could anything be more simple? Isn't it a mere study of 1 Cor. 14 that suffices to answer this brilliant assertion to prove that foreign languages could absolutely not have been meant? As for the congregational use of the gift, he surely shows that the speaker could reveal a mystery, sing, bless, pray well, and it would then be of use to a congregation who had an interpreter of the language altho they themselves had no knowledge of it.

" He shows the lack of worth of the gift in 1 Cor. 14." This statement is based upon a superficial reading of the chapter because no one with ordinary intelligence, who reads it with care, can avoid seeing that Paul speaks, not of the lack of value of the gift under ~~the~~ circumstances, per se, but of the lack of value of the gift under the circumstances of the Corinthian church. Certain members had abused the gift and had spoken publicly to the congregation who did not, in the least, understand and had no interpreter. Of what value was it then? Of no more value than the use of Latin in the ritual of the Roman Catholic church when no one understands except, perhaps, the priest. This was the difficulty. The gift, per se, was good or a St. Paul would not have told them not to forbid the gift, 1 Cor. 14:39, and the Holy Spirit would not have given it, if we can judge by an examination of all other charismata and gifts of God in the Old and New Testaments and do not like to believe in a "Luxuswunder". When prophesy is spoken of, over against the gift of tongues, we will see that the gift is of

high value. Is the gift worthless in its proper use? Ask rather whether a prayer, a revelation of a mystery of God, v.3, a song, a blessing, a thanksgiving, v.14-16, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit be useless and the question is answered.

" The language was not understood by the people."

This is another remarkable statement to prove the impossibility of holding the view of foreign tongues but to what does it refer? The only passage to which it can refer is 1 Cor.14 and now that the situation has been repeatedly explained the statement loses all force. These people did not understand the languages and for that very reason Paul tells the speakers to keep still unless they had an interpreter. Who, today, would listen to a speaker in an unknown tongue? Was the mentality of the people of that day less than ours? Or will anyone be so bold as to make an assertion to the effect that, in no place, could they have been understood by the people except through an interpreter? Where is the proof? There is none.

" Interpretation was always necessary". This is another hasty generalization because there is absolutely no other indication anywhere else that an interpretation was needed. The gift of interpretation would be very good for a disciple in a foreign country, accompanying a preacher, but in this chapter the evident use would be to interpret a foreign language to a congregation. Why, if the gift always needed an interpreter, did the Holy Spirit not combine both and make it available for use if it were useless otherwise? Why should he give an incomplete gift? But, on the other hand, why ask so much when such a statement has no foundation? The situation of the church at Corinth, a people not knowing the languages, sufficiently explains the need of interpretation here. Was Paul, who spoke with tongues

more than all of them, always under the necessity of having an interpreter for them? If he spoke with tongues more than all of them, could none be found to interpret for him so that he preferred speaking to them "by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine"? The only apparent hindrance to the presentation of the matter of the speech was the natural inability to express the inspired words in ordinary discourse in one's native tongue and could not Paul do this? Even looking aside from the hasty generalization, this would indicate that, independent of interpretation, the gift was in use.

" In 1 Cor. 14:5 there is a direct contrast to prophesy." Only in so far is this statement correct, that there is a contrast, but a contrast of what? Of a gift of tongues and of prophesy? Read the passage and what is the outcome? The contrast is not of tongues and of prophesy but of a gift of tongues, uninterpreted, and of a gift of prophesy in the language understood by the people. Very naturally, as Paul wished, anyone would conclude that here a gift of tongues is of no account to the people because no one understood and derived any benefit while a gift of prophesy is understood and people are edified, if they listen. Does this militate against foreign tongues? By no means, but, on the contrary, Paul says, "Greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret". What, then, is the natural conclusion? He that speaketh in tongues and interprets or is interpreted is equal to him who prophesieth. The argument, thus, whether intentionally misstated or not, has no proof force. Foreign languages may well be held and as yet there is no evidence of ecstatic speech.

" At Corinth the unbeliever would have thought them insane

because the speech was incoherent and ejaculatory but this would not have happened if it had been foreign languages." This is taken from 1 Cor. 14:21-23 and, if anything, it shows foreign tongues plainly. Paul quotes Isaiah 28:11-12 to show that the speaking of foreign tongues to the Jews by the Assyrians and Babylonians, their conquerors, would serve as a punishment for not listening to the prophets of God when they could have done so. They were to experience a dearth of preaching of grace while the speech of foreigners was to show them that the visitation of Jehovah was upon them. This, then, is a sign to an unregenerate, stiff-necked race. Why now, says Paul, will ye inflict this punishment upon believers? Why will ye speak to them in the language of a foreigner if they cannot understand? That is a sign of wrath to an unbelieving people but not to a Christian congregation! Here is the point. If they, Christians of the gift of tongues, monopolize the entire service by speaking in unknown tongues and a person, ignorant of the languages, or an unbeliever, not willfully so, who knows that the people do not understand, enter, will they not consider them mad? They surely will, as anyone else possessed of ordinary common sense would. But where, in this passage, is there an indication of incoherent and ejaculatory speech? The situation doesn't point to it. The reference of Paul to Isaiah, on the other hand, would indicate a speaking of foreign tongues, and no one else, who had not heard of a revival, would think otherwise. It's surely reading a matter absolutely extraneous into the text.

