



The Gift of Tongues

Chapter 1: The History of Tongues-Speaking

SPEAKING in tongues, also called *glossolalia*—from the Greek words *glossa* (*tongue*) and *lalia* (*speech*)—was a common practice in the early Church. The teaching and practice of modern "speaking in tongues," or "glossolalia" (we will use quotation marks to distinguish modern "tongues" from the manifestations in the early Church), has had a considerable and very controversial impact on Christendom in recent years. Even "orthodox" clergymen of "straight-line" denominations (Catholic as well as Protestant), many of whom carefully avoided and discouraged "tongues-speaking" in the past, have been seeking for themselves and their church members to get and exercise it freely, probably in many cases seeing in it a helpful means of retaining or winning back many of their rapidly dwindling numbers, as well as attracting new adherents.

As Truth-seekers, inquiring to know the will of God in all things that affect our proper relationship with Him, and desiring earnestly to "rightly divide the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2: 15), that we may thus know "sound doctrine" (Titus 1: 9) and practice, we need to understand correctly this subject.

We may well ask: Is modern "tongues-speaking" of God? Is it taught in the Bible? Of what value is it? Should we seek to have it?

We will seek to answer these questions by examining the tongues-speaking in the early Church, how it and other "gifts" of the Spirit were obtained, its purposes, uses and abuses, and the history of modern "tongues-speaking," its sources, the kind of utterances, arguments in favor of and against it, *etc.*

With this, as with any other teaching or practice that has to do with God and the outworking of His purposes and plans, a true judgment can be formed only by carefully examining how closely the teaching and practice conforms (1) to His infallible Word, the Bible, which is able to make us "wise unto salvation," and is "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. 3: 15-17); (2) to God-given and properly used reason, "the spirit of a sound mind" (2 Tim. 1: 7); and (3) to facts—for what is contrary to facts obviously is not true.

TONGUES-SPEAKING IN THE EARLY CHURCH

The power to speak in other tongues was by God bestowed upon the early Church. The New Testament contains a number of accounts of various ones receiving and using this "gift" (we will use quotation marks also when referring to the *miraculous* gifts of the Spirit). In 1 Cor. 12, 13 and

14 the Apostle Paul's treatment of speaking in tongues indicates that the possession and use of this particular "gift" was considered very important in the early Church.

Many sincere Christian believers place great emphasis on present-day "speaking in tongues," claiming that their and others' experiencing it is a sure proof that they have received the holy Spirit and are children of God. Some of them are inclined to esteem lightly other Christians who have not had such an experience, and to awaken in them serious doubts that they have ever really become children of God and have ever received His holy Spirit.

In the New Testament record, the first marked miraculous manifestation of speaking in tongues occurred at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, ten days after Jesus' ascension, when the waiting disciples were baptized with the holy Spirit. It resulted in Jews of many lands hearing in their own languages the preaching of the wonderful works of God (Acts 2: 1-11). This was the obvious purpose of this tongue-speaking—to spread the Gospel more widely among the people of various languages.

A supplementary baptism with the holy Spirit upon the Church, with a similar marked miraculous manifestation of speaking with tongues, occurred 3½ years later in Caesarea, when the first Gentiles—Cornelius and his household—were received into the Body of Christ (Acts 10: 44-47; 11: 15).

Other manifestations of speaking with tongues came upon the early Church *only through the laying on of hands by one or more of the twelve Apostles* (Acts 8: 14-18; 19: 6; as to Acts 9: 17, 18, see Appendix). There is no hint in the Scriptures or otherwise of the use by the early Church of repetitious lively music to induce the Spirit's coming upon believers, as is done in many "tongues-speaking" meetings today.

The "gift" of tongues is listed with other "gifts" of the Spirit in 1 Cor. 12: 4-11 (compare vs. 28-30) and is referred to also in 1 Cor. 13 and 14, where the Apostle Paul explains quite thoroughly its inferiority to the grace of charity (Greek, *agape*, unselfish, disinterested love) and to the "gift" of prophecy (in some cases, the miraculous ability to foretell, or forecast, future events, as, *e.g.*, in the case of Agabus—Acts 11: 28; 21: 10, 11—but especially the miraculous ability to teach, to publicly expound, various features of God's Word—past, present and future.

We are to distinguish sharply between the holy Spirit itself and the miraculous "gifts," or manifestations, granted to the early Church. As the Apostle explained, "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord" (1 Cor. 12: 4, 5).

It is a matter of history that the "gifts" of the Spirit died out in the early Church shortly after the last of the Apostles—who alone could bestow the "gifts"—fell asleep. Some who uphold the current practice of "speaking in tongues" allege that this dying out occurred because the Church became lukewarm, and that Rev. 2: 4 supports this claim.

"TONGUES ... SHALL CEASE"

But the Apostle Paul indicated clearly that the "gifts" of the Spirit would pass away—not because of lukewarmness on the part of the Church, but *because the purpose for the bestowal and use of these "gifts" would be fully accomplished and they would therefore no longer be needed*. He pointed out in 1 Cor. 14: 22 that speaking in tongues was given "for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not," that the attention of unbelievers might be drawn to the Church and her methods. In other words, this "gift" was adapted less to *the development of the Church* than to *witnessing to the unregenerate world*, and thus to enable the Church to obtain a proper footing and recognition in the world.

In harmony with this, the Apostle said (1 Cor. 13: 8): "Charity [love] never faileth [never will cease]: but whether there be prophecies [*obviously he did not mean Bible prophecies*—which surely would not fail but would all be fulfilled—rather, he meant the special 'gift' by God's power to publicly expound the Truth and, subordinately, to forecast future events—v. 2; 1 Cor. 12: 10], they shall fail [cease to be exercised as one of the Spirit's 'gifts'; the Greek verb *katargeo*, used here, means *to be rendered entirely idle or useless, to bring to an end*]; whether there be tongues [the special 'gift' by God's power of speaking in other languages—v. 1; 1 Cor. 12: 10], they shall cease; whether there be knowledge [surely not *all* knowledge, but the special 'gift' by God's power to know things—v. 2; 1 Cor. 12: 8], it shall vanish away [*katargeo* is used here again]."

Why would these "gifts" (and by implication all the other "gifts" of the Spirit—the three mentioned standing for the others also) cease to operate? For two reasons: (1) Once the early Church would be established and would have gained a proper footing and recognition in the world, thus bringing it to the attention of the world, especially those whom the Lord was calling "out of darkness into his marvelous light" (1 Pet. 2: 9) from among Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 1: 16), these "gifts" no longer would be needed; (2) When the New Testament writings would be complete and added to the Old Testament, the Church would have no need of the "gifts," since the Scriptures are themselves sufficient to make "wise unto salvation," and to make the man of God "perfect [Greek, *artios*, *complete* in accomplishment, fully qualified], *thoroughly* furnished unto all good works [including the primarily essential and vital work of developing Christlikeness]" (2 Tim. 3: 15-17).

"THAT WHICH IS PERFECT"

This latter thought especially is supported by Paul's words in 1 Cor. 13: 9-13. After stating in v. 8 that various "gifts" of the Spirit would fail, cease, vanish away, he explained:

V. 9: "For [*i.e., because*—he now gives the reason for his words in v. 8] we know in [Greek, *ek*, *from*, *out of*, and therefore, because of, on account of, a] part [the Old Testament was the only part of the Bible that had yet been given], and we prophesy in part [Christians in the beginning of the Gospel Age had these 'gifts' because the Bible had not yet been fully given; so the 'gifts'

were given to *supplement*—temporarily—the Old Testament, the incomplete revelation for the Church]."

V. 10: "But when that which is perfect [Greek, *to teleion, the complete, the entire*, as opposed to that which is *in part*—in other words, *the completed Bible*] is come, then that [the 'gifts' of the Spirit] which is [*i.e., exists*] in [*from, because of, a*] part [only the Old Testament portion of the Bible having yet been given] shall be done away [Greek, *katargeo*; the 'gifts' were *to be brought to an end*—to fail, cease, vanish away—after the Bible's completion]."

Contrary to this prophecy's fulfillment, some who support the practice of present-day "tongues-speaking" claim that "that which is perfect" refers, not to the completed Bible, but to (1) the completed, perfected Church. Some others insist that it refers to (2) the perfect Age—the period of Christ's Second Advent and His Kingdom. That the Apostle was not referring to either of these two things by "that which is perfect," is shown by vs. 11-13. For the purposes of his argument, he personifies the Church in himself (compare v. 12, "we")

V. 11: "When I was a child, I spake [alluding to *tongues*] as a child [compare 1 Cor. 3: 1; 14: 20], I understood [alluding to *prophecy*] as a child, I thought [*reasoned, judged*, alluding to *knowledge*] as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things [alluding to the 'gifts' of the Spirit, which pertained only to the early Church—the Church's childhood—the Greek word for *child* in this verse is *nepios*, meaning *babe, infant*]."

V. 12: "For now [in the Apostle's day] we [the Church in its infancy] see through [Greek, *dia, through*] a glass [*through a dim window*—Rotherham; not our modern clear glass, but thin plates of horn, transparent stone crystals, *etc.*; compare Rev. 4: 6; 21: 11; 22: 1], darkly [Greek, *en ainigmati*, enigmatically, dimly, obscurely—see Emphatic Diaglott footnote; God's revelation, the Bible, not being yet completed and only a part of that already fully given being clearly understood, gave but an obscure vision, so that the early Church could not know fully, as they were known by God, and could not understand clearly]; but then [when the written revelation, the Bible, would be completed, by having the New Testament added] face to face [they would then have a clear understanding; and since the glass represented *incomplete* knowledge, the expression 'face to face' by contrast obviously is metaphorical for the state of *completed* knowledge, as far as God's written and revealed will is concerned; the face sometimes typifies or symbolizes knowledge—see Rev. 1: 16; 20: 11; thus when God 'spake unto Moses face to face'—Ex. 33: 11—Moses did not *see* Him face to face—Ex. 33: 20—'face to face' here means *clearly*; for God spoke to Moses, not in visions and dreams, as to other prophets, but in perfectly clear communications: 'mouth to mouth, even *apparently* (*manifestly*—ASV), and not in *dark speeches*' (*ainigmaton*—Septuagint)—Num. 12: 6-8; Deut. 34: 10]: now I [the Church] know in part [*from a part, from only that portion of God's Word—the Old Testament—that was already given, thus incompletely*—compare vs. 9, 10]; but then [when the written revelation would be completed] shall I know [*fully*—so the Greek] even as also I am [*have been fully*—so the Greek] known [by God; not that Paul or any others of the Church would be given omniscience, but that the unclear glass condition—the supplementation of the Old Testament by the 'gifts' of the Spirit—ceasing with the completion of the New Testament, they would through the completed Bible—the 'face to

face' condition of clear knowledge—know in full, or clearly, the character, plan and works of God as He reveals them to His Church in His completed Bible]."

V. 13: "And [Greek, *but*—in contrast to the 'gifts' of the Spirit, which were soon to pass away] now [during the entire Gospel Age, when especially needed] abideth [a triad (three) of the graces, in contrast with the triad (three) of the temporary 'gifts' of the Spirit, which were soon to pass away—v. 8] faith, hope, charity [love], these three [which stand for all the other graces of the Spirit as well, even as in v. 8 the three 'gifts' of the Spirit mentioned stand for all the other 'gifts' of the Spirit as well]; but the greatest of these [abiding graces] is charity [love]."

The expression "that which is perfect" (*to teleion, the complete, the entire*) cannot refer, as some claim, to the completed, perfected *Church*, or to the perfect *Age*—the Millennial Age, or Kingdom Age, with the Christ, Head and Body, reigning in Truth and righteousness—for either one of these suppositions would force us to the unreasonable, unfactual and unscriptural conclusion that the Church was in an infantile, childish condition throughout the entire Gospel Age and never grew up to maturity. How contrary this would be to such Scriptures as Acts 20: 32; Eph. 2: 20-22; 4: 11-16; Col. 2: 6, 7, 19; 2 Tim. 3: 15-17; Heb. 5: 11-14; 6: 1-3; 1 Pet. 2: 2, 5; 2 Pet. 1: 1-11; 3: 18!

The Apostle's argument was that the Church's childish things, the "gifts" of the Spirit, so much needed in her infancy, would be *put away, brought to an end* (not at the time of her perfection, or resurrection, nor at the time of her Millennial-Age reign with her Lord and Head, but) "when that which is perfect is come"—when the Scriptures, including the New Testament, would be perfect, entire and complete.

Then, and not at the time of her completed perfection, nor at the time of her Millennial reign in glory, the Church would put away the childish things, the no longer-needed "gifts" of the Spirit. Then with the completed Word of God and the graces of the Spirit, represented in the abiding triad of faith, hope and love—her needs of head and heart thus fully supplied—she would continue in her growth in knowledge and grace unto perfection.

But the early Church, in the days of the Apostles, was *as a whole* infantile, immature, not yet in an adult stage—hence God gave to them the "gifts" of the Spirit until "that which is perfect" (the complete revelation) was given and they could "put away childish things."

EARLY CHURCH TESTIMONIES ON "TONGUES"

Since therefore the "gift" of tongues, in common with the other "gifts" of the Spirit, ceased shortly after the New Testament was given to the Church (thus making "perfect," complete, the Bible, the inspired Word of God), a few decades after the Apostles fell asleep, how do we explain the manifestations of this "gift" and other "gifts" during the first two centuries A.D.?

It must be borne in mind that some on whom the Apostles conferred "gifts," including the "gift" of tongues, outlived John, the last one of the Apostles to die, and therefore we would naturally expect to find evidence of some of the "gifts" in use not only during the first century but also during much of the second century. Irenaeus (115-202) and Tertullian (115-224) wrote of tongues-speaking as being practiced in their day. But Chrysostom (347-407) leaves no doubt that in his day tongues-speaking had ceased completely.

Concerning 1 Cor. 12, in his "Homilies on the First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians," he wrote:

"This whole place is very obscure: but the obscurity is produced by our ignorance of the facts referred to and by their cessation, being such as then used to occur, but now no longer take place."

And Augustine (354-430) was equally definite. In his "Homilies on the First Epistle of John," he wrote:

"In the earliest times, 'The holy Spirit fell upon them that believed: and they spake with tongues,' which they had not learned, 'as the Spirit gave them utterance.' These were signs adapted to the time. For there behooved to be that betokening of the holy Spirit in all tongues, to show that the Gospel of God was to run through all tongues over the whole earth. That thing was done for a betokening, and it passed away."

HISTORY OF MODERN "TONGUES" MOVEMENT

After the first two centuries A.D. until about 1700 A.D. there were very few reports of "tongues-speaking," and these reports are very unreliable. But about 1700 A.D. manifestations occurred among the Huguenots in France. And beginning in 1830 in Scotland and in 1831 in England, there were similar manifestations; these aroused much excitement and were believed by some, including Edward Irving, a Presbyterian clergyman, in whose church many of the manifestations occurred, to be genuine evidences of the restoration of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit prevalent in the early Church. Irving and others of like persuasion soon formed the Catholic Apostolic Church, which is still active; also, there are a number of other assemblies, such as the Pentecostal Churches, some Holiness Churches, some Churches of God, the Assemblies of God, the Gospel Assemblies, the Apostolic Faith Mission, the Mormons, the Catholic Pentecostals, charismatic groups within other churches, the Jesus People, charismatic campus groups, *etc.*, which likewise claim that their members have and exercise the miraculous power of speaking in tongues.