"The terminology offers serious objections because *kainais* is used in Mk. 16:17 and *heterais* in Act. 2:4 where there really is foreign languages and, in other places, there is no adjective."

This, and the next three arguments are the real and apparently cogent arguments for an ecstatic speech. The others were mere bagatelles, but, in regard to actual validity, the one is as good as the other and none prove ecstatic speech. Since it is a question of terminology let us examine the terms. In the passage which is accepted as treating of foreign tongues, Act. 2:4, heterais glossais is used, but in Mk. 16:17, kainais glossais, Act. 19:6; 1 Cor. 12:30; 1 Cor. 13:1, 8; merely glossais, 1 Cor. 14, glosse, and glossai are used. In 1 Cor. 12:10, 28, gene glosson is used but many exponents of an ecstatic speech seem to hold the gene in disfavor and neglect to remark upon it. Let us examine each passage and see whether there is any real difficulty.

In Mk. 16:17 the possibility of taking kainais glossais as foreign languages is conceded by Thayer, who, in fact, accepts this view of kainais, as meaning foreign languages, and McClintock and Strong says that the "obvious meaning is to speak in new languages which they had not learned as other men learn them." No objection can, then, be found in regard to this meaning of kainais. Behgel^a, and most other exegetes, distinguish between heterais and kainais although the one excludes the other but does it? If today we study a new language must it be a language never before spoken, "quas nulla natio antea habuerat"? There were two writers who used these terms, Luke, in Acts, and Mark, in his Gospel. Isn't there a possibility that two different authors use different terms? Besides this, Mark's purpose is to show that this was to be a miracle to follow after the disciples as a confirmation of their doctrine and, therefore, says

a) Gnomon Novi Testamenti, Mk. 16:17.

that these tongues are to be new to them while Luke is describing an historical event and endeavors to show that the languages spoken by the disciples were foreign tongues. The view-point of both authors is different and consequently, a different adjective is used. But Bengel makes them denote two entirely different things, *kainais*, languages never before used and *heterais*, foreign languages, but is this arbitrariness of any value? Has it any force? Doesn't he place a meaning into a word which was never intended? And since the plural is used there were more than one previously unheard of language, *kainais*? In what did they differ? Were there varieties of ecstatic speech, several systems of ejaculatory utterances? Were they ejaculatory utterances in foreign languages? Then the trouble isn't in foreign languages but in incoherent and ejaculatory utterance, which will be examined later but at least a doubting of foreign languages involves vastly greater problems than foreign tongues ever would and suggests amusing absurdities and ridiculous situations because some authors describe ecstatic speech as the barking of dogs and the wailing of cats, as obscene speech. Are these the various languages? Given by the Holy Spirit? If not, what else, pray? Isn't it strange that the Spirit increased the miracle by giving unknown tongues when one could not be understood, if to be ecstatic speech, because languages is evidently the meaning of *glossai*? In addition to this, he says that 1 Cor. 12:10 is *kainais glossais*, not *heterais*, and, pray, with what justice? Neither expression is used and may it not be either? Why merely the one? But a great question is involved in accepting *kainais* as foreign tongues. Then one must take not merely Act. 2 as foreign tongues but also all other passages because these tongues are to be a sign to follow along with them, par-

akolouthein, not merely once, but just as the gift of healing also mentioned in Mk.16:17. It must be granted that there is no absolute proof that foreign tongues is intended. This gift may have followed along unmentioned but isn't it exceedingly and extremely likely that that gift of tongues mentioned in 1 Cor.12:10 along with healing as in Mk.16:17 should be foreign languages? Or should that be omitted and ecstatic speech be placed instead and foreign tongues go on unmentioned? Absolutely speaking, it is possible but who would be so foolish as to think seriously of the possibility? This surely indicates foreign languages throughout and there is no forcing of language as ecstatic speech absolutely must have to attempt to make a show of justification and in II:4, as was mentioned, a 1 Cor. 14:23 would certainly exclude an interpretation of ecstatic speech as even a holder of this view of ecstatic speech admits in treating of 1 Cor.14:23, (II:16). If this point be admitted then the argument from terminology falls to the ground but there are more indications of the lack of value of the argument from terminology.