Modern Pentecostalism as such originated in the Pentecostal-type experience of Evangelist Charles F. Parham and his co-laborers in Topeka, Kansas, about 1900. Miss Agnes Ozman, a member of the Bible School founded by Mr. Parham, is said to have received the "gift" of the holy Spirit and to have spoken with other tongues. Shortly thereafter twelve students reportedly also

were filled with the holy Spirit, and spoke with other tongues, while some in the room were said to have seen cloven tongues of fire such as appeared on the day of Pentecost. From Topeka the "tongues" manifestations spread to Los Angeles, where they resulted in the Azusa Mission, which became the center for Pentecostalism for many years.

Since these early beginnings, the modern "tongues" movement has gained much momentum, adding to its ranks many thousands of Christian believers desirous of having and exercising the miraculous "gift" of speaking in tongues. Especially since in the 1960s the "tongues" movement has come into much greater prominence and respectability.

Cases of "tongues-speaking" have occurred also during certain religious ceremonies and rites among those *not even Christians*, but heathen. It is reported that the Russian dictator, Joseph Stalin, often passed into a trance and spoke in tongues. And the news magazine *American Opinion* described how the hippies on Los Angeles' Sunset Strip would go into "freak outs" and speak "glossolalia" or "hep tongue."

Were all of these cases manifestations of genuine, God-given, speaking in tongues, such as took place at Pentecost, at Cornelius' home, *etc.*, in the early Church? Surely not!

CONFERRING OF "GIFTS" BY APOSTLES ONLY

The Scriptures plainly teach that the privilege of bestowing the "gifts" of the Spirit through the laying on of hands was *exclusively an Apostolic power*. This being so, the "gift" of tongues—along with the other "gifts," conferred in the same manner—would naturally cease (1 Cor. 13: 8) when the last brethren on whom any of the Apostles had laid hands died—for these brethren, not being in the Apostolic office, could not bestow the "gifts" on others. We search the Bible in vain for the record of anyone other than an Apostle conferring the "gifts" of the Spirit.

This is forcefully illustrated in Acts 8: 5-24. This account makes it very clear that even Philip the Evangelist, though able to perform "miracles and signs" (vs. 6, 13), could not confer the "gifts" of the Spirit, but was obliged to wait for *Apostles* to do this for his converts (vs. 14-17). Simon the sorcerer "saw that through the laying on of the apostles' hands," *and not the hands of any others*, the "gifts" were bestowed. He then selfishly and foolishly sought to buy from the Apostles this exclusive Apostolic power of conferring the "gifts" (vs. 18-24).

Furthermore, the disciples at Ephesus did not receive the "gifts" until after the Apostle Paul had laid hands on them (Acts 19: 1-6).

We must conclude therefore that since the only human instruments through whom God bestowed the "gifts" of the Spirit were the twelve Apostles, *these "gifts" must have ceased to exist in the second century, when the last disciple died on whom an Apostle had conferred one of these "gifts."*

ONLY THE TWELVE IN THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE

It will not do to claim that there have been Apostles throughout the Gospel Age, including the present time. There have never been, nor will ever be, any others except the Twelve in the Apostolic office (Rev. 21: 14). All others claiming to have this office are unauthorized by God (2 Cor. 11: 13; Rev. 2: 2). The choice of Matthias, supposedly as an Apostle, by about 120 disciples, during the time between our Lord's ascension and the outpouring of the holy Spirit at Pentecost (for which the Apostles had been instructed to wait—Acts 1: 4, 5, 15-26), was never authorized nor recognized by God.

It was contrary to God's arrangement, for He reserved to Himself the right to choose the Apostles, having selected the original Twelve through Jesus (John 15: 16; 17: 6-24) and having chosen St. Paul ("a chosen vessel"—Acts 9: 15; Gal. 1: 15; 2 Cor. 11: 5; 12: 11) to take Judas' place as one of the Twelve. (For more Bible proofs that the Apostolic office was for the Twelve only, see *The Bible Standard* No. 325—a copy free on request.)

The Gift of Tongues

Chapter 2: Three Causes of "Tongues-Speaking"

Since therefore the Scriptures teach that speaking in tongues is not for our day, and that this "gift" of the Spirit, in common with the other "gifts," ceased shortly after the Apostles—who alone could bestow these "gifts"—fell asleep, how do we account for the modern manifestations of what is claimed to be Biblical tongues-speaking?

In our day, "speaking in tongues" is featured at many religious meetings, and with great fervor is defended verbally and in voluminous literature as being an evidence of genuine baptism with the holy Spirit. Factually, present-day "tongues-speaking" manifestations have generally been of three general classifications.

We state these without any desire to reflect against any of our sincere, earnest Christian brethren who are seeking to ascertain the will of the Lord. Nevertheless, we believe that those sincere Christians who now claim to receive and/or that others receive from God through His holy Spirit the miraculous power to speak in tongues are laboring under a delusion.

FAKED IMITATIONS

(1) As most of our "tongues-speaking" brethren will agree, it is fairly easy for someone to make believe, to act out, that he or she is genuinely speaking in tongues, by going through certain motions, usually manifesting much emotion, and speaking something in another language or uttering some unintelligible gibberish. This kind of acting, or hypocrisy, has often been practiced, with the result that many have been deceived thereby. Often it is done merely to impress others. Sometimes such fakery can be detected by noting a repetitious lingo, apparently memorized. However, we recognize that such hypocrisy is surely not practiced by all, nor even most, who claim to genuinely speak in tongues.

PSYCHOLOGICAL "TONGUES-SPEAKING"

(2) Modern "glossolalia" may be psychological in origin—the result of more or less of emotional ecstasy, in which one loses temporarily to some extent his self-consciousness and his power of fully rational thought and self-control. This extreme emotionalism is often stirred up by a kind of rhythmic hymn-playing which is much akin to jazz, accompanied by singing, repetitious prayer, shouting, hand-clapping and other nerve-jangling sounds.

Many, however, claim to have received the power to "speak in tongues" under seemingly peaceful conditions, there being no unusually strong emotional pressure externally present.

Emotions no doubt are aroused, but not to the extent that the condition may be called one of extreme emotionalism.

Then, too, present-day "tongues-speaking" may be the result of autohypnosis or autosuggestion. In this case the suggestion comes from oneself rather than directly from another. This could explain those experiences of modern "glossolalia" which begin in private (sometimes by watching or hearing manifestations of "tongues-speaking" on television or radio).

It may be that a person fixes his attention so intently on an experience, such as modern "glossolalia," that he provides for himself the strong power of suggestion usually supplied by a hypnotist. Thus he is led to yield himself to what he conceives the "tongues" experience to be, though in his mind he believes he is yielding to the influence of the holy Spirit. Because he knows what present-day "tongues-speech" is like, he imitatively breaks forth in the same kind of utterance. This experience may come only after many days and nights of fervent prayer and seeking, which thus magnify the original suggestion until there is produced a kind of self-hypnosis, resulting in what is believed to be the genuine tongues-speaking "gift" of God's holy Spirit—the power to speak with other tongues.

Where present-day "speaking in tongues" has taken the form of utterances in a genuine foreign language, it may be because of exalted, or heightened, memory. In such cases a person has retained in his subconscious memory utterances in a foreign language which cannot be recalled under normal circumstances. But when the necessary psychological conditions are met, the foreign expressions are released and the person is able to speak more or less fluently in that language, which often he has never used or formally studied.

For example, an illiterate servant in delirium—a certain part or parts of her brain thus being inflamed—spoke at length in Latin, Hebrew and Greek. Upon investigation it was discovered that when she had been serving for some time at a clergyman's home she had heard him recite long passages in these languages. And because of the prevalence of television, radio, newscasts, records, tape recordings, movies, *etc.*, almost everyone hears some foreign languages spoken. Given the right emotional and mental conditions, they could probably recall from the subconscious mind some or all of what they had heard, as the foregoing illustrates.

Finally, under this heading, psychological "glossolalia" may occur as an "escape valve" for one under great emotional strain or depression. This is made possible as the person mentally dissociates himself from the normal, intelligent patterns of thought and speech, thus freeing himself from certain adult inhibitions; and, not submitting his words to a rational examination by the conscious intellect, he utters the first things that come into his mind—including nonsensical syllables and words and/or foreign terms and sayings brought from the subconscious. The result is usually a release of tensions and a feeling of peace and joy.

DEMONIC "TONGUES-SPEAKING"

(3) As much as we appreciate the evident sincerity and earnestness of our Christian brethren who "speak in tongues," we must warn them that some cases of "glossolalia" are undoubtedly demonic in origin. The yielding of oneself fully in order to experience "tongues" lays one open to the entrance and control of Satan and his demons.

Satan is a person, and not just an abstract principle (see *Bible Standard* No. 458). He has been a "liar from the beginning" (John 8: 44), and he has ever sought to undermine God's influence among angels and men, to discredit His holy character, and to misrepresent His purposes and plans. This he still is doing, among other ways, by counterfeiting many features of God's Plan and His methods of operation. We see such counterfeits especially now as "the god of this world" (2 Cor. 4: 4; John 14: 30; Eph. 2: 2) is seeking to keep men under deceptions in order to hold together his divided and disintegrating kingdom. In Matt. 12: 25-27, our Lord said: "Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: And if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?"

Jesus here indicated that exorcism would be practiced by Satan when he (the strong man—v. 29) would be in the process of gradually being bound, *i.e.*, restrained in his control over the angelic and human members of his house, and over his goods, by the many strong "links" of secular and religious truths in the Lord's great Chain of Truth (Rev. 20: 1-4). Signs of the times indicate that Jesus here in the end of the Age is indeed binding Satan and spoiling his house (kingdom). From this we may rightly conclude that Satan has been and is divided against himself. Our Lord also implies in v. 27 that it is possible for Satan to cast out Satan, *i.e.*, to do, to a degree, what God, through Jesus and a holy power, could do (2 Cor. 11: 13-15).

An outstanding example of Satan's power to imitate, though limitedly, God's power, is found in Ex. 7: 8-12, where Pharaoh's magicians cast down their rods, as Aaron under Moses' direction had done with his, and caused them to turn into serpents, evidently by the power of Satan. That the power of Satan is inferior, is shown by the fact that the magicians' serpents were swallowed up by the one serpent of Moses and Aaron.

Since Satan is able to counterfeit, though limitedly, the miracles of God, is it not reasonable to conclude that he is able to counterfeit the gift of speaking in tongues? And just as a counterfeit is an inferior imitation, but not the real thing (as the magicians' serpents were inferior to the serpent of Moses and Aaron), so we would expect the "tongues-speaking" that is produced by Satan and his fallen angels, to be an inferior imitation, but not the true, God-given "gift" of speaking in tongues found in the early Church, *e.g.*, at Pentecost and at Cornelius' home.

NO "UNKNOWN TONGUES" IN GREEK TEXT

Most of the present-day "speaking in tongues" consists of utterances which do not resemble any of the many languages known to man. "Glossolalics" often concede this, saying that this is the speaking in an "unknown tongue" referred to by the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 14. However, please note that in the King James Version Bible *all* of the six occurrences of this expression "unknown tongue" (in 1 Cor. 14: 2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27) show the word "unknown" in italics, thus indicating *that it has no corresponding word in the original text*, but was supplied by the translators. Most other translations do not add the word "unknown" to the text. The expression for "*unknown* tongue" does not occur anywhere in the Greek text, and there is no basis in it for such a thought; and therefore we should not use this expression, because the thought usually associated with it—that it refers to an *unearthly* tongue—is unscriptural, as we shall see.

THE PURPOSES OF TONGUES-SPEAKING

One of the reasons for which the "gift" of tongues—along with the other "gifts" of the Spirit—was bestowed upon the early Church was, as already stated, to serve as a sign for the unbelievers especially (1 Cor. 14: 22), thus enabling the Church to gain recognition in the world and to mark her out as being special. Undoubtedly, while this attracted the attention of some of the world and unbelievers who remained in unbelief, it attracted the attention also of those whom God was drawing unto Jesus (John 6: 44): from among (1) the Jews—the "Israelites indeed" (John 1: 47)—and (2) the Gentiles, who were "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel" (Eph. 2: 11-19). Thus, when the Gospel was due to go out to the Gentiles (Acts 10: 1-48; 13: 46; 28: 25-28), God "did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name" (Acts 15: 14).

Consonant with this purpose of God, the "gift" of tongues was used also to preach to men of different languages in various countries. The outstanding example of this was at Pentecost, when Peter and the other Apostles spoke in tongues—languages—it being recorded in Acts 2: 5-11 that "there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven ... and [they] were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language [Greek, *dialekto*; *i.e.*, dialect—compare v. 8, where the same Greek word is used] ... we do hear them speak in our tongues [Greek, *glossais*] the wonderful works of God." The miracle was not in the *hearing*, but in the *speaking*, as this passage quite clearly shows. (It cannot reasonably be argued that those listening to the Apostles were enabled to understand what was said through a miracle, some special act of God, such as a "gift" of interpretation; for as yet the majority of hearers on that Pentecost day were unconverted, and therefore could not have been regenerated by the holy Spirit and have had the "gifts" of the Spirit—vs. 37, 38, 41.)

Note that the Greek word *glossa*, translated (in the plural) "tongues" in v. 11, is the same word that is used throughout the whole of the New Testament—including Paul's famous remarks about the "gift" of tongues in 1 Cor. 12, 13 and 14—whenever the word "tongues" occurs. That *glossa* (in the plural) was intended to convey the meaning of true languages, earthly discourses, is made plain by the fact that it is used in relation to kindreds, peoples and nations—all of whom

of course speak various languages and dialects (Rev. 7: 9; 10: 11). Additionally, in the passage under discussion—Acts 2: 5-11—*glossa*, translated (in the plural) "tongues" in v. 11, is made *synonymous* with *dialektos*, translated "language" and "tongue" in vs. 6 and 8, which verses obviously refer to a foreign, but *earthly* speech.

SPEAKING WITH "OTHER TONGUES"

In Acts 11: 1-18 Peter relates to those "Jews that were of the circumcision" his experience with Cornelius and his household (Acts 10). After summarizing the matter, he says (v. 15): "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, *as on us at the beginning*." When Peter referred to "us" he undoubtedly had in mind the disciples at Pentecost ("the beginning"). How did Peter know that the holy Spirit came upon Cornelius and his household *as it did upon the disciples at Pentecost*? It was by the same visible manifestation, for like those at Pentecost they spoke "with other tongues" and magnified God (Acts 10: 44-46). Peter makes it very clear that they were not speaking in some kind of unintelligible gibberish but were speaking "with other tongues"—*in genuine foreign earthly languages*—"as on us at the beginning" (Acts 2: 4-11); for he explains to his Jewish brethren that "God gave them *the like gift* as he did unto us" (Acts 11: 17).

Acts 2 and 10 give us the only two detailed Scripture accounts of persons speaking "with other tongues." And in both cases, as we have just seen, the tongues spoken were *genuine foreign earthly languages*. Thus we have a criterion, a standard of judging, as to what Paul meant by the "gift" of speaking with tongues when he wrote of it later in 1 Cor. 12, 13 and 14; for he did not define it otherwise. *We must understand various terms to mean what the Scriptures originally indicate them to mean (unless specified otherwise) if we would have a true and harmonious understanding of the Scriptures.*

NATURE OF MODERN "TONGUES-SPEAKING"

There are a few recorded instances of modern-day "glossolalia" in genuine foreign languages. For instance, at a large religious gathering, a Chinese lady heard a person speaking from the platform in a "tongue," and she recognized it to be her native language. She refused to tell inquirers what was uttered, saying that it was impure, filthy speech, too vile to repeat. However, all cases of speaking in "tongues" in a truly foreign language are not impure, filthy. But "tongues-speaking" that is really in a known foreign language occurs very rarely compared with the more usual experience, where what is said is unintelligible to anyone.

ALL FOR THEE

*Take my life and may it be,
Lord, acceptable to Thee;
Take my voice and let it bring*

Honor always to my King.

*Take my love, my God; I pour
At Thy feet its treasure store;
Take myself—I wish to be
Ever, only, all for Thee.*

The Gift of Tongues

Chapter 3: Modern "Tongues" Vs. Real Languages

When we say that very rarely has a modern "tongues" utterance been identified as real speech, as distinct from gibberish, we imagine some will object that not all of the 3,000 or more languages in use are known by linguists, and for this reason the utterances may not have been recognized.

Dr. William E. Welmers, Professor of African Languages at the University of California, Los Angeles, writes:

"We do know something about representative languages of every known language family in the world. I am by no means unique among descriptive linguists in having had direct, personal contact with well over a hundred languages representing a majority of the world's language families, and in having studied descriptions of languages of virtually every reported type. If a glossolalic were speaking in any of the thousand languages of Africa, there is a 90% chance that I would know it in a minute."

Dr. Welmers and others explain that if any "glossolalic" utterance is in a foreign language, certain translation characteristics will be present. For instance, there should be a certain amount of correspondency between the length of the text of the "tongues" utterance and the text of the interpretation—but this is seldom the case.

Additionally, there is in any real language some intelligent structure that identifies it as true speech. In most "tongues" utterances today this is wholly lacking. There are usually no more than two contrasting vowel sounds, and there is usually much repetition and alliteration. Often the same word or sound is used in several different applications in the same utterance. In short, the usual present-day "tongues-speaking" does not sound like any earthly language, and therefore it fails to qualify as tongues speaking of the New Testament kind.

"TONGUES OF ANGELS"

But what of the claim that "tongues-speaking" is not earthly but heavenly, celestial—the language of angels? In support of this thought, proponents of "glossolalia" cite 1 Cor. 13: 1: "Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels. ..." It is claimed that the "tongues of men" refers to earthly languages, those known among men; and that the tongues "of angels" refers to heavenly, celestial languages—ecstatic utterances unknown to mankind.

But note carefully Paul's plan of argument. He is *supposing* that *if* he were to speak with the tongues (*glossais*, languages—see Diaglott translation) of men and of angels, *if* he had a superlative "gift" of prophecy, *if* he understood *all* mysteries, *if* he bestowed *all* his goods to feed

the poor, *if* he gave his body to be burned—*if* he had all these abilities and did all these things (which was not the case), and had not unselfish love, then it would be of no profit to him as far as his eternal salvation was concerned.

With reference to tongues, Paul says that even if he were to "speak with the tongues [languages] of men and of angels," *i.e.*, with the richest rhetoric and greatest eloquence imagined, superior to all (which he did not claim to do)—if this were done without the motive of unselfish, disinterested—*agape*—love, then it would be of no avail.

Paul in this chapter was emphasizing love and showing how vitally important it is to have this "fruit of the spirit" irrespective of how eloquent, capable or outwardly generous one may be. The reference to the "tongues of angels" was a superlative, just as in Gal. 1: 8 where he said, "*Though [even if] we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.*" Paul was not saying that an angel from heaven *would* preach another gospel, but he was using this figure of speech to emphasize that what he had already preached to them was the only true gospel and should be stoutly defended (Jude 3).

Likewise, when the manna in the wilderness was called "angels' food" (Psa. 78: 25), the thought was not that it was the food which angels themselves ate, but that it was a most excellent food. (In Psa. 139: 8-12, David uses a language technique similar to that used by Paul.)

Thus we can see that, in harmony with Biblical teachings elsewhere on speaking in tongues, Paul was speaking *hypothetically* in order to emphasize the very great importance of charity—unselfish, disinterested love. He was not at all teaching that God gave him or other Christians the ability to speak in the languages of the spirit-being angels—in celestial tongues.

There is no real Biblical evidence that warrants the present-day "tongues-speaking," which for the most part is unintelligible to any hearer. But those who advocate it put forth certain Scriptures that they think support their views. We will examine these passages *pro* and *con*.

THE APOSTLE PETER'S USE OF JOEL 2: 28, 29

Joel 2: 28, 29: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions: and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my spirit."

On the basis of Peter's use of this passage on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2: 16-18), it is claimed that God's Spirit was then poured out for all flesh and that the manifestation of this was, among other things, the "gift" of tongues.

It is evident from the context of Joel 2 that it refers to the Christian dispensation, or Gospel Age, with the Time of Trouble at the end of the Age. Thus "*in those days*" would mean during the

Gospel Age. This is indicated by the fact that v. 28 shows that "afterward," *i.e., after* the Gospel Age (including the Time of Trouble), *in the Millennial Age*, God's Kingdom will come on earth (Matt. 6: 10), and His Spirit will be poured out for all flesh (Isa. 32: 13-18).

Can we say that God's Kingdom is here now and that He through Christ is blessing "all flesh," *i.e., all mankind*, and giving them His Spirit now (Gal. 3: 8, 16, 29; Num. 14: 21; Hab. 2: 14)? Surely not! The world's great Time of Trouble (Dan. 12: 1; Matt. 24: 21, 22; *etc.*), has been with us since 1914 and will continue for some time, before God's Kingdom will be established on earth. The nations must first be humbled through the Great Tribulation. *Then*, "afterward" (and not before), God "will make wars to cease," and He "will be exalted in the earth" (Psa. 46: 8-10); He will "then"—after this Great Tribulation has done its work—"make the storm a calm" and bring "all nations" "unto their desired haven"—His Kingdom on earth (Psa. 107: 23-30; Hag. 2: 7); "then" He will "turn to the people a pure language [the unadulterated Truth]," that they may "serve him with one consent" (Zeph. 3: 8, 9); then "shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings" (Mal. 4: 1, 2).

But some claim that Peter's quoting of Joel's prophecy in Acts 2 proves that it applies only to the time in which he was speaking—the Gospel Age. We reply that his quoting it was not *for the purpose of interpreting it, nor to show to what Age or Ages it applies, but to refute the accusation of drunkenness* made by the Jews against him and his fellow Apostles (Acts 2: 13). He denied that the phenomenon the Jews witnessed was drunkenness (v. 15), and asserted that it was instead an outpouring of the holy Spirit—not a sinful but a Divinely approved thing, prophesied by Joel (v. 16). He then quoted the entire section of Joel treating of the outpourings of the Spirit, but made no interpretation or application of the passage further than to use it to prove *that the Jews were not witnessing drunkenness, but an outpouring of the Spirit.*

If Peter's *purpose* in making the quotation from Joel's prophecy and his *use* of it are kept in mind, it will at once be recognized that there is nothing in his use of it to limit its application to the Gospel Age, as some contend. Similarly, if in the Millennial Age the outpouring of the Spirit would be represented as drunkenness, Joel's prophecy could with equal propriety be quoted to disprove the charge; but such a use of the passage then would not limit its prophetic application to the Millennium, for v. 29 applies to the Gospel Age—"in those days."

Thus there is no sound basis for claiming that Joel 2: 28, 29 together with Acts 2: 16-18 prove that God is even now pouring out His holy Spirit for "all flesh," for v. 28, as just seen, applies only to the Millennial Age—"afterward." God's Spirit is poured out now for believers; but this does not mean that the modern "speaking in tongues" is an evidence of this outpouring, as will be shown later.

"STAMMERING LIPS AND ANOTHER TONGUE"

Isa. 28: 11 is said to refer to speaking in tongues, especially because the Apostle Paul quoted and used it in 1 Cor. 14: 21. However, neither passage teaches that the "gift" of tongues is for our day, or that it was a miraculous power of making unintelligible utterances.

In the context in Isa. 28, the prophet warns God's people Israel of impending judgment at the hands of their enemies. Since the people of Israel would not heed the Lord, they were to be taught their lesson by aliens, heathen—those who spoke a foreign language (Deut. 28: 49; compare Jer. 5: 15, where the same Hebrew word is translated "language"). It is significant that the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 14: 20-22 applies Isa. 28: 11, 12, with its reference to a foreign language, to the tongues problem at Corinth. It strongly indicates that the Corinth tongues-speaking *was also in foreign languages*.

The words "with [*in* or *by*] other tongues" (v. 21) are from the Greek *en heteroglossois*. *Glossois* is a plural form of *glossa* ("tongue") which is employed elsewhere in 1 Cor. 14 to refer to the "gift" of tongues. As Paul does not distinguish between this use of the word "tongues" and its other uses in the chapter, all evidently refer to the same thing, namely, *foreign languages* (see 1 Cor. 14: 21-23, Diaglott, etc.).

Note that the two component parts of *heteroglossois* occur separately in the account concerning the "gift" of tongues at Pentecost (Acts 2: 4): "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues [*heterais glossais*], as the Spirit gave them utterance." As already shown, evidently the Pentecost experience was one of speaking in foreign (earthly) languages that had not been learned by the speakers. Therefore the tongues of 1 Cor. 14 evidently were of the same nature as the tongues of Acts 2.

Paul's use of Isa. 28: 11 does not at all suggest that the tongues-speaking in the early Church was to persist from then on to our day, or even that it would die out and then recur in our day. Rather, his words show that tongues (and the other "gifts" of the Spirit) were given to the early Church so that the message they were preaching—*Christ crucified* (1 Cor. 1: 23)—would claim the attention of those to whom it was chiefly directed—the Jews—but who were unbelievers, generally speaking (1 Cor. 14: 22).

In 1 Cor. 14: 20, Paul exhorts the Corinthian brethren to "be not children in understanding [*i.e.*, be not as nominal Fleshly Israel, who failed to understand God's simple, initial instructions as given by the Law, its types and His holy prophets; but who instead, in their stubbornness, despised and derided them as being too elementary, and made them of no effect through their traditions (Matt. 15: 6), adding so many complexities that the true spirit and essence of the Law's original simplicity was lost in a jungle of confusion]: howbeit in malice [ill will] be ye children [guileless, pure-minded and of a loving disposition], but in understanding [especially in the understanding of the main purpose for God's bestowal of the 'gift' of tongues, namely, to witness spectacularly to the unbelieving nation of Fleshly Israel, in addition to preaching the Gospel message to people of other nations] be men [mature, not infatuated with the mistaken idea that

the 'gift' of speaking in tongues was to be used selfishly, for purely personal reasons, or that tongues-speaking should be considered of paramount importance]."

Outwardly moral, respectable, having a form of godliness (2 Tim. 3: 5), the Jews, especially their leaders, drew nigh to God with their mouth, but their spiritual vision was darkened, their spiritual hearing was dulled and their heart was removed far from Him (Isa. 6: 9, 10; 29: 10-14; Matt. 13: 14-17; Acts 28: 26, 27).

Thus, when God sent the Jews His own Son for their salvation and presented to them the Kingdom message, they, with few exceptions, were so stupidly drunk with the tradition of the elders (Mark 7: 3, 8, 9, 13) and the wine of false doctrine that they could not see their Messiah and King in His true light, nor appreciate the Kingdom message; so, except for the comparatively few "Israelites indeed" (John 1: 47), they received Him not (John 1: 11)—they rejected and sought to get others to reject the Kingdom message (Matt. 23: 13), and they crucified their King!

Therefore they were cast off from God's favor and mouthpieceship (Matt. 23: 38), for they knew not the time of their visitation (Luke 19: 44). Instead, God chose other mouthpieces to bear the Kingdom message, among whom were some who did not have much formal education (Acts 4: 13). Their "stammering [*strange*, ARV; *jabbering*, Rotherham] lips," *i.e.*, their manner of presentation, and their message, accompanied by the "gift" of speaking in tongues, was indeed strange to the Jews, especially their scornful rulers, as God's message was to the scornful rulers and others in Isaiah's day (Isa. 28: 11-21). Like the Philistines (v. 21; 1 Chron. 14: 8-15), the latter set of rulers had become *enemies* of God and His anointed.

Referring to Isa. 28: 11-21, Paul shows (1 Cor. 14: 21, 22) that the presence of the miraculous "gift" of tongues was a sign of God's visitation and approval upon the Christian believers, designed not so much for them as for unbelievers, especially nominal Fleshly Israelites. But so far as the majority of that nation were concerned, it was as God had prophesied, "and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord." "Wherefore," *i.e.*, because of the dullness of hearing on the part of the unbelievers, tongues were "for a sign, not to them that believe [for they did not need this sign], but to them that believe not [some of whom by this miraculous 'gift' would learn that God was now doing His work through the Christians as His mouthpieces, and would thus be drawn toward the message of Truth, which previously they had not received]." But, says the Apostle, "prophesying [in some cases the foretelling of future events, but especially the teaching and expounding of the Word of God, pertaining to the past, present and future] serveth not for [is not particularly intended for] them that believe not, but for them which believe [whose hearts and minds are receptive and who accept the Truth in faith]."

"THEY SHALL SPEAK WITH NEW TONGUES"

Mark 16: 17 is another text used by many to support the modern-day practice of "glossolalia." They claim that Jesus here shows that His disciples would be given, among other signs (vs. 17,

18), the miraculous ability to "speak with new tongues," *i.e., languages that they had not been able to speak before.*

Mark 16: 9-20 is not found in the two oldest available New Testament Greek manuscripts—the Sinaitic and the Vatican. However, these verses or parts of them are quoted by nearly 100 ecclesiastical writers who wrote *before* the oldest Greek N.T. MSS. now in existence. And the Syriac and Latin versions, the writers of which had access to Greek N.T. MSS. older than any now extant, included Mark 16: 9-20. When later on the transcribers of the Greek MSS. came to these verses, and *saw no trace of such "gifts" then in existence*, they may have concluded that these verses are not genuine, but had been added. Some therefore may have marked them as doubtful, and others omitted them altogether.

However, *Biblical Numerics* proves that Mark 16: 9-20 is genuine. (For an explanation of the principles of this science—which helps us to prove the Bible's verbal inspiration, establish right readings and correct wrong ones—and its varied and valuable applications, please see our book *The Bible*, pp. 56, 335, 607-636.)

Although Mark 16: 9-20 is genuine, we are not to believe that the signs spoken of in vs. 17, 18 would accompany believers *throughout* the Gospel Age. But the Lord's disciples of the early Church did have these signs to accompany them (v. 20), as is shown in the cases of Paul (Acts 28: 3-6), and of the Apostles who spoke in "new tongues" at Pentecost (Acts 2: 1-11; see also Heb. 2: 3, 4; please note that "new tongues" has nothing to do with unintelligible utterances).