We have examined Mark and have found him exceedingly favorable to foreign languages but let us examine the strange manner of Luke's use of terms in Acts. In Act.2 he, as those holding this view admit, speaks of foreign languages but in Act.10:46 and 19:6 a mere glossais is used and the conclusion drawn is that these passages indicate ecstatic speech. We will look aside from the previous paragraph and see whether Acts itself does really point to such a view. In both cases they spoke with tongues, glossais, and there is no modifier of any kind. In the one case, they prophesied, and, in the other, they praised God but this makes no difference in the terms. From

the presentation of the story there is no indication of ecstatic speech but the plural would indicate foreign languages. The affair at Caesarea turns out unfortunately for Peter. He is called to Jerusalem to answer for preaching to the Gentiles and what is his defence? It is stated in a seriously overlooked passage, Act. 11:15-17, which some one used to prove that Act. 2:1-11 was ecstatic speech! Peter tells the church that "the Holy Spirit fell on them, as on us in the beginning, v. 15". This is rather suggestive, but not conclusive? No, some one will answer, it was merely the being imbued with the Holy Spirit more than normally, although how a person is to notice this is somewhat difficult. Perhaps from a heightened color or a sparkling of the eyes? Peter, however, evidently refers to the speaking in tongues. Can anyone deny it? There may be some and they may already have been in the church at Jerusalem and Peter becomes more explicit and says that "God gave unto them the like gift as he did unto us," "and they held their peace," as anyone would. What was the outstanding gift of the Spirit that characterized Pentecost? What is suggested by Pentecost if not a gift of foreign tongues? And if they received the like gift at Caesarea, wasn't it foreign tongues? But why does Luke use such an expression, so misleading to many? Luke wrote Acts 60-64 A.D. and Pentecost took place about 33 A.D. and there is an interval of 25-30 years. Are we seriously to suppose that the people never spoke of this Pentecost in the meanwhile? The term became a technical term in this time and a simple glossai meant foreign tongues. Can anyone object to such an evidently natural phenomenon? Some one might. Luke wrote the book 25-30 years later and not Act. 2:1-11 about 33 A.D. and the other stories later, hence all terms ought to be the same. But such a person

ought to consider the fact that Luke, in Act. 2:1-11, describes the miracle and there makes plain that it consists of foreign tongues and afterwards uses the technical term just as any other writer would do who uses a technical term in a book. The first time it occurs it is explained and later taken for granted as being understood. What follows from this? Merely this, that, unless there be any cogent reason, and there is none, all of these expressions mean one and the same thing, foreign languages. This, too, is brought out in 1 Cor. 12:19. Here, *glosson* is used twice and can anyone deny that this can mean different languages, kinds of language, Greek, Latin, German, Italian, etc.? Only twice is it used and then Paul uses the technical term in all other passages. This terminology thus points to foreign languages and to nothing else.

" In 1 Cor. 14:10-11 there is a comparison of likes and one foreign language would never be compared with another." " *Ne tropus ultra tertium* " ought to be our motto here, Verses 7-11 cause Zahn a great deal of difficulty. He doesn't even exert himself to prove a point. In regard to 1 Cor. 14:9 he says, "Es bedarf keines Beweises, dasz man sich dafuer nicht auf 14:9 berufen kann, wo ja nicht von *glossais* lalein selbst die Rede ist sondern vonder Zunge als dem Werkzeug (*dia tes glosses*), mittels dessen man wie durch Trompete (14,3)" etc. " Diese Vorstellung lag um so naeher, da *glosse* auch vom Mundstueck der Floete und anderer Instrumente gebraucht wurde", Act. p. 103:n. 52. Act. 104 he says that in 14:10-11, *phonon* means " Naturlaute ". Another exegete will tell us that a comparison of a flute or of a harp cannot apply to foreign languages but only to ecstatic speech. It is beyond the province of this paper to write an exegesis of verses 7-11 but that is what this, in places, amounts to and

since it bears a vague relation to it we will consider the almost pertinent points.

Zahn asserts that glosse means the organ, tongue, and not language and bases this assertion upon the fact that the tongue is used to blow the trumpet and the flute.---Perhaps he means to regulate the supply and force and direction of the wind.--- But why does he omit the harp? It would be absolutely unfair to disregard one disproving factor as though it were not there. In the entire connection glosse is used solely and alone for language and there is no reason for changing the meaning in this case. The instrument of speech by which something is said is always, in this chapter, an unknown tongue and the houtos leads back from musical examples to the subject of the chapter, the languages, "therefore, also ye, through the language, if ye do not utter an understandable word, how shall that which is spoken be known?" What cause would there be in using tongue, the organ, when no one ever thought of it; and it lay far from the thought? The most natural meaning, however, is the subject of discussion, the unknown tongue, as the entire context shows. There is no warrant for an introduction of such a definition. It really makes no difference in either view and proves nothing for or against foreign tongues but it happens that Zahn asserts that it does not mean foreign tongues but the organ, tongue. "Es bedarf ja keines Beweises!"