If tongues as one of the signs is for our day, then why do not the believers have the other signs also, *e.g.*, the ability to take up poisonous serpents without being harmed, or to drink poisons without suffering injury? While special signs, for example, taking up serpents without being harmed thereby, did follow believers at the beginning of the Gospel Age (see, *e.g.*, Acts 28: 3-6), it is evident that they do not do so in our day. Believers of our day do not take up poisonous serpents without danger of fatal results, as is evidenced, for example, by the fact that some believers who have handled them at certain religious meetings (usually to show off) have been bitten and have died.

Therefore it is evident that Mark 16: 17, including the sign of speaking with "new tongues" (languages *they could not speak before*), could apply *only* to that time of the Church's history when the "gifts" of the Spirit were with the Church, namely, the first two centuries, even as shown earlier in this treatise. (For further details, please see our "*Faith Healing*" booklet—a copy free on request.)

"GROANINGS WHICH CANNOT BE UTTERED"

Many claim that Rom. 8: 26 refers to the "gift" of tongues and demonstrates that speaking in tongues need not always be *speech* intelligible to the human ear, but that it frequently consists of sounds and disconnected and jumbled words which are unintelligible to the average person.

The so-called ecstatic experience of "tongues," it is claimed, is such that the "glossolalic" cannot properly convey the utterances of the holy Spirit because they are emotional "*groanings* which cannot be uttered."

An examination of this text and its context will make the Apostle Paul's meaning plain. He had just been writing of sin-burdened humanity groaning in its fetters under the Adamic curse of sin and death. He assures us that it shall be granted liberty from this bondage when the Church, the "sons of God" (v. 19), in glory with their Lord, shall bless the world in God's promised Kingdom on earth (Matt. 6: 10). He then passes from the *groanings of the world* to the earthly condition of the Church, in which he says that even they, being burdened by the flesh, *groan within themselves* (v. 23), waiting for "the redemption [deliverance] of our body [the Church, the Body of Christ—1 Cor. 12: 12-27]" in the First Resurrection (Rev. 20: 6).

Rom. 8: 26 states that "the Spirit [God's holy mind, or disposition, in the Church] also helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we should pray for as we ought: but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." The Greek word *alaletos*, from which the expression "cannot be uttered" is translated, means "unspeakable." Now, if the groanings of the Church *cannot be uttered*, how can they refer to *utterances*, such as *speaking* in tongues? How could anyone *utter* the *unutterable* groans of the Spirit? Furthermore, the groanings are "*within*" ourselves. The Apostolic tongues could be uttered and could be *interpreted* (1 Cor. 14: 13, 28), but who can *interpret* groanings which *cannot even be uttered*?

Also, no miracle or "gift" of the Spirit is necessary in order to groan, since the unregenerate world of mankind, out of harmony with God, *also groan*. Again, to claim that the groanings of v. 26 refer to speaking in tongues must lead one to the logical conclusion, based on this argument, that *all* Christians speak in tongues; for the Apostle says of the Church in general, "ourselves *also* ... even we ourselves groan within ourselves" (v. 23). It would be foolish to claim that Paul was here referring only to those who had the "gifts" of tongues, since it is true of *all* Christians that the "Spirit maketh intercession" (v. 26) for them, and it was not true that *all* Apostolic-day Christians spoke with tongues (1 Cor. 12: 30).

Hence the "groanings" of Rom. 8: 26 cannot refer to speaking in tongues, either as unintelligible utterances or as genuine foreign languages. Rather, the thought of the text is that the spirit, or disposition, *of the believer* makes intercession through Christ with God, supplicating Him. And, because of being burdened by the flesh, it often fails to express itself adequately and figuratively *groans*, longing for the promised deliverance in the resurrection. (See *The At-one-ment Between God and Man*, pp. 288, 289.)

"KINDS OF TONGUES"

Some claim that in 1 Cor. 12: 10 the Apostle Paul referred to tongues-speaking which consisted of unintelligible utterances. Here, dealing with the various "gifts" of the Spirit in use in the early Church, he mentions that some of the Church members were given "kinds of tongues [the word

divers is in italics, to indicate that there is no corresponding word in the Greek text]." The Greek word for "kinds" in this verse is the plural of *genos*, which means an aggregate of many persons or things of the *same nature, kin, kind or sort*—as in Matt. 13: 47; 17: 21; Mark 9: 29; Acts 4: 6; 7: 13, 19; 1 Cor. 12: 28. (diversities [margin, *kinds*] of tongues [languages]—exactly the same Greek words as in v. 10); 14: 10; *etc.*

And just as there are many kinds of birds, but they all still are birds, and many kinds of fish, but they all still are fish; so the Apostle explains in 1 Cor. 14: 10 that there are "many kinds of voices [earthly languages] in the world, and *none of them is without signification* [meaning]"—they all are of the *same general nature*, in its various *kinds or sorts*, having definite vocabularies, grammatical constructions and *meanings* as languages (see also vs. 9 and 11) .

Paul was a masterful logician and could not have reasonably and consistently combined the many kinds of *known* and *intelligible* earthly foreign languages with *unknown* and *unintelligible* utterances, for the two do not come under the same classification. They are entirely different—not of the *same general nature*, in its various *kinds or sorts*. Hence, from 1 Cor. 12: 10 we see that the "gift" of tongues given to the early Church was one whereby some of its members were enabled, through God's holy Spirit, to speak in other earthly languages, and we see also that unintelligible utterances are not of the "kinds of tongues" taught in this passage.

The Gift of Tongues

Chapter 4: 1 Cor. 14 Examined

Many Pentecostals, neo-Pentecostals and other charismatics who believe in and advocate present-day tongues-speaking, including unintelligible, so-called "ecstatic utterances," as opposed to genuine foreign languages, rely heavily on 1 Cor. 14, where the Apostle Paul says much on the subject of tongues-speaking, especially in vs. 2, 4, 14 and 28. They claim that these verses prove that the Corinthian brethren spoke in tongues with unintelligible utterances. We will now examine this chapter in considerable detail:

V. 1: Paul here exhorts the Corinthian church as a whole *first*, or chiefly, to pursue diligently their development in charity (unselfish, disinterested love, the chief abiding *character* grace, as he had just pointed out—1 Cor. 13: 13), and *secondarily* (subordinately) to "desire" (Greek, *zeloute*, *desire earnestly*—see ASV, NASB, RSV, Diaglott, *etc.*; compare 1 Cor. 12: 31; 14: 39, where *zeloute* is translated "covet") the spiritual "gifts" (the temporary spiritual powers or "gifts," *e.g.*, working miracles, healing diseases, discerning of spirits, speaking with other tongues and interpreting tongues by the superhuman power of God's holy Spirit—which "gifts" were helpful to the early Church, capable of edifying and otherwise assisting them, if rightly used); "but rather [*especially*, NASB, Beck, NIV, Fenton, Goodspeed]" they should desire earnestly, esteem more highly than all the other "gifts," the exercise of the "gift" of prophecy in the church—the miraculous power not only to forecast future events, but especially *to teach and publicly expound portions of God's Word*, pertaining to the past, present and future. Such a "gift" of prophecy, rightly used, would lead to the edification of the whole assembly, so the Apostle stresses that if the Corinthian brethren were to desire earnestly the exercise in the church of any "gift," they should desire earnestly this one especially. The superiority of the "gift" of prophecy to that of tongues is further emphasized by the connecting word at the beginning of v. 2:

V. 2: "*For* he that speaketh in a tongue [the word *unknown* should not be used with the word *tongue(s)*, according to the Greek text, for it has no corresponding word there; this is shown by its being *italicized* in the KJV Bible] speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man [present] understandeth him; howbeit in the spirit he speaketh mysteries." This verse does not prove that the tongues referred to were unintelligible utterances. It is evident that it refers to one who spoke in a tongue, a foreign language, *without its being interpreted or any who understood the pertinent language being present*. This, says the Apostle, was not profitable for the hearers, because no one understood what was being said—not because what they heard was an unintelligible utterance, but because it was a *foreign language* with which they were not acquainted. We are not to think that tongues-speaking was mainly for *personal* edification. The Apostle negates this thought completely in v. 22, when he says that tongues were for a sign for them "that believe not."

"Howbeit in [by] the spirit he speaketh mysteries." This simply means that, as far as the hearers—who did not understand what was being said—were concerned, the tongue-speaker was uttering something *mysterious to them*. If and when the utterance was interpreted, it was mysterious no longer.

V. 3: Prophesying helped to edify, exhort and comfort the church (compare v. 31). Thus the "gift" of prophecy was more valuable to the church than the "gift" of tongues, especially if the tongues were not interpreted, just as the knowledge of God is better than sacrifice without such knowledge (Hosea 6: 6).

V. 4: "He that speaketh in a tongue [a foreign tongue, without its being understood] edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth [gives a message in a language that can readily be understood] edifieth the church." Nothing is said here *pro* or *con* about an unintelligible utterance, but since Paul was discussing the "gifts" of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12: 10), the prophetic "gift," not public speaking merely, is meant.

V. 5: Paul here (as in v. 2) shows that tongues-speaking (which was in languages foreign to the hearers) especially if it was uninterpreted, was decidedly inferior in results and value to the exercise of the "gift" of prophecy, for prophesying could readily be understood by the brethren, and so it could edify them.

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS AN ILLUSTRATION

Vs. 6-8 make it very plain that uninterpreted tongues were of little profit in edifying or teaching the church. Illustrating this by instruments, Paul says, "... whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?" Who would be properly edified, strengthened and instructed for the Christian warfare if he heard nothing but unintelligible sounds—foreign tongues which were not interpreted? Note what Paul adds:

V. 9: "*So likewise ye, except ye utter by [Greek, *dia*—through] the [literal] tongue words easy to be understood [significant, margin—they were not to speak with the "gift" of tongues unless someone present could interpret; it would be better for them to 'keep silence' (v. 28) and let others prophesy, so that all could understand and be benefited (vs. 19, 24-26, 31)], how shall it be known [without interpretation] what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air [sounds spoken into the air are meaningless sounds, not profitable to the hearers; it was not that they were uttering by the tongue sounds which were not true speech, but rather that what they were saying was in a language *foreign* to the hearers].*"

V. 10: Paul here says that there are many kinds of voices in the world and adds that "none of them is without *signification*." As already mentioned, this denotes that the many kinds of languages in the earth all have significance, or meaning; and so did the tongues of which Paul speaks in this chapter. This thought is further borne out by his words in v. 11. Obviously,

unintelligible utterances are not meant, for such have no meaning, or signification, but are merely muddled sounds (gibberish) spoken into the air—into space or emptiness.

V. 11: "Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." If one does not understand the "meaning of the voice" it does not mean that what is being said is totally unintelligible to *any* human ear, or that it is a so-called "ecstatic utterance," but rather that the words spoken are in a language *foreign* to the ear of the listener.

The Greeks viewed mankind as consisting of Greeks and barbarians. A barbarian was a foreigner *speaking a foreign language*. The word "barbarian" is onomatopoeic, expressing the idea of unintelligible speech, *i.e.*, the one speaking in a foreign language sounds like he is saying "bar, bar," *etc.*, to the one who does not understand his speech. Thus, we see that throughout 1 Cor. 14 Paul is treating the "gift" of tongues *in the context of real languages*.

V. 12: Recognizing that the Corinthian brethren were zealous of having spiritual powers (*spirits*—see margin—in the sense of powers, *i.e.*, the powers, or "gifts," of miracles, tongues, *etc.*), Paul encouraged them to *seek that they may abound for the building up of the ecclesia*. Thus they should seek *above all* to grow in grace (*agape* love and all of its beautiful qualities—see *The New Creation*, p. 406), and then *subordinately* to have and exercise the temporary "gifts," helpful to the early Church, especially the "gift" of prophecy, the most helpful "gift" for the edification of the brethren (compare vs. 1, 5).

V. 13: "Wherefore [*i.e.*, if you really desire to edify the church] let him that speaketh in a tongue [he who has this 'gift' of speaking in a foreign language] pray that *one* [not the tongue-speaker himself] may interpret [compare 'let one interpret' (v. 27) and v. 5 (which should read 'except *one* interpret'—Rotherham, margin, Young, RSV, Fenton)]."

Paul did not mean that the tongue-speaker was to supplicate God that he might directly be given the "gift" of interpretation—for, as already seen, the Bible shows that the "gifts" of the Spirit could be bestowed *only through the laying on of the hands of an Apostle*. Moreover, the "gift" of interpretation of tongues was an entirely different "gift" than tongues-speaking; and there is no record that God ever gave the "gift" of tongues-speaking and the "gift" of interpretation of tongues both to the same individual except in the case of the Apostles (1 Cor. 12: 7-11; compare Rom. 12: 6-8; note how in the context of these passages Paul emphasizes the *body* figure, in which each "member" has its own *special* function.

Accordingly, it seems that in v. 13 Paul was emphasizing that if anyone with the "gift" of tongues-speaking were praying publicly in a foreign language and no one (*another person*, an interpreter, v. 27) were present who was able to interpret his prayer, he was to "be silent in the congregation" (v. 28, Diaglott).

UNINTERPRETED TONGUES UNPROFITABLE

Vs. 14-17 show why the tongue-speaker in praying publicly should so employ his "gift" as to edify the church. Paul puts himself into the place of the tongue-speaker and says: "For if I pray in a tongue [offer prayer in a church meeting in a foreign language], my spirit prayeth [my disposition in its graces of piety, reverence and adoration, operating through my 'gift' of tongues-speaking, is indeed effective in speaking to God—compare v. 2], but my [God-given] understanding [my revelation, being uninterpreted] is unfruitful [is not effective as far as edifying the rest of the church is concerned]. What is it then [what should be done, then]? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."

Paul (impersonating the tongue-speaker) could be praying or singing ever so earnestly in a tongue, or foreign language, but if no one were present with the power to interpret there would be no understanding among the hearers, no edifying of the church—the object to be kept in view. The tongue-speaker should speak only through an interpreter, so that the intellect, understanding, of his hearers could give consent, and benefit from the tongues message. This thought is forcefully brought out by Paul's words immediately following:

Vs. 16, 17: "Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit [the 'gift' of tongues, without any interpreter and without any understanding on the part of the hearers], how shall he that occupieth the room [or, fills the place] of the unlearned [*i.e.*, as far as understanding the foreign language spoken is concerned] say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is *not edified* [because he does not understand the language spoken]."

If one gave thanks in a tongue and the hearers, not knowing the language, did not understand, then the tongue-speaker's understanding (his God-given revelation, being uninterpreted) was unfruitful (v. 14)—that is, it did not bear fruit in the sense of edifying the hearers. But if one gave thanks in a tongue *with* the understanding (which would imply the presence of an interpreter) he would be speaking in a way that the hearers could understand what was said and thus receive the understanding, the meaning of the God-given message. In such a case the tongue-speaker's God-given understanding *was* fruitful. Why? Because he thus edified the hearers, the church (v. 12).

V. 18: "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all." Surely Paul did not mean by this that he spoke more in irrational, unintelligible babblings than they all! Note also that he equates the nature of the tongues that *he* spoke with the nature of the tongues that *they* spoke; accordingly, it is easily demonstrated that the Corinthian brethren in exercising the "gift" of tongues spoke in foreign languages—not in unintelligible words, "ecstatic utterances," irrational babblings, which Paul certainly never would have sanctioned.

V. 19: Paul emphasizes that he would much rather speak five words that the church could understand and be edified by, than speak 10,000 words in a language not understood nor interpreted.

A CAUTION AGAINST CHILDISHNESS

V. 20: Paul cautions the brethren not childishly and selfishly to misuse the "gifts" of the Spirit, as though their value were only in their use. Instead, they were to take a spiritually mature attitude and conduct themselves accordingly, seeking earnestly in the church meetings to assist and upbuild one another in the most holy faith by a charitable use of their "gifts" (compare v. 26).

V. 23: In addition to the explanation already given on vs. 21, 22, please note the connective "if therefore," between vs. 22 and 23. In v. 22 Paul had clearly stated that "tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but *to them that believe not.*" "If therefore the whole church be come together into one place," why should all having the tongues-speaking "gift" speak in tongues, since there were no *unbelievers* present? And if an unlearned one or an unbeliever would come into such a church meeting, he might well think that they all were insane, or drunken (as was thought at Pentecost—Acts 2: 12, 13), seeing that they would be speaking in foreign languages among *themselves!*

That tongues, as a sign to *unbelievers*, were, with possible exceptions, out of place in a congregation consisting entirely of believers, is brought out by several statements in the context: "*Brethren*, if I come unto you speaking with tongues ..." (v. 6); "Yet *in the church* I had rather speak ..." (v. 19); "How is it then [or, How then should it be], *brethren? When ye come together* ..." (v. 26).

Vs. 24, 25: Here we see the perspective that Paul puts on this matter: It would be far better for the church to concentrate on prophesying than on speaking with tongues, especially if uninterpreted. Then if an unbeliever or an unlearned one were to come into their midst, he would be instructed and helped spiritually by hearing *in his own language* what was spoken. Thus, he would the more likely be convinced and converted, and testify that God was in their midst, because of the wonderful truths he had heard declared.

But why then did Paul (v. 22) say that tongues, rather than prophecies, were for a sign to them that believe not? Obviously he was speaking of tongues *when interpreted*, even as he emphasizes it throughout this chapter. Otherwise the tongue-speaker was to be silent in the church (vs. 27, 28). It would be better to say five words for others' understanding than 10,000 words in an uninterpreted tongue (v. 19). For how would an unbeliever be persuaded that God was in the church by what to him was a series of meaningless sounds? How, for instance, would he know the difference between an unfamiliar foreign language and a so-called "ecstatic utterance," since both would be without any meaning whatever to him? For all he would know, the congregation could be perpetrating a fraud, and only *pretending* to speak in other languages. How would he

know the difference, without the "gift" of interpretation, which he as an unbeliever could not have?

V. 26: "How is it then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." Paul here sets forth the ideal situation—how it should be in an assembly of believers. They should not stress one "gift" (tongues [v. 23] or prophecy [v. 24]) to the exclusion of the others; for this would prevent some members of the church from having a chance to edify the brethren with their own particular "gift," since all were not given the same "gift" (1 Cor. 12: 4-11, 28-31; note that in Rom. 12: 3-8, where Paul deals with the "gifts" of the Spirit, and in Eph. 4: 11-13, where he mentions the gifted men that the Lord had given to the early Church, the "gift" of tongues *is not mentioned at all!*).

Each member of the assembly was to be given an opportunity to serve other Body members, since he was a part of that Body (1 Cor. 12: 12-27), and thus he would fulfill his part in edifying his fellow members. The various "gifts" which existed in any one church should be made use of, the Apostle says, with due regard to the *edification* of the brethren.

CONDITIONS WHEN 1 COR. WAS WRITTEN

Paul wrote this epistle probably not later than 57 A.D., toward the end of his three-year ministry in Ephesus (Acts 20: 31; 1 Cor. 16: 5-8). It is one of the earliest of his letters. At that time the Christians had very few manuscripts, even of Old Testament writings, for they were outcasts and aliens from Jewry. Thus they were in special need of the temporary "gifts" of the Spirit like knowledge, prophecy, tongues, interpretation of tongues, *etc.* But as more Old Testament manuscripts became available (Acts 17: 11) and more New Testament books were completed, there was correspondingly less need for the "gifts." Accordingly, less and less emphasis was placed on the "gifts," including the "gift" of tongues, as the New Testament revelations progressed. The "gift" of tongues is mentioned (and that not emphatically—see 1 Cor. 12: 8-10, 28) only in the earlier epistles, and is not mentioned at all in the later ones, such as Paul's epistles to the Romans (Rom. 12: 3-8), Ephesians (Eph. 4: 11-13), *etc.*, and Peter's, Jude's and John's epistles.

Vs. 27, 28: Here Paul lays down guidelines for *orderly, edifying* church meetings (compare v. 40). Those with the "gift" of tongues were not all to speak at the same time, but in turn, and then no more than two or three. In each case the tongue was to be interpreted by someone other than the tongue-speaker (v. 27). But if no interpreter were present, the tongue-speaker was to *keep silence in the church* (though he could use his "gift" privately, if he so desired—v. 28). How many of our "tongues-speaking" friends observe this rule today and keep silent in the congregation, speaking only to themselves and to God, when no interpreter is present? Not many, it seems. They frequently violate this rule.

DEVOTIONAL TONGUES

Some claim that there are two types of speaking in tongues; one they call "devotional" tongues and the other, the "gift of tongues," or glossolalia. Devotional tongues, they say, are used for communion with God only and for *personal* edification. They create such a distinction in order to evade the force of the arguments in favor of the tongues-speaking in the New Testament being a speaking in genuine foreign languages. However, in vs. 27, 28 Paul clearly identifies the kind of tongues that was to be spoken *in the church* (v. 28) with the kind of tongues that was to be used to "speak to himself, and to God."

In other words, if one contemplated speaking in a tongue *in the church*, but learned that no interpreter was present, he was to *refrain from such speaking* in the church; however, he could, if he wished, use that *same* "tongue" to "speak to himself, and to God," in private. There is no indication anywhere in this chapter that Paul was referring to two different kinds of tongues-speaking. He was showing that the "gift" of tongues without interpretation was not to be used publicly, for such unintelligible utterances would not edify, but would divert the attention of and confuse the congregation and interrupt the proceedings, which were to be conducted in an *orderly* and *edifying* manner.

Vs. 29-31: Those with the "gift" of prophecy were also to speak in turn, but no more than two or three in succession, and the brethren (Greek, *the others*; ASV) were to consider (discern, discriminate, judge) what they had heard. And if to a brother, seated and listening to the speaker, a further, perhaps supplementary, revelation was given, the first prophetic speaker was in an orderly manner to give way and listen in silence (v. 30). How *orderly* and *edifying* (v. 31)!

This is in perfect harmony with what Paul had said earlier (vs. 23, 24). He did not approve of those having the "gift" either of tongues-speaking or of prophecy monopolizing the meeting; but if he had to choose between the two, he would choose the latter, since prophesying—expounding—was more profitable (edifying) to all than was tongues-speaking. However, the ideal, as we have seen, was what he indicated in v. 26.

Nor are we to think that because Paul discussed in this chapter only those with the "gift" of tongues or the "gift" of prophecy as serving the church and did not emphasize the use of other "gifts" (1 Cor. 12: 8-10), therefore a church meeting was to center around the tongues-speakers and prophets. Paul discussed these two particularly, because these were those he had been emphasizing all through the chapter, and he was trying, by comparing the "gift" of tongues with the "gift" of prophecy, to help the Corinthian brethren to see that they were overemphasizing and misusing the "gift" of tongues.

V. 32: "And [besides, additionally] the spirits [*powers* inherent in their 'gift'] of the prophets are subject to the prophets." Here Paul makes another strong argument to show the superiority of the "gift" of prophecy over that of speaking in tongues. To prophets their own spirits (powers) were under control, for in receiving Divine revelations in the church meetings they needed no interpreter, but could speak with understanding; whereas the tongues-speakers were to keep

silence before the congregation and to speak only to themselves, and to God, unless there was an interpreter present.

The word *and* connects v. 32 with the preceding verses and gives an additional reason why the prophesying speaker should find no difficulty in holding his peace; for prophets, having their spirits (powers) in full subjection and the communications between *spirit* and *mind* and between *speech* and *tongue* unimpaired, could choose either to speak or not to speak.

V. 33 gives a crowning reason why decorum and orderly procedure should be observed in the exercise of "gifts" in the church assemblies—for God is not a God of confusion, disorder or tumult, but of peace. He is not in harmony with anything contrary to "the spirit of a sound mind" (2 Tim. 1: 7) and "holiness with sobriety" (1 Tim. 2: 15). He must therefore disapprove of the emotional frenzies of delusion that becloud sober Christian judgment, the vociferous clamors, the hubbubs in prayer and the emotional jabberings in unintelligible "tongues" that turn professed meeting-places of the Lord with His people into babble-houses of confusion, that call to mind the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel and the agonized and prolonged cries of the prophets of Baal and the groves in their contest with Elijah.

Vs. 34, 35: Here Paul gives instruction regarding the proper course for women *in the church meetings where doctrinal presentations were given* by interpretations of tongues or by prophesying in the sense of preaching and teaching from God's Word, as just described in vs. 27-32. In such church meetings for preaching and teaching instruction in the Word, the women were to take a subordinate part and not attempt to be *the teachers*. They were to abstain from *teaching in such meetings*, for it would be "a shame for women to speak in the church."

In doctrinal meetings *in the church*, women could, however, participate and receive many blessings, joining in the prayers and in "the psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Eph. 5: 19; Col. 3: 16; see *The New Creation*, pp. 268, 269). In study meetings they could with propriety ask questions and answer questions asked by the teacher, but they were not to usurp the teaching office. Under Divine inspiration (Matt. 18: 18) and in harmony with the Divine order (Eph. 5: 23, 24), Paul says, "Let the woman learn in silence [in the preaching and teaching meetings *in the church*] with all subjection. But I suffer [permit] not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence" (1 Tim. 2: 11, 12).

If women were uninformed or unclear on some matters, especially those set forth in the preaching and teaching meetings of the church, they could afterward ask their husbands at home (v. 35), or the one or ones who had prophesied, or one of the other brethren. Also, they could bring up such matters when appropriate and when there was an opportunity in the study meetings or in private discussions and conversations with the brethren, rather than to interrupt the proceedings of the general preaching and teaching assemblies of the church for their own or others' personal instruction.

This restriction did not, however, apply to the non-doctrinal meetings—praise services, testimony meetings, prayer meetings, *etc.*—where consecrated Christian women could pray and

prophesy (*testify*, but not *teach*), with their heads covered (1 Cor. 11: 5, 6). Outside the preaching and teaching meetings *in the church* they had full liberty to minister to others—they could teach other women, children and also men—especially unbelievers (Acts 18: 24-26; Rom. 16: 1-6, 12; Phil. 4: 3; 1 Tim. 5: 9, 10; 2 Tim. 1: 5; 3: 15).

V. 36: With a sudden flash of irony, Paul in effect asks the church at Corinth: What? was it from you that the Word of God (and its proper pertinent exposition) originated? or unto you alone (and not to God's chosen Apostles) did it come? Proper methods, order and decorum should be observed in your assemblies, with no irregularities, such as tongues-speaking in the church without an interpreter, two or three prophets declaiming at once and women presuming to teach in the doctrinal meetings of the church. All these anomalies must cease, *or* (the only possible alternative) are you Corinthians grasping for the power of being the special teachers of the churches? Are you really the model and exemplar of all the churches, the first and last word on correct doctrine and practice in these matters?

Vs. 37, 38: After the irony, Paul speaks with gravity, and asserts his Apostolic authority seriously: Let anyone who thinks that he is Spirit-gifted as a prophet or otherwise recognize, that what I am writing is Divinely inspired instruction from the Lord; but if anyone ignores (the Divine source of what I write) let him ignore—let him persist in refusing to recognize that I speak the Lord's mind; let him be content with his own stupidity and its consequences before the Lord.

Vs. 39, 40: Paul now summarizes the relationship between the "gift" of tongues with attendant interpretations and the "gift" of prophecy in understandingly expounding God's Word, and with Christian tenderness he calls them *brethren*. He tells them to desire earnestly the "gift" of prophecy, but not to forbid the less profitable "gift" of speaking with tongues within the prescribed limits; only let all things be done in a becoming manner and in proper order.

The above review of 1 Cor. 14 shows that this chapter in no way supports the unreasonable thought that the Corinthian brethren or any others in the early Church spoke in unintelligible tongues—so-called "ecstatic utterances"—or that it is right and proper to do so today. It shows clearly also that the "gift" of tongues was the miraculous power to speak in genuine foreign languages. Consistent with this is the fact that in 1 Cor. 14 wherever the word "tongue(s)" occurs we can substitute "foreign language(s)" without changing the true meaning.

EPH. 5: 18-20; COL. 3: 16 CONSIDERED

Eph. 5: 18-20 and Col. 3: 16 are claimed by some to teach that Christians today should practice glossolalia for mutual edification. However, these passages make no allusion whatever to the "gift" of speaking in tongues or any other miraculous "gift" of the Spirit. In them Paul merely exhorts the Christian believers to use—in proper decorum, of course, in the spirit of a sound mind—the beautiful psalms, hymns and spiritual songs available, to encourage and upbuild one another in Christian doctrine, practice and fellowship (Heb. 10: 25).

In Col. 3: 16 we read: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in [or, *by*] psalms [from the inspired Psalter; see 1 Cor. 14: 26] and hymns [especially of praise to God; compare Matt. 26: 30; Acts 16: 25] and spiritual songs [the plural of the Greek word *ode*; compare Rev. 15: 3; the general word for a song, whether of praise or on any other subject; the early Church apparently had odes in the form of lyric poems suitable for singing or chanting]." Eph. 5: 18-20 teaches similarly.

Accordingly, Eph 5: 18-20 and Col. 3: 16 cannot reasonably be understood to refer to the "gift" of speaking in tongues, and most certainly not to teaching that this "gift" is for our day.

DANCING "BEFORE THE LORD"

Many Pentecostals and other charismatics claim that in Christian church meetings it is proper to have dancing "before the Lord," with much shouting, *etc.* They appeal to such Scriptures as Ex. 15: 20, 21 (describing Miriam and the other women of Israel "with timbrels and with dances" joining in the song of victory), 2 Sam. 6: 14, 15 (telling how David "danced before the Lord with all his might," and all Israel "brought up the ark of the Lord with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet") and Psa. 149: 3 (which exhorted God's people to praise Him in the dance).

There is nothing wrong in these methods of praising God, when done in the proper place and with proper decorum; but there is nothing in these or other Scriptures or early Church history that shows that our Lord and His Apostles taught that these practices should be followed in New Testament church meetings.

HEAVENLY TRUTH

*Praise to Him, by whose kind favor
Heavenly Truth has reached our ears;
May its sweet, reviving savor
Fill our hearts and calm our fears.*

*Truth, how sacred is the treasure!
Teach us, Lord, its worth to know,
Vain the hope, and short the pleasure,
Which from other sources flow.*

The Gift of Tongues

Chapter 5: Paul's Desire for Us in Prayer

On the basis of 1 Tim. 2: 8, many Pentecostals, neo-Pentecostals and other charismatics claim that the only proper and effective way to pray in church meetings is with uplifted arms and hands. The Apostle Paul says: "I will therefore [in view of what he stated previously] that men pray every where [Greek, *in every place*], lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting." It is only as we as Christians fulfill these three conditions mentioned by the Apostle that we can really pray effectively to our Heavenly Father and really expect our petitions to be answered (compare John 15: 7; 1 John 3: 22).