Others draw the conclusion from these verses, 7-9, that the comparison of instruments of indistinct sounds with that of foreign languages does not apply and therefore ecstatic speech is correct. This is a true case of a tropus ultra tertium and a lack of understanding of the comparison and it leads a person, as many another of these arguments, into the absurd.

The comparison merely shows that an instrument which produces no clear and definite sound is of no value, and so, also a language which is not understood by the people is valueless. Press the point as they do and you arrive at the conclusion that there is no difference, diastolen, in words but only one sound and that is repeated again and again and no interpreter could ever interpret such nonsense! To such an absurdity this leads. But take the comparison as it is intended and you see that just as valueless as an instrument is, which gives no distinction in sound to the hearers, so also a language, which is not understood by the people and gives them nothing but the knowledge that the person is making noise, perhaps speaking, is of no value. Now what is there against foreign languages in this? The entire situation in the church of Corinth points to nothing else!

In verses 10-11 Zahn finds----Es bedarf ja keines Beweises----that phonon means "Naturlaute". It surely is a wonderful bit of poesy in a commentary and makes a passage darker and darker. All that the passage means is that there are, as it were, so many kinds of language in the world and none is without the power of language (to express thoughts). In verse 11 Paul continues with the same word, phonen, in the singular, and says, "If, therefore, I do not know the significance of the language, I shall be a barbarian". Would he use such an appellation, barbarian, one who speaks a foreign language, in regard to Nature? Could he use phonen readily with speaking, lalein, if it meant one sound of Nature? The participles are present, continued action, not aorist, a completed, single action. Why introduce this new idea of sounds of Nature when languages, foreign languages, are evidently intended?

These are unimportant points but the main point is that likes, foreign languages, phonon, as even those who hold ecstatic speech, with few exceptions hold, otherwise this argument wouldn't be extant, that identical things, cannot be compared. Again, the point of comparison is missed utterly. It is not merely foreign languages compared with foreign languages but foreign languages under ordinary circumstances in every-day life compared with foreign languages used in church when people do not understand them. Even in ordinary life no one would think of attempting to speak to some one who speaks an unknown tongue and does not understand the speaker, why should this be done in church? The opposing argument is based upon the fact that foreign speech could not be used in this passage and therefore it must be ecstatic speech but it has been shown that it does not apply. The comparison was not understood as the entire chapter shows because the situation is that of a congregation being spoken at in an unknown tongue and nothing ecstatic is indicated.

" The gift would, if it were foreign tongues, be absolutely out of the same category of other charismata, as, for example, the gift of healing." In order to obviate this difficulty we need simply show that a power which could be acquired in an ordinary manner may also be acquired by a gift of the Holy Spirit, and, if by the Spirit, we would expect it to be perfect. Healing in a miraculous is pointed to because it differs in so far that it could be acquired naturally. Foreign tongues can and ecstatic speech, it is supposed, cannot. Whether this last supposition be correct or not may be doubted but there is no use discussing it and we will, therefore, not even mention Marcion's spiritual bride, or any pythoness, or speaker of ecstatic nonsense in a revival. All of the above proofs and this

paper show that foreign tongues is meant but we can look aside from these proofs and look for a gift of the Holy Spirit that may be acquired to a certain extent also naturally. 1 Cor. 12 deals with spiritual gifts and here we read of a word of Knowledge, of a word of wisdom, of faith, of healing, of working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, kinds of tongues. Some exegetes try to make a distinction here on account of changes as of allos and heteros but this is absolutely unjustifiable. For an attempt at this consult Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown and compare the use of allos and heteros in the Greek New Testament and smile. It does not work out. In the commentary the Greek isn't used and merely referred to and it surely looks pretty, as anyone must admit, but he forgets and no man, in the first place. It is just as in English when we say: the one, the other, another, still another, etc. and even Thayer, who holds this view of ecstatic speech, recognizes this fact. The gifts are simple given as in a catalogue and no difference is made between them so as to classify them. Now, if we have a word of wisdom, if we have faith in the catalogue and a gift of healing and of miracles, why must foreign languages be excluded? Cannot a Christian acquire a strong faith thru a study of God's love letter? Can not preaching be learnt? Naturally, and just as naturally the objection vanishes.

"The speaker spoke not with the intelligence but with the spirit." This is no argument at all because a person may certainly speak foreign languages with the spirit though the intelligence or mind be inactive. There is positively no reference to ecstatic speech as it is understood, an incoherent, dark, strange, unintelligible, series of disconnected utterances

and it is, therefore, practically unnecessary to enter into a discussion of it but since it may serve for clarity, we will present an elucidation of the unclear (?) verses, 1 Cor. 14:14-5. *Nous* is here used as the intellective faculty, understanding, Thayer, I:a. While speaking in tongues the intellectual faculty was not made use of but only the spirit. *Nous* is here used in contradistinction to *pneuma*. It is not to be understood as though the speaker were unconscious of what he said or else how could he be edified anymore than the rest of the congregation who did not understand the language? *Nous* is a quality or power of man and was not taken hold of by the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is here used as "the highest and noblest part of man, which qualifies him to lay hold of incomprehensible, invisible, eternal things, in short, it is the house where Faith and God's Word are at home." Luther, in Thayer. These things a man, not under the special influence of the Holy Spirit could not ordinarily make clear or discourse about to his audience. Thus, just as a man is edified by a good sermon, only in a higher degree, so was he under the influence of the Holy Spirit, but, also, just as an ordinary layman cannot clearly give a reproduction of a sermon, so here, when speaking in the ordinary language. Therefore Paul expresses the wish that all present could both speak and have the power to reproduce the ideas, etc. in the colloquial language. The *akarpōs* refers to the congregation which should be edified and not to the speaker as verse four show. This is not strange that the person could not clearly speak in his own tongue. It was the Holy Ghost Who gave him utterance, Act. 2:4, cf. Mt. 12:19 and parallels, Jer. 1:7-9, Ex. 4:12, Nu. 11:29, and when the special gift was used it made no especial increase in the man's natural endowments and this should

have prevented any boasting as though the man spoke with his own ability. Again, prayer is spoken ~~often~~ what is prayer without understanding (Mt.6:7)? If there were no clear statements, though they were translated, in ecstatic speech, how could the congregation "try the spirits whether they be of God"? How could they say, "Amen! "? If it were ecstatic speech, how could Paul say that they prayed well?

In conclusion to this examination let us make the situation clear. Ecstatic speech is based upon a view prejudiced by a knowledge of modern and ancient ecstasies that were due to neurosis or high excitement of fraud or Satan and upon the fact that since foreign languages could not be applied to these passages it must be ecstatic speech. This view has been overthrown in various ways and all that remains is to ask the simple question, "Of what use would ecstatic speech be?" Why should the Holy Spirit, who never gives nonsensical gifts, give ecstatic speech? This thought is the origin of the paper. The only use is for curiosity and as for miracles for curiosity confer Mt.12:38 ff.

Thus far we have discussed the view in regard to its attempt to overthrow foreign tongues and have shown that it alone suffices. There still remain four points to be considered before we finish the discussion of this theory: the use of the gift, the personal edification over against that of the church, the sign to unbelievers to damnation, and Act.2:1-11 as a unique instance of foreign tongues. This is merely for the sake of completeness and not from any innate necessity because these questions can readily be answered by a study of that which has been said.

It has been stated that the gift of tongues was merely

used for pouring forth the spiritual emotions alone in praise and adoration and that it was unfit for teaching. This is built to some extent upon an argument from silence that has no worth, as has been shown before, but even the Sacred Book tells us expressly of more than this. In Act. 10:46 we read that they spoke with tongues and praised God. Thus praise is mentioned. But in Act. 19:6 we read of prophesy, "they spoke with tongues and prophesied". These are no two distinct acts, speaking with tongues and prophesying, for just as in Act. 10:46 and in Lk. 2:13, Luke coordinates terms and expresses the substance in an additional verb, thus: they spoke in tongues and praised God, praising God and saying, they spoke in tongues and prophesied, preached. Preaching implies teaching so we can justly conclude that the people also ^{taught} preached in these tongues. In 1 Cor. 14:2 the speaker declares a mystery. In verse three there is a contrast between prophesy and tongues. The same matter is indicated, edification, exhortation, and comfort, and only because the people do not understand these languages do they lose the teachings, etc., cf. v. 5. In verses 15-17, prayer, singing, blessing, and thanksgiving are mentioned and it is done well, as Paul remarks. All of this is contrary to a mere emotional outburst in ecstatic speech, as it is understood, which Paul could not have recommended, but implies all of the uses of language, praise, singing, prayer, blessing, declaring the mysteries of God, thanksgiving, and preaching, a form of teaching. Ecstatic speech is thus not exactly, as it were, biblical. Since these things are so we are to take the gift of tongues as not at all directed to God alone and of purely personal benefit but of vast benefit to the church. When it is said that he speaks to God alone, v. 6. the remark is based upon the reason that the people do not understand, not that this is the only use. A study of 1 Cor. 12 shows this

because the entire chapter makes plain that spiritual gifts are for the benefit of the church as in this chapter too. God understands all languages and because he can hear him, Paul recommended that, if the speaker must use the gift, he speak to himself and to God. In that tongue he is uttering words with the help of the Holy Spirit and he can thus, all the better, bring his thoughts to God and be edified but this was merely a subsidiary use. The great good was in the helping and edification of others in faith and in knowledge.