LIFTING UP HOLY HANDS

(1) *We must continually be righteous in our conduct* (Christ's blood-merit covering our Adamic imperfections), *fully consecrated to God and holy* (pious, devout) *in our service for Him*. Surely Paul was not in this first condition to acceptable prayer giving instruction as to the only proper *physical posture* that believers should take when praying; for we read of acceptable prayer being made also with head bowed (Luke 18: 13), head uplifted (Luke 9: 16; John 11: 41; 17: 1), kneeling (Dan. 6: 10; Luke 22: 41, 45; Acts 7: 50; Eph. 3: 14), and even while lying in bed (Psa. 63: 6).

In Paul's expression he may have had in mind the common custom, among both the Jews and the heathen, of lifting up or spreading out the hands in prayer. E.g., Solomon, when dedicating the Temple, stood before the altar and "spread forth his hands toward heaven" (1 Kgs. 8: 22), but at the end of his prayer (v. 54), he arose from before the altar ... from kneeling ... with his hands spread up to heaven" (compare 2 Chron. 6: 13). Ezra also kneeled when he spread out his hands in prayer (Ezra 9: 5). But neither the standing nor the kneeling determines what should be the posture generally or exclusively in prayer in the Christian churches.

Sometimes Psa. 28: 2; 134: 2 and 141: 2, which speak of prayer and the uplifting of hands, are cited as indicating that this is the only proper posture when prayer is offered in Christian congregations; but why not cite also Psa. 95: 6, which says, "O come, let us worship and bow down: let us kneel before the Lord our maker"? None of these Old Testament texts was given for definitive instruction as to Christian church meetings, as respects the proper posture in prayer. Christians are at liberty to choose their posture in prayer. In church meetings it properly is sometimes *standing*, sometimes *seated* and sometimes *kneeling*.

The Jews also washed their hands before prayer: "I will wash mine hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Lord" (Psa. 26: 6); but does this mean that we must always wash our literal hands before we can offer acceptable prayer? Surely not! The clean hands here stand figuratively for clean conduct—we are to "worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness" (1 Chron.

16: 29). God will not grant the petitions of those who come to Him with figuratively unclean hands: "When ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood" (Isa. 1: 15-18; compare Isa. 59: 1-3; Job 17: 9; Psa. 24: 3, 4; 1 Pet. 3: 7).

Paul's earnest desire was that we purge out the old leaven of sin, error, selfishness and worldliness, so that we can come to God in a cleansed (justified) condition, lifting up figurative holy (consecrated) hands, and thus be acceptable and prepared to receive answers to our prayers. It may be that some early Christian congregations lifted up literal hands in prayer, and Paul may have had this in mind, at least partly, when he exhorted the brethren to pray, lifting up holy hands. Surely he would not have objected to their praying with literal arms and hands uplifted; but to think that he meant only literal hands made literally holy is to miss the spiritual truth that he was trying to impress. Like the Master's, his words "are spirit, and they are life"—"It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh [including as to exactly how we hold our arms and hands in prayer, etc.] profiteth nothing" (John 6: 63).

The Apostle was an able minister, "not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life" (2 Cor. 3: 6). Those who are spiritually minded will understand, appreciate and profit by the spiritual application of Paul's exhortation, that we pray, lifting up figurative holy hands, *i.e.*, in holy conduct, fully devoted to God, and serving Him in spirit and in truth; they will look beneath the surface for the spiritual meaning—"For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2: 10).

WITHOUT WRATH

(2) Paul mentions next *that we are to put away wrath*. This second one of the conditions pertains directly, not to our external conduct, our service to God, but to our heart—our will to do God's will, our intentions, our affections. The heart, as well as the conduct, must be "*Holiness unto the Lord*" (Zech. 14: 20, 21). "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life" (Prov. 4: 23; see also Psa. 24: 3, 4; Prov. 23: 7; James 4: 8). Our hearts are to be free from wrath, from unrighteous anger and bitterness; we are not to harbor ill will or vindictive feelings against any person (Rom. 13: 8-10; Eph. 4: 26, 31; 1 John 4: 20).

How can we ask God to "forgive us our debts, *as* we forgive our debtors," if we hold such feelings against them? Jesus warns us (Matt. 6: 15): "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." But this forgiveness must come not only externally—"lifting up holy hands"—it must come "from your hearts" (Matt. 18: 35). How vital it is, then, that we allow no "root of bitterness" to spring up in our hearts and defile us, thus making us unacceptable to God in prayer (Heb. 12: 15)!

WITHOUT DOUBTING

(3) Paul instructs also *that we are to have a strong faith*—one that is *without doubting* [Greek, *dialogismos, discussion, disputation, (external) debate, doubt*]. If we would have our prayers answered we must "ask in [the full assurance of] faith, nothing wavering. ... Let not that man [who wavers in doubtings and negative thoughts and reasonings] think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord" (James 1: 6, 7; compare Heb. 11: 6; Matt. 9: 29; 21: 22; Mark 9: 23; 11: 22-24). There is no excuse for doubting; "for he is faithful that promised" (Heb. 10: 23).

From the above we see that Paul's words in 1 Tim. 2: 8 are filled with rich spiritual blessings for those who have and exercise the holy Spirit. Let us not overlook the spiritual significance in his teachings, and claim that prayers should be offered only with the posture of uplifted fleshly arms and hands.

SPIRIT BAPTISMS AND "TONGUES-SPEAKING"

Generally, charismatics claim that "tongues-speaking" is the manifestation of the individual believer's baptism with the holy Spirit—his own "Pentecost" experience—and therefore that there are repeated Spirit baptisms, like the one at Pentecost. But the Scriptures do not support their claim.

The Scriptures show that there was to be but one baptism of the Spirit for the Church as a whole, on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2: 1-11). The supplementary manifestation 3½ years later, when the first Gentiles—Cornelius and his household—came into the Body of Christ (Acts 10: 44-47; 11: 15), was necessary to show unmistakably that God then had received and thenceforth would receive Gentiles as well as Jews into the Body (see *The At-One-Ment Between God and Man*, Chap. IX). But, according to the Scriptures, there was no further necessity for, nor were there to be, any further Pentecosts for the Church, though "afterward"—after the Gospel Age — there is to be a Pentecostal blessing for the world —"all flesh" (Joel 2: 28; for further discussion of this, please see *The Bible Standard* No. 255—a copy free on request).

The baptism of the holy Spirit which came upon the Church at Pentecost has remained with it all down through the Age, and as each one has come into the true Church, he has come under and shared in that original baptism of the Spirit. However, before anyone has been prepared to get this blessing of the Lord's Spirit, first of all he has had to have the justification by faith in Jesus Christ and a heart free from the love of sin, and has had to make his solemn resolution to use his life in serving the Lord, the Truth and the brethren—his vow of consecration (Rom. 12: 1)—before he could be in the right attitude to receive the blessing of the enlightenment, the comfort and the fellowship of the Father and the Son in Their holy Spirit (1 John 1: 3). All of God's people have had to come into an attitude similar to that of the brethren who were blessed on Pentecost day, in order to enter into the special favors and privileges of the Gospel Age.

Even though inflamed with the desire to serve the Lord, the Truth and the brethren, the wise course for anyone to follow is the course of the early Church—to study and pray—that he may be filled with the Spirit (Eph. 5: 18), before attempting to act as God's ambassador to others. Indeed, no one is authorized, from the Scriptural standpoint, to preach the Gospel, much or little, except first he have received the authorization of God's holy Spirit from above (compare Isa. 61: 1).

While opposing the unscriptural view—that new Pentecosts, new Spirit baptisms and miraculous "gifts" of the Spirit are to be prayed for—let us not lose sight of the important fact that until each member of the Body received his share of the blessing of the first Pentecost, he could not have the perfect peace of God (Isa. 26: 3; Phil. 4: 7), nor be properly, actively and successfully His servants and ambassadors. Would that all of the Lord's people would seek earnestly for a larger measure of the holy Spirit (Luke 11: 13)—watching and praying thereunto (Eph. 6: 18), watching their words, their thoughts and their deeds, the leadings of God's providence, and opportunities for His service! Let us ask Him to grant us more and more the emptying of worldly ambitions and desires, and more and more the filling with the mind or spirit of Christ—His disposition, rather than to seek for the redundant "gift" of tongues.

THE BEAUTY OF HOLINESS

*So let our daily lives express
The beauties of true holiness;
So let the Christian graces shine,
That all may know the power divine.*

*Let love and faith and hope and joy
Be pure, and free from sin's alloy;
Let Christ's sweet spirit reign within,
And grace subdue the power of sin.*

*Our Father, God, to Thee we raise
Our prayer for help to tread Thy ways—
For wisdom, patience, love and light,
For grace to speak and act aright.*

The Gift of Tongues

Chapter 6: How to Know the Spirit's Witness

In view of the Scriptural teaching that the miraculous "gifts," like tongues-speaking, ceased forever when the twelve Apostles died and those upon whom they had conferred these "gifts" by the laying on of their hands also died, some may ask, how since then has it been possible for consecrated believers to have the assurance that they have the holy Spirit and are children of God?

In Romans 8: 16 we read, "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Aside from the miraculous "gifts" given only to the early Church, there are especially seven things Biblically taught as constituting the full witness of the Spirit given for the assurance of every one of God's Spirit-begotten people of the Gospel Age. Any one of these seven testifies to the possession of the holy Spirit and the sonship of those who have it; but to have the complete witness of the Spirit, all seven are required. In brief the seven are:

(1) An appreciative understanding of the deep things of God's Word (1 Cor. 2: 6-16, compare Isa. 64: 4; Mark 4: 10-12; John 7: 17; 14: 15-17; Psa. 25: 8-10, 12, 14); (2) spiritual aspirations (Col. 3: 1-4, compare Col. 2: 12 and Rom. 6: 4, 5; Psa. 42: 1, 2; 63: 1; 84: 2; 105: 4; 119: 2, 10, 20, 40; Matt. 5: 6; 6: 33; Phil. 3: 12-14); (3) Divinely given opportunities for service (Rom. 12: 1; Matt. 20: 1-16; 21: 28, 30; 25: 14-30; John 4: 34-38; Gal. 6: 10); (4) growth in Christlikeness (Rom. 8: 9, 29; 2 Cor. 3: 18; Gal. 5: 22, 23; Eph. 5: 9; Col. 3: 12-14; 2 Pet. 1: 5-11; 3: 18; 1 John 3: 14, 16; 4: 16); (5) persecution for Christ's sake (Matt. 5: 10-12, 44, 45; John 15: 18, 19; 16: 2; Acts 5: 40, 42; Rom. 8: 17; Gal. 4: 29; Phil. 1: 28, 29; 2 Tim. 2: 10-12; 3: 12; Heb. 10: 32-34; 1 Pet. 3: 14, 16, 17; 4: 14, 16, 19); (6) chastisements for faults (Heb. 12: 5-13; Psa. 94: 12, 13; 118: 18; 119: 67; Prov. 3: 11, 12; Isa. 26: 16; Luke 12: 47, 48; Rev. 3: 19); (7) trials amid temptations to disobey God's will, to test our progress or lack of progress (Deut. 13: 3; 8: 2; Psa. 66: 10-12; Dan. 12: 10; Jas. 1: 2-4, 12; 4: 7; 1 Pet. 1: 6, 7; 4: 12; 5: 8, 9). (See *Christ-Spirit-Covenants*, pp. 627-654, for details.)

Many regard as their witness of the Spirit such things as their feelings of exuberance, or habitual cheerfulness, or audible voices speaking to them, or their "speaking in tongues," dreams, visions, impressions, imaginations, *etc.* However, when sickness, pain, losses, disappointments, family troubles, hardships, necessities, persecutions, severe contrarities, *etc.*, come, their witness often deserts them—and *that at the times when they need it most!* But not so with the sevenfold witness mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Instead of deserting us amid trials, it will keep our hearts and minds in perfect peace through Jesus Christ our Lord (Isa. 26: 3; John 14: 27; Phil. 4: 7), assuring us that our interests are all right with God, that we have His holy Spirit and that He is continuing to deal with us as members of His family. Praise God for this!

THE GREAT COMMISSION—MATT. 28: 19, 20

The proper carrying out of the Great Commission (Matt. 28: 19, 20; compare Mark 16: 15-20) is alleged by some to require that the "gifts" of the Spirit be operative. It is claimed that because the Apostles and other early Church disciples were given the "gifts," including tongues, to help them to carry out properly their part in this commission (Acts 2: 1-11; 1 Cor. 14: 22), therefore Jesus' followers throughout the Gospel Age and/or here in the end of the Age have needed and still need the "gifts," including tongues, to help them to carry out properly their part in it. To this the Scriptures do not agree, nor can we.

Jesus in His statement about sign "gifts" following Christian believers (Mark 16: 17, 18) was not contradicted by Paul, who by Divine inspiration wrote that the "gifts" would "vanish away" (1 Cor. 13: 8), as we know from history they did, after the Apostles (who alone had the power of conferring them by the laying on of their hands) and those on whom they had bestowed them died.

Obviously the Great Commission did not contain any idea or implication that the "gifts" would be given to *all* of the disciples "unto the end of the *age* [so the Greek]" (Matt. 28: 20), or that the operation of the "gifts" would be required and revived here at the end of the Age.

HEB. 2: 3, 4 CONSIDERED

This passage is claimed to uphold what is mentioned above on Matt. 28: 19, 20. In their *teaching* and *preaching* the disciples were to emphasize "the gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. 4: 17; 10: 7; 24: 14), the "great" or "high calling" salvation. Heb. 2: 3, 4 states: "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also *bearing them witness* [co-attesting], *both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the holy Spirit*, according to his own will."

Accordingly, the heavenly Kingdom Gospel message of the Church was much more important than the signs, wonders, "gifts," *etc.*, which were given to attest to its truthfulness, and assisted in the Church's early recognition and establishment as a special group (Matt. 5: 14). However, once God's written revelation was complete, the signs, "gifts," *etc.*, were no longer needed, because the truthfulness of the Gospel message could be determined by the *study* of the "*more sure* [much more certain than signs, wonders, *etc.*, which could easily be faked or misused] word of prophecy [instruction]" (1 Tim. 4: 13, 16; 2 Tim. 2: 15; 3: 14-17; 4: 2; 2 Pet. 1: 19).

GOSPEL-AGE SUCCESS WITHOUT "GIFTS"

If it is argued that Christ's disciples cannot effectively attract and convert others except through the use of tongues and other "gifts" to assist them in the preaching of the Word, we

reply: If this were true, why did not Christ's faithful disciples throughout the Gospel Age have and use the "gifts" to assist in their discipling work? Why did not Marsiglio, Huss, Savonarola, Luther, Zwingli, Wesley and other reformers perform miracles or use "glossolalia" in addition to their preaching and expounding of God's Word? Why did Wycliffe, Tyndale, Luther and others spend much time and effort in seeking to understand, expound and translate the Scriptures when they could so much more easily have used, for example, the "gifts" of interpretation and knowledge, and thus better have understood, expounded and properly translated the Bible?