This gift of tongues, moreover, was no sign to unbelievers for damnation. Here a reference dependent upon a quotation of the Old Testament is made to apply to the New Testament conditions. It could not be that because this gift was referred to in Mk. 16:17 as a sign to follow along with the disciples as their possession. They were to conquer the world for Christ and a gift of this ecstatic speech would repel the people while their native tongue would attract them and win a ready ear for the cause of Christ. Manifestly, the unbeliever is not an unwilling unbeliever but an unbeliever on account of lack of knowledge for how can they believe anything which they have not heard? This is correct because Paul, --consult the Greek and not the English---uses the same word, *apistoi*, and wants them converted. It is thus not at all a sign to unbelievers to damnation.

Finally, Act. 2:1-11 has been shown to be no such instance of foreign tongues. An Act. 11:15-17 absolutely disproves this. If it were the only instance, where would be the great, evident miracle in ecstatic speech, so often manifest outside of the Church? Only then is it a manifest miracle when unknown, previously not-learned foreign languages are spoken and no one

can doubt that this gift was supernatural who will consult 1 Cor.12:10, the catalogue of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit.

If anyone, as a last resort, should refer to 2 Cor.12:4 let him know that the things impossibly said in human language could not, as a matter of course, be said in foreign languages or in ecstatic speech and if God wanted them said he had the power to give the gift of perfect expression also in this case and it should furthermore be remembered that in the gift of tongues, not man himself spoke, but it was the Holy Ghost who gave them utterance and spoke through the man.

III.

The third view of the gift of tongues teaches that, as in part two, the gift of tongues is ecstatic speech but goes further in so far that it claims ecstatic speech, dark, disconnected, utterance also in Act.2:1-11. Since all other passages but Act.2:1-11 have already been examined we shall concentrate our attention upon the Pentecostal gift of tongues.

This view is based upon the following thought: Luke never saw the manifestation of tongues and, therefore claims it to be of foreign tongues. Since in Act.10:46 and 19:6 ecstatic speech is meant and Act.11:15-17 refers it to the gift at the beginning, so it must necessarily be ecstatic speech. Luke tried to invest Pentecost with a special miracle, that of the giving of the law at Sinai. He took his sources without criticism. Heterais is his own addition to the story. In Act.2 Luke interpreted v.5. and v.6." because that every man----to v.11, mighty works of God. There were no foreigners there before the speaking began. The multitude could not

understand them at Pentecost and accused them of being drunk, cf. 1 Cor. 14:23. Peter makes no mention of foreign tongues and in v. 14sq. interprets the meaning of ecstatic speech to the multitude. God never sets a premium upon laziness and wants sciences and languages to be studied.

Let us first examine the passage for itself and then decide upon the validity of the proofs against foreign languages. In Gal. 3:3 there can be no objection taken in regard to speaking coherently. The word, according to Thayer, indicates the utterance of one's self either by one's self or by means of some speaker and this is especially the use in the Bible of things spoken by God through men or by Christ. This verb is more fully explained by the following, "as the Spirit gave them to utter, *apophtheggesthai*". This verb has an especial significance in Acts and in the Septuagint. It is not used of ordinary conversation but especially of utterances by prophets, Ez. 13:9; Mic. 5:12; 1 Chron. 25:1. In classic Greek, too, the word is used especially of utterances of wise men and of philosophers. As Thayer says, it was speech "belonging to dignified and elevated discourse". Ecstatic speech never was dignified but astonishing or disgusting or rousing ridicule if that which has been written by eye-witnesses be trustworthy and to ascribe this to people under the influence of the Holy Spirit and speaking for him is well-nigh blasphemous.

They spoke with other tongues, *heterais glossais*. This is plural and not singular, and would, if it were ecstatic speech, necessitate different kinds of dark, disconnected utterances. This leads to the absurd but there is no necessity for dwelling upon this point. The term is explained by verses 6-11. Each

one heard them speaking his own dialect in which he was born. Dialektos cannot be taken as dialect because the people themselves use it as equivalent to glosse and call it the language in which they were born, referring to their respective countries. A list of countries is given to make it more definite so that it cannot be misunderstood. Various words serve the same purpose: heis hekastos, idia dialektos, specifically a language of a definite country, hemeterais glossais. Luke evidently understood the importance of making the language plain. He understood the miraculous element that fights against reason. He spoke here of the first occurrence of the miracle and took pains at making it definite and no one can deny that he did and must, in consequence, to uphold another view, accuse him of putting his own ideas into the text? But that merely shows that the story itself speaks of foreign tongues.