The fact that such prominent Church servants did not use the "gifts" proves that they did not have them. And would we say that this was because they were lukewarm? Surely not! God used such reformers mightily to preach and expound His Word, to attract especially and to edify His elect people; this was done without the "gifts," which Paul testified would cease to exist (1 Cor. 13: 8, 13), and which did cease in the second century, as Church history proves.

"THE LATTER RAIN"

Many "glossolalics" agree that the "gifts" were given only to the early Church and not to the Church throughout the whole Gospel Age. But many of them insist that the "gifts" must be expected upon the Church again in the end of the Gospel or Church Age as the promised "latter rain" (Joel 2: 23; compare Hos. 6: 3; James 5: 7). Such do not understand the matter clearly.

In Joel 1 the Prophet describes under the figure of blights, droughts and famines the devastating work of the great Apostasy, which began to show marked evidence even in the days of the Apostles, proceeding later to the development of episcopism—the rule by bishops (the palmerworm), then papalism (the locust), then Antichristism (the cankerworm) and finally Protestant sectarianism (the caterpillar)—Joel 1: 2-4.

The thought of Joel 1 is that as in nature all fruitage has been destroyed by such blights, so the various stages of the apostasy from primitive Christianity destroyed the fruitage of the Apostolic sowings of truth and righteousness—did away with much of the teachings, practices and works that Jesus and His Apostles gave the Lord's people in the Harvest of the Jewish Age. Thus briefly in this figurative way Joel 1 describes the spiritual desolation prevailing in the figurative fields where the Apostolic sowing occurred—a desolation lasting until recently.

In Joel 2 the Prophet describes (vs. 1-11) the resultant Great Tribulation of the Day of the Lord, and those who would bring it about. But he shows that before the trouble would come the Lord would send forth a message to the people to repent (vs. 12-17). The faithful would receive the assurance that before the Time of Trouble would break out the Lord would take away the effects of the figurative blight (v. 25), and, punishing the wrongdoers (v. 20), would restore the Apostolic teachings and practices, which would result, before the Great Tribulation, in great fruitfulness returning to the fields of labor where His faithful would work (vs. 19, 21-24, 26, 27).

THE TRUTH IS FIGURATIVE RAIN

The rain of Joel 2: 23 obviously refers to the Truth—God's Word (John 17: 17). Deut. 32: 2 is to the point: "My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distil as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass." Beautifully does this symbol in the text show that the easier truths (small rain) are for the immature and that the harder truths (showers) are for the full grown.

Psa. 72: 6 gives the same thought: "He [the Christ] shall come down like rain upon the mown grass, as showers that water the earth." In Biblical symbols grass represents human beings (Isa. 40: 6-8; 1 Pet. 1: 24). By the curse they are made into mown grass, and the fierce heat of the experience with evil has burnt this mown grass. And just as in nature the mown and burnt grass is revived and made to grow again by copious supplies of *rain* falling upon it, so *the Truth* in the Millennium, coming down from the Christ, will cause the race, cut down by the death sentence and burnt by the experience with evil, to be revived and to spring up again—restitution (Acts 3: 19-21). Showers (stronger truths) will water (make fruitful) the earth (society).

The following passages also use the word *rain* in the same symbolic sense: Isa. 55: 10, 11; Zech. 10: 1; 1 Kings 17: 1, 7, 14.

EARLY AND LATTER RAIN

The early and latter rain of Joel 2: 23 refer respectively to the High Calling truth (Phil. 3: 14) and the Restitution truth (Acts 2: 19-29). The former rain coming "moderately" was in the Harvest of the Jewish Age. This refers to a giving occurring before Zion was bidden to rejoice: "for he *hath* given, *etc.*" Zion's rejoicing time would be here in the end of the Gospel Age.

The next sentence of v. 23 tells of a giving of the *former* rain future to its first giving, which future rain (note the strange expression, if it applied to the natural rain, which it of course does not) would occur at the same time as the giving of the latter rain: "He will cause to come down for you the rain, the former rain and the latter rain in the *first month.*" When were both of these rains due to come at the same time? and when would they actually come together? *Here in the Harvest of the Gospel Age!*

Thus it is evident that the coming of "the latter rain" refers to the Restitution truth which has so greatly blessed God's enlightened people. It has no reference to the "gifts" being restored to the Church here in the end of the Age.

GOD'S SELECTION OF THE ELECT

If we understand God's Plan, we are prepared to appreciate why after the Church's establishment through the Apostles He did not need nor use the "gifts" to accomplish His Gospel-

Age purpose, not of *converting the world*, but of *selecting, drawing disciples "out of" the various nations* (Rev. 5: 9, 10).

Acts 15: 14 also shows this, declaring that God "at the first did visit the Gentiles [after first visiting the Jews—Matt. 10: 5, 6; Luke 24: 47; Acts 1: 8; Rom. 1: 16; 11: 17-24], *to take out of them a people for his name*" (compare John 6: 44, 45). They are a limited, select group, a Little Flock (Luke 12: 32), the Bride of Christ, the Lamb's Wife, and associated with them is the Great Multitude, the Bridesmaids (2 Cor. 11: 2; Rev. 7: 1-17; 19: 7-9; 21: 2, 9, 10; Psa. 45: 14, 15).

With Christ, as Abraham's heavenly seed ("the stars of heaven"—Gen. 22: 16-18; Gal. 3: 8, 9, 16, 29), they will during the "thousand years" bless mankind with restitution blessings, drawing "all men" and uplifting all the willing and obedient to the condition Adam lost—human perfection on earth, with all its rights and privileges (Luke 19: 10; John 12: 32; Acts 3: 19-23; Rom. 8: 17-21; 1 Tim. 2: 4-6; 4: 10; Rev. 20: 4, 6; 22: 17).

Each of the Little Flock through crucial trials and testings was to develop and be crystallized in Christlikeness (Col. 1: 10-13; 2 Pet. 1: 5-8), in order to gain life on the Divine, immortal plane (2 Pet. 1: 4; 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54; 1 John 3: 2). Therefore, it was not God's purpose to attract all of mankind into the race for the prize of this, the High Calling (Phil. 3: 14).

TRUTH CONCEALED FROM THE UNWORTHY

Accordingly, in order not to encourage those without the right heart condition and requisite faith to enter this race, He arranged the Bible in such a way as to turn away those without hearing ears: "But the word of the Lord was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little; [in order] *that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken*" (Isa. 28: 13; see also vs. 9, 10). It is a historically proven fact, in harmony with Paul's prophecy (2 Thes. 2: 7), that of those attracted by the signs, *etc.*, in the establishing of the early Church, there was a great falling away.

Concealing the Truth from the unworthy accomplished two things: (1) It helped prevent those without hearing ears from tampering with God's truths and arrangements for His people (Deut. 29: 29; Psa. 25: 14; 50: 16, 17; Matt. 7: 6). (2) It kept from them the responsibility which having the Truth brings with it; for those who have the light—the Truth—are obliged to live in harmony with it and are more culpable if they disobey its leadings than those who never had the light. If they willfully disobey it, they deprave their characters, and bring God's punishments upon them, which will eventually include the Second Death—annihilation—for the incorrigible (Luke 12: 47, 48; John 15: 22, 24; Heb. 6: 4-6; 10: 26, 27; 2 Pet. 2: 20-22).

In harmony with this, Jesus expressed the Truth in such a way as to keep the understanding and appreciation of it from all but those who were at heart sincere, believing, meek and guileless—His disciples (Matt. 11: 25; Luke 8: 10). Deliberately, Jesus' sayings were "hard," to turn away the unfaithful (John 6: 60, 66; compare 1 Cor. 1: 18-25).

Similarly, referring to the Jews, Paul says, "God hath concluded [shut] them all in unbelief, [in order] that he might have mercy upon all" (Rom. 11: 32). In other words, God presented His Truth in such a way that the Jewish nation (with desirable exceptions—John 1: 11, 12), being stiff-necked and hard of heart (Mark 10: 5), were blinded.

However, in the coming Kingdom (Matt. 6: 10), when Satan and his influence will be removed (Rev. 20: 1-3; Isa. 35: 1-10) and Christ and His chosen ones will reign in righteousness (Acts 17: 31; Isa. 32: 1; Rev. 20: 4, 7), it will be easier for the Jews and others—for all the non-elect will be raised from the dead (John 5: 28, 29—the word rendered "damnation" should be translated *judgment*; see ASV, RSV, Rotherham, Diaglott, *etc.*; compare 1 Tim. 2: 4-6; 4: 10)—to understand and be given an opportunity to obey the Truth and thus to gain everlasting life (Isa. 11: 9; 35: 5, 8; Jer. 31: 31-34). No wonder the Apostle exclaims as he does in Rom. 11: 33! How merciful and wise God is!

OTHER REASONS FOR CEASING OF "GIFTS"

If the "gifts" had been in use throughout the Gospel Age, in the absence of the Apostles, whose doctrinal pronouncements were infallible (Matt. 18: 18), no doubt many would have used their "gifts" of prophecy, tongues, miracles, *etc.*, to mislead. Therefore God gave the "*more sure word of prophecy*" which, being written, was more dependable.

Also, there would have been a great many more people attracted to the Christian Church for the "loaves and fishes," for mercenary and material profit, as was Simon the sorcerer (Acts 8: 13-21). Instead of coming to God prepared to consecrate their all to Him and to suffer for His cause, many would have come to receive the "gifts," being attracted by their novelty (especially tongues), and desiring to show off. This certainly would have created havoc in the Church, and would have interfered with God's purposes.

Would the brethren in Corinth have had so much confusion and disorderly conduct among them if it had not been that many of them were coveting the "gift" of tongues—rather than prophesying and the *fruits* of the Spirit for others' and their own edification? Not, of course, that the "gifts" which God gave to the early Church were in themselves undesirable, though their misuse and abuse certainly were not good. For the purposes given, the "gifts" brought rich blessings to and aided to a very great degree in establishing the early Church. But God in His wisdom did not intend to continue this arrangement, for reasons given above, and so arranged for *all* the "gifts" to cease when the New Testament had been completely given to the Church. They had filled their purpose admirably—but they were no longer needed (1 Cor. 13: 8).

"THAT WHICH IS PERFECT"

*Thank God for that which is perfect!
Our vision no longer is blurred,
For now we are thoroughly furnished
By the fulness of God's holy Word.*

*With faith, hope and love still abiding,
The "gifts" have long passed away,
We rejoice in the Spirit's graces,
For these are with us to stay.*

*And the more we carefully study,
The more of God's plan we learn,
And we grow in His grace and knowledge
As our hearts within us burn.*

The Gift of Tongues

Chapter 7: What Value "Tongues-Speaking"?

Since, as we have seen, the "gift" of tongues—the supernatural, unlearned ability to speak in foreign languages—had served its purpose and therefore died out from the Church by God's arrangement in the second century A.D., shortly after the last of the Apostles (who alone had the power to confer the "gifts") fell asleep in death, and since therefore what is claimed to be tongues-speaking in our day must be counterfeit, why should God's people now seek for a "gift" which no longer exists? Why seek for a counterfeit? Of what value is it? Rather, we might ask, What danger is there in it?

It is always dangerous for God's people to dabble with error, especially once they have recognized it as such. No matter how attractive a teaching or practice may seem, *if it is not in harmony with God's Word* (Isa. 8: 20), it will lead into darkness.

Be not deceived: Satan has many ministers; and they do not all come preaching cold, spiritless doctrines. They often come as *spiritual* ministers, "transformed as the ministers of righteousness" (2 Cor. 11: 14, 15). Many are serving Satan unwittingly. Those seeking for what they regard as "deeper" spiritual experiences are likely to be deceived if they are not paying close attention to God's Word. And all too often there is too great an emphasis on what are thought to be the *spectacular* manifestations of the holy Spirit, with not enough regard for the *inward* fruits of the Spirit, which alone inure to life everlasting (Gal. 5: 22, 23, 25, 26).

THE USE OF SANCTIFIED REASON

Whenever a belief requires us to "silence our intellect," *beware!* While we are to exercise faith (Heb. 11: 6), we are not to have a *blind* faith, that goes out contrary to the spirit of a sound mind (2 Tim. 1: 7)—*that would be credulity*. God wants us to use sanctified reason, to use our intellects, to test any teaching or practice as to whether it should be accepted as true, or rejected as false (Isa. 1: 18; John 8: 32; 17: 17; Acts 17: 2-11; Rom. 12: 2; 1 Cor. 4: 6; 1 Thes. 5: 21; 2 Tim. 2: 15; 4: 2-4; 1 John 4: 1, etc.). *We cannot rely solely on the testimony of our or others' experiences!*

To switch off our reason is to invite deceptions, and surely Satan and his ministers will take advantage of the situation (2 Cor. 2: 11; 1 Pet. 5: 8, 9). In fact, in seeking to help us to get the "gift," they will play on the emotions and encourage us to close our minds to sound reasoning, to relax, to give up, for they know very well the effectiveness of *sanctified* human reason, *i.e.*, a consecrated Christian mind illuminated by God's Spirit, in searching out the Truth; they know that they cannot easily palm off their errors and "strong delusions" (their dupes usually are sincere, but deluded; 2 Thes. 2: 11) on a mind in which a *reasoning* faith operates.

To insist that we must silence our intellects and seek for the "gifts" is to minimize—indeed, largely to make redundant—the written Word of God. For if we need to go elsewhere for a revelation of God's will, *then the Bible is not what it claims to be—"the power of God unto salvation"; the "more sure word of prophecy"* (Rom. 1: 16; 15: 4; 2 Tim. 3: 15-17; 2 Pet. 1: 16, 19)!

Thus also we would tend toward minimizing *God's ability* to reveal His will to us other than in "gifts." The very reason for the passing away of the "gifts" from the early Church was so that the *complete written revelation of God for the Church, the Bible*, might stand supreme as the source of true belief and practice (1 Cor. 13: 10, 12). To cast aside God's Word and to go contrary to its clear teachings is to invite the Lord's disapproval, and is likely to induce spiritual pride: If we think we have the "gifts" and personal revelations from God aside from the Bible, what need have we to study any more or to think ourselves in error? How manifestly foolish is such reasoning!

"BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM"

The truthfulness or falsity of any doctrine can be determined also by the *effects* of its teaching, and the doctrine that the "gift" of tongues is for our day is no exception.

As we pointed out at the beginning of this treatise, one of the effects of this doctrine is that those who do not receive the "gift of tongues" (even after "tarrying" for a spectacular infilling of the Spirit), begin to feel inferior to other Christians who they think have this "gift," and thus they may consider themselves not fully accepted, or even disapproved by the Lord.

The test of one's consecrated standing before the Lord and acceptance by Him should not be whether or not he has a "gift." Such was never the test of true discipleship even in the early Church when the "gifts" were in operation. Our Lord said that His people would be known, not by their possession of any of the "gifts," but by their development in Christlikeness—the "fruits" (of the Spirit—Matt. 7: 15-29; 12: 33; compare 2 Cor. 9: 10; Gal. 5: 22, 23; Phil. 1: 11; Jas. 3: 17)—and their Christian good works, aside from any miraculous "gift." (It cannot be rightly claimed that the Apostle James [Jas. 2: 14-26] means by the "works" that are to accompany and attest to one's faith the "gifts," for in vs. 21 and 25 he speaks of the works which Abraham and Rahab did in testimony of their faith, and he quite clearly is not there referring to the "gifts.")

Another bad effect of the doctrine that tongues (or any other "gift") is for our day, is that those who have the "gift" often think of themselves "more highly than they ought to think" (Rom. 12: 3), regarding themselves as being outstanding and specially favored by God. Such spiritual pride is sometimes linked with a conviction that they are eternally "saved," *i.e.*, that being "once in grace" they will always be in grace, without further efforts on their part (Phil. 2: 12). This is a dangerous fallacy. (For a refutation of this anti-Scriptural teaching, see *The Bible Standard* No. 440—a copy free on request.)

REVERENTIAL WORSHIP NOT DISORDERLY

The highly uncontrolled emotional and disorderly meetings in many Pentecostal, neo-Pentecostal churches and other charismatic "tongues" groups, have deceived many Christians into thinking that true worship of the Lord must be with noisy demonstration. Many claim that those who do not raise or clap their hands when singing the Lord's praises, or shout hallelujahs, *etc.*, or sing to the accompaniment of various musical instruments, or dance in the aisles, *etc.*, are not really "Spirit-filled" Christians. And they look upon the beliefs and orderly meetings of others as being rather dull and lifeless and to be avoided as not fully of the Lord.

We encourage all Christians not to neglect sober, thoughtful study and meditation on the Word of God, nor to forget that the "ornament of a meek and quiet spirit" is pleasing to Him, and that it should express itself in reverent and appropriate conduct—in our daily lives and in the house of God (1 Cor. 14: 33, 40; 1 Tim. 3: 8, 15; Titus 2: 1-7; 1 Pet. 3: 4; 1 John 2: 6).

IN CONCLUSION

This treatise is sent forth with prayers for God's blessing on all readers, especially careful students of His Word. We have sought not to find fault unduly nor to criticize unkindly those Christian brethren who in sincerity—though erroneously—believe that God has endued them with so-called "Spirit-gifts." But we have felt obliged to present the pertinent clear Scriptural teaching on "tongues" for their and others' edification.

Since the Scriptures, reason and facts prove that the "gift" of tongues, along with all the other "gifts" of the Spirit, ceased long ago, it is evident that what today is practiced as and claimed to be the "gift" of tongues is counterfeit. No amount of rationalization, trying to make error appear truth, should cause God's people to seek for that which He through His Word—the Christian's *sole* source of faith and main rule of practice—has not authorized.

Rather, let us go from childishness to maturity in the Lord (Eph. 4: 14, 15), growing in knowledge through an earnest and reverential study of His Word, and growing in grace and service, by a sober application of those things which we have learned. If we do this faithfully and continually, we shall never fall but will have the Lord's approval and blessing (2 Pet. 1: 5-11; 3: 17, 18).

THE WONDERFUL WORD OF GOD

*Thy Word is like a garden, Lord,
With flowers bright and fair;
And every one who seeks may pluck
A lovely cluster there.
Thy Word is like a deep, deep mine;*

*And jewels rich and rare
Are hidden in its mighty depths
For every searcher there.*

*O may I love Thy precious Word,
May I explore the mine,
May I its priceless jewels glean,
May light upon me shine,
O may I find my armor there,
Thy Word my trusty sword,
And learn to fight with every foe
The battle of the Lord.*

The Gift of Tongues

Appendix: Ananias and Saul (The Apostle Paul)

How do you harmonize Acts 9: 17, 18, which tells of Ananias, *who was not an Apostle*, putting his hands on Saul (Paul), *etc.*, with the teaching that *only the Apostles* had the power to bestow the "gifts" of the Spirit by the laying on of their hands on others?

That only the twelve Apostles had as a special prerogative of their office the power to bestow the "gifts" of the Spirit upon others by the laying on of hands is evident from Acts 8: 5-24; 19: 1-6.

How then are we to understand Acts 9: 17, 18? It reads: "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized."

Certainly Paul could not and did not receive his appointment as an Apostle by virtue of any power of Ananias or any other man, for God reserved to Himself alone through Jesus the prerogative of choosing and appointing all of His Apostles (Acts 20: 24; 1 Cor. 12: 18, 29; Gal. 1: 1, 16; Rev. 21: 14; see *Bible Standard* No. 325). It was not even in the power of any Apostle or Apostles to elect or appoint another Apostle. The selection of Matthias as a supposed successor of Judas as an Apostle, by the Apostles (Acts 1: 15-26), who had been instructed to wait, was never authorized or recognized by God. We hear nothing further about Matthias in the Bible. It manifestly was Paul, appointed by God Himself through Jesus, who was to take Judas' forfeited bishoprick—*office or charge*—as an Apostle (v. 20), and who so ably filled that office, as the Scriptures show.

The Scriptures show also that *before Ananias visited him, Paul had already been specially chosen by God and appointed* to be His vessel for carrying the Gospel message, not only to Jews, but also—and especially—to the Gentiles (Acts 9: 15; 22: 14; 26: 16-18; compare Gal. 1: 15). This is shown by all three accounts of Paul's conversion (two in his own direct speech):

(a) In Acts 9: 15, God told Ananias that Paul "*is [i.e., already]* a chosen vessel unto me." (b) Acts 22: 14 records Ananias telling him that "the God of our fathers *hath* chosen thee." (c) In Acts 26: 9-20, Paul relates that the glorified Jesus spoke with him, and he indicates that by God's authority our Lord appointed him as an Apostle *at least three days prior to Ananias' visit*; for we read that the Lord told him "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister" (v. 16). He then commissioned Paul to go to the Gentiles, adding "unto whom *now [i.e., from then on]* I send thee" (v. 17).

One requirement for being an Apostle was that one must have personally witnessed Jesus after His resurrection (Acts 1: 2, 3, 22; 2: 32; 22: 14, 15; 26: 16; Rom. 15: 15-20; 1 Cor. 15: 7, 8; Gal. 1: 1, 16). This was accomplished by our Lord's appearing to Paul on the Damascus road. As a consequence Paul was then commissioned by Divine authority as an Apostle to be a special "witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee" (Acts 26: 16). *This was all done several days before Ananias visited him.*

Apparently God's use of Ananias, as recorded in Acts 9, was additionally in part to *confirm* Paul in the Apostolic office already given to him, and to pronounce the Divine blessing upon his ministry. Ananias also instructed him as to baptism (v. 18; 22: 16).

Although Paul had the "gifts" of the Spirit from shortly after his appointment as an Apostle, on the Damascus road (Acts 14: 3, 8-10; 15: 12; 16: 16-18; 19: 1-6, 11, 12; 20: 7-10; 28: 8, 9; Rom. 15: 19; 1 Cor. 14: 18; 2 Cor. 12: 12; Gal. 3: 5), and also had the power to confer the "gifts," in common with the other Apostles (Matt. 18: 18), it is not stated in the Scriptures that Paul received these "gifts" or the power to confer them, at the hands of Ananias or any of the Apostles. Note also the following considerations:

(1) From Acts 9: 10-16 it is evident that *the special reason* for Ananias' "putting his hands" on Saul was *"that he might receive his sight"* (v. 12; 22: 13). It evidently was a common practice for those with the "gift" of healing (1 Cor. 12: 9, 28, 29)—both Apostles and non-Apostles—to *lay their hands on the sick in order to heal them* (Mark 16: 17, 18; Acts 28: 8, etc.).

Certainly there was a thriving Christian community at Damascus, else Saul would not have specially besought the high priest at Jerusalem for "letters" to the Damascus synagogues, with the express purpose of apprehending Christians there (Acts 9: 1, 2; 22: 5; 26: 10-12).

Most likely the brethren at Damascus—including Ananias, a faithful disciple of Christ, who was of good report and probably prominent there (Acts 9: 10; 22: 12, 13)—were in frequent contact with the church at Jerusalem, for Saul's persecuting activities were well known to Ananias (9: 13, 14; compare 8: 3, 4; Gal. 1: 13). Therefore Ananias probably had received from one of the Apostles his "gift" of healing; for, as we have seen, it was *usual* for the "gifts" to be bestowed on consecrated Christian believers by the Apostles.

Why did not God send an *Apostle* to heal Paul's eyes? It evidently was God's design that Paul have no personal contact with any of the other Apostles for some time (three years, in fact—Gal. 1: 16-18) after his conversion, probably so that it might be specially demonstrated (a) that Paul was in no way subordinate to the other Apostles (2 Cor. 11: 5; 12: 11; Gal. 1: 12, 16 ["flesh and blood"]) and (b) that his appointment and mission was a most unique one. (Compare Num. 11: 16, 17, 24-26, where Eldad and Medad, two of the elders of Israel, were anointed with God's Spirit while yet in the camp, and not at the tabernacle of the congregation where other elders had assembled.)

Paul's being dealt with in this special manner no doubt served to highlight his office and ministry from the very outset.

(2) Although the expressions "putting his hands on him," "laying on of hands," "laid their hands on them," *etc.*, in the Scriptures sometimes signified the conferring of a "gift" of the Spirit, *they often did not*—compare (1) above. Rather, these expressions have at least five distinct meanings in the Bible:

(a) *Representation*. When Aaron and his sons laid their hands on the head of the bullock in the priestly consecration service (Lev. 8: 14), the act symbolized that the bullock stood for, represented, them. Again, when Aaron laid his hands on the head of the scapegoat (Lev. 16: 21), he thereby symbolized how the goat represented him from a certain standpoint (see *Tabernacle Shadows* for details).

(b) *Sanction, or endorsement*. Acts 13: 3 shows this clearly; the Antioch Church is set forth as sanctioning, or endorsing, Paul and Barnabas in going on a missionary journey on their behalf. Deut. 34: 9 shows that Joshua, because he was properly qualified and filled with God's Spirit of wisdom, had been endorsed by Moses to be his successor. Moses' laying his hands on Joshua and Joshua's being "full of the spirit of wisdom" cannot mean that he had received any "gift" of the Spirit, for the "gifts" were not given before Pentecost (Mark 16: 17, 18; Heb. 2: 3, 4). Other examples of laying on of hands with this meaning are found in Gen. 48: 13-18; 1 Tim. 5: 22, *etc.*

(c) *Blessing others*. Matt. 19: 13, 15 and Mark 10: 16 show this. Obviously Jesus' laying His hands on little children was not to bestow the "gifts," nor to heal them of sickness, but to bless them.

(d) *Performing healings*. This has already been discussed sufficiently under point (1).

(e) *Bestowing powers or "gifts."* This is apparent from Scriptures already examined. See also 2 Tim. 1: 6. In the early Church the "laying on of hands" was evidently a fundamental doctrine in itself; an understanding of it and the related obtaining and use of the "gifts" then available to the brethren was then considered necessary (Heb. 6: 2).

(3) Although the expression "filled with the Holy Spirit" and similar expressions sometimes signified the receiving of the "gifts" (Acts 2: 4; 10: 44-48; 19: 6, *etc.*), *they often did not*.

For example, Acts 6: 3-6 shows that the deacons Stephen and Philip (later called the Evangelist—Acts 21: 8) were *already* "full of the Holy Spirit" (vs. 3, 5) *before* the Apostles laid their hands on them, after which they each possessed a "gift" (v. 8; Acts 8: 5-13), though obviously they were unable to confer "gifts" on others (Acts 8: 14-19; see *Bible Standard* No. 469, p. 28).

Also, in Acts 4: 31 it is said that those who were *already* believers and associated with the Apostles (v. 23) "were all filled with the Holy Spirit"—but evidently not in the sense of receiving the "gifts."

It has always been of prime importance—both in the days when the "gifts" were operative and since—that Christian believers be *consecrated*, that is, *fully dedicated to the doing of God's will in all respects* (Matt. 16: 24; Rom. 12: 1), and also that they be well filled with God's holy Spirit—His *disposition* of wisdom, power, justice, love, joy, peace, *etc.* (2 Tim. 1: 7; Gal. 5: 22; 1 John 2: 5; 3: 24)—before they could be counted as of the Lord's true followers—even apart from any "gift" (Luke 14: 25-33; Acts 8: 19-23; compare v. 13). And after the "gifts" ceased from the early Church, it was (and still is) *requisite and imperative* for one to be "filled with the Holy Spirit"—with God's *disposition* and holy power—even without possessing the "gifts."

It was in this sense that Paul was especially "filled with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 9: 17; 13: 9, *etc.*). For no doubt the words of comfort and reassurance spoken to him by Ananias quickened his understanding and appreciation of his ministry for the Lord and His people; and this quickened appreciation no doubt deepened his spirituality. God's disposition permeated his whole being through and through, making him more powerful in service for the Lord and more fully aware of his sonship with God (Psa. 119: 50; Heb. 4: 12; Jas. 1: 18).

In Rom. 8: 14 we read: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." By the Spirit of God here the disposition of God in His consecrated children is meant. His disposition blends in perfect harmony, His attributes of wisdom, justice, power and love. Those whose motives, thoughts, words and acts are actuated and sustained by this disposition, are sealed by God as His own. Therein all of such have the strongest possible witness of their sonship with God. If this were not the most important aspect to being "filled with the Holy Spirit," then we would have to conclude that no one could be a true Christian without the "gifts"—a conclusion contrary to the Scriptures (Rom. 8: 1, 5, 6, 9, 10; 1 Cor. 3: 16; Gal. 5: 22; 1 Thes. 5: 19; Eph. 5: 18, *etc.*).

(4) In each of the Scriptural accounts of the conferring of the "gifts" (notably the "gift" of tongues) upon believers, and where the expression (or its equivalent) "filled with the Holy Spirit" occurs, it is also clearly stated that there was also some early consequent *manifestation* of the "gifts" having been received (Acts 2: 4; 8: 17, 18; 10: 45, 46; 19: 6).

However, in the account from Acts 9: 17, 18, although it is recorded that Paul "received sight forthwith" (v. 18), after Ananias had "put" his hands on him, nowhere does the record show that there was any *manifestation* of a "gift" or "gifts"—not even the "gift" of tongues, and we know from 1 Cor. 14: 18 that Paul *did in fact possess the "gift" of tongues-speaking*. This fact argues against the thought that Ananias conferred any "gifts" of the Spirit upon Paul.

(5) The Apostles at Pentecost did not receive their "gifts" or the power to bestow these "gifts" upon others through the "laying on of hands," their appointment as Apostles being made by God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, even as He had promised (Luke 24: 49; John 14: 26; Acts 1: 4, 5, 8);

and the Apostle Paul was at least the equal (2 Cor. 11: 5; 12: 11), if not the greatest (2 Cor. 12: 7) of the Apostles; therefore it is obvious that he could not receive the Apostolic office (including the "gifts" and the prerogative of bestowing these "gifts" on others) at the hands of another.

Thus it is evident that Acts 9: 17, 18 is not at all out of harmony with, but agrees fully with, the teaching that *only the Apostles* had the power to bestow the "gifts" of the Spirit on others by the laying on of their hands.

*And He walks with me, and He talks with me,
And He tells me I am His own;
And the joy we share as we tarry there,
None other has ever known.*