The first six assertions to the contrary are based upon unbelief of primary inspiration and are, therefore, not worthy of consideration by a Christian. It is nonsense to say that so good an historian as Luke attributed foreign tongues to these people on account of popular tales because he never said it, as Ramsay says. We know that he searched diligently into all sources and questioned the witnesses. Had he been wrong, humanly speaking, we would surely have heard ~~our~~ anti-Christian brother-hood voice its denunciations and set him right. In regard to Act. 11:15-17 they would be right if this story could, in any way, be taken as referring to ecstatic speech but since it is obviously turning language upside down on account of a favorite view of ecstatic speech, the argument proves the reverse, namely: foreign languages in Act. 10:46 and 19:6. It is St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen, p. 370. Ramsay.

pleasing to note that an unchristian, if we can go so far, exegete sees the force of Act. 11:15-17. The special miracle referred to at Sinai is the Hebrew tradition that when God spoke the Law His voice went out into the world in seventy languages. But this is especially inapplicable to Luke, a Greek. Why should he want to ornament his story with Hebrew, Rabbinic legend? He was no Jew. The story was written especially for the heathen, the Greeks, who took no stock in any fairy tales but their own. Heterais is his own addition and an unnecessary one because it seems very forceful to many a good-souled exegete. (Heterais, in itself, however, is no real argument and can be taken as Kainais in Mk. 16:17. The context is the real argument here. If it were kinds of ecstatic speech, heterais could mean other and exegetes who point to this as a true distinguishing feature are sadly mistaken and place too much confidence upon an indefinite word.) The same applies to his so-called emendation or interpretation or interpolation. All such argument accuses not so much Luke as the Holy Spirit of falsehood and this is nothing short of blasphemy.

The remaining arguments, though not anti-biblical, are of about the same value. Need there have been foreigners present when the disciples began speaking? Surely a person ought to be satisfied with the crowd that came soon enough and heard them and when they did come they certainly did give testimony that the disciples spoke in their languages. As for being accused of being drunk, Peter certainly defends them well and it is remarkable that 1 Cor 14:23 refers to a possibly similar accusation which shows that the same effect could be produced by them and probably was from the same cause, looking aside from the abuse of the gift. That Peter should mention no foreign

tongues is quite natural in an account that is rather a synopsis of the Acts of the Apostles than a full, exegetical discussion. The people did not have to be told, they knew, as the preceding paragraph of the story tells us. Peter did not interpret ecstatic speech but tells them the cause of the gift, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, a fulfillment of prophecy. There is not the least indication of translation or of interpretation of ecstatic speech, which would have been natural had it been so, as though the Holy Spirit could not fully express himself but needed a Peter to explain what he had said through others! Peter merely explains the circumstances.

IV.

The value of early church literature in this question is of little importance, and, if anything, supports the first view. When Paul says, 1 Cor. 13, that tongues will cease it seems as though they were already very quickly to pass away with the other charismata. Throughout the Apostolic Fathers we have no reference to a gift of tongues and in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the passage, 1 Cor 14, is quoted but in such a way as to give no information and in most writers it seems to be avoided. They consider the passage exceedingly obscure. Irenaeus, 125-200, once mentions a case that seems to give us evidence that he had been a witness of the gift of foreign tongues. Tertullian, 153-220, mentions an often quoted case but it seems to be a spiritist medium from all indications, but there is no mention of languages and no attention is to be paid to the oft quoted passage from Origen, 186-253, because it refers to Adv. Haer. p. 531 Ad. Marc. V: 8. Contra Celsum, p. 615.

Hebrew prophets, as further reading ¹proves, cf. 2K9:11, and not to foreign languages. Otherwise there is merely exegesis of Act.2:1-11, assuming foreign tongues for missionary purposes.

V.

Other views are championed by the following: Lightfoot; Shelling and Delitsch; Fausset and Brown; Schaff, Vincent, and Calvin; Robertson; Wieseler; Herder, Eichhorn, Bardeli, and Bunson; Bleek, Ernesti, and Ewald; older and newer rationalists; Thomas; Conybeare; Hayes, James, Pratt, and Hoeffding; and Dimond. A brief statement of these views has been found in Schaff's History and in McClintock and Strong unless it is obvious from the bibliography that the books have, themselves, been used.

The views in this paragraph have no warrant according to sound exegesis but are not, at least, anti-Christian. No effort will, therefore, be made to refute the views. Lightfoot holds that the language was pure Hebrew but since the plural and the singular of glosse are used denoting languages this is impossible. Shelling and Delitsch think it the normal language of the inner spiritual life which unites the redeemed together with a sympathetic rapport between hearers and speakers. Fausset and Brown believe in foreign languages which the speaker himself did not understand. Schaff holds that all was ecstatic speech but in Act.2 the Holy Spirit interpreted while in Corinth the interpreter performed this necessary function. Vincent coincides with him in this view. Calvin believes that the speakers words were interpreted by the Holy Spirit to the hearers thus multiplying the miracle. F.W. Robertson believes that speakers and hearers were in sympathetic rapport and

thus some understood and others not. Wieseler believes that the gift consisted in inarticulate whisperings. Eichhorn, Bardeli, and Bunson, to some extent, hold that the lips were motionless and merely the tongue moved. Bleek and Ernesti consider the matter spoken as archaic words, and Herder extends it to mystical interpretation of the Old Testament passages. Ewald wants it to mean synonyms in foreign languages, Rom. 8:15, Gal. 4:6, 1 Cor. 16:22. Whence some of these explanations arise is difficult to find out, much more, in fact, than interpreting 1 Cor. 14, and would make an agreeable study in psychology.

Older rationalists, disbelieving in miracles as most of the following do, held that it was a praying in the vernacular or in foreign tongues, if the speakers had known them before. Modern rationalists consider it a subjective vision mistaken by Christians for an objective fact. Thomas, the anthropologist, considers it a form of automatism. F.C. Conybeare thinks it a form of nervous excitement manifested by an ancient prophetess, heathen Sandwich Islander, revivalist, etc. Pratt, Hayes, James, and Hoeffding solve the problem by psychology. Dimoné, the most modern, applies psychoanalysis in the most admirable manner, quite in accord with Freud, Joseph Breuer, Van Tessaar, etc. The last named investigators are quite bold in interpreting all facts in the light of the revival as though a gift of the Holy Ghost were to be judged in the same way as the frenzy of a whirling dervish.

Bibliography.

Bengel: *Gnomon Novi Testamenti.*

Brown: *Critical and Explanatory Commentary.*

Calvin: *In Acta Apostolorum.* 48:23.

Calvin: *In Epistolam ad Romanos.* 1:16. *Brit. Ency.*

Calvin: *In Epistolam ad Galatas.* 3:12.

Calvin: *In Epistolam ad Hebraeos.* 10:1.

Bibliography.

Bibliography.

- Bengel:Gnomen Novi Testamenti.
- Brown:Critical and Explanatory Commentary.
- Calvin:In Acta Apostolorum. 48:28.
- Conybeare.Frederick Cornwallis:Tongues, Gift of, Brit.Ency.
- Davis.J.D.:A Dictionary of the Bible. Tongues.
- Dimond.Sydney G.:The Psychology of the Methodist Revival.
- Eusebius:Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.
- Faasset:Critical and Explanatory Commentary.
- Findlay.G.G.:First Corinthians in Expositor's Grk.Test.
- Fisher.G.P.:The Beginnings of Christianity.
- Harnack.Adolph:Brit.Ency. Prophecy.
- Hayes.D.A.:The Gift of Tongues.
- Hoeffding.H:The Philosophy of Religion.
- Irenaeus:Adv.Haer.I:V:6:1.
- James.Wm.:The Varieties of Religious Experience.
- Knowling.R.J.:Acts in Expositor's Grk.Test.
- Krauss.E.A.W.:Lebensbilder.
- Kretzmann.P.E.:The Baptism, or Gift of the Holy Spirit.
:Popular Commentary.
- Kurtz:Church History.
- Leigh-Bennett.E.:Hand-book of the Early Christian Fathers.
- Luther.Martin.:Deutsche Messe, An die Rathsherren aller Stæd-
to Deutschlands, Predigten.
- McClintock and Strong:Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological,
and Ecclesiastical Literature.
- Meyer-WendtsCommentary on Acts.
- McGiffert.Arthur Cushman:A History of Christianity in the
Apostolic Age.
:Prophecy, in Brit.Ency.

Morehead.Wm.G.:Outline Studies.

Oliphant:Life of Edward Irvin^d.

Origen:Contra Celsum.

Pratt:The Religious Consciousness.

Robertson.F.W.:The Dispensation of the Spirit.

Robinson.Ed.:Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament.

Schaff:History o f the Christian Church.

Souter.A.:Pocket Lexicon of the Greek New Testament.

Stoeckhardt.G.:Biblische Geschichte.II.

Tertullian:Adv.Marc,De Anima.

Thayer:Lexicon of the New Testament.

Thomas.Northcote Whitridge:Automatism,in Brit.Ency.

Vincent:Word Studies in the New Testament.

Weizsaecker.Carl von:The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church.

White.Ellen G.:The Acts of the Apostles.

Zahn.Th.:Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas.