

Patmos, whither he is brought "for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," he is made to deliver his message again in new and broader form to meet the double enemy on a wider field. This is not "forgery." Even if the pseudonymity be deliberate, this is simply the method of apocalypse, which has not one true representative among its multitude of productions that is not pseudonymous. Its strict parallel is found in the use of the authority of Peter against the same heretics in 2 Peter. The appendix to the Fourth Gospel furnishes the key to the history of the conflicting traditions of John the "following" and the "tarrying" witness, superseded as they could not fail to be by the Pauline-Johannine doctrine that the true prophet-witness of Messiah, refuting the false-prophecy of Antichrist-gnosis, abiding with the church until the coming of the Lord, is the "witness of the Spirit." But how inevitable it was that an age which took literally the symbolism of the prophet-apostle in Patmos, addressing "the churches of Asia," should cling to one form of the earlier "prophecy" of Jesus, and gradually build up for itself, first in Palestine, afterward, in Irenaeus' time, in Asia, the legend of the "tarrying Witness."

B. W. BACON.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES AT CORINTH.

It is not likely that there ever will be complete unanimity on the vexed question of the nature of the Glossolalia. It is a question on which each one must endeavour to satisfy his own mind. Apart from the brief reference in the appendix to St. Mark's Gospel (Mark xvi. 17), our only sources of information are the accounts in Acts and 1 Corinthians.

Most recent writers on the subject start with the hypo-

thesis of the identical nature of the phenomena of Jerusalem and Corinth. The language of Luke in Acts ii., as it stands, undoubtedly makes speech in foreign languages a part of the phenomenon, but it is not so evident whether Paul in 1 Corinthians makes it such. The tendency in recent writers is to start with the words of Paul—to take them as the basis, and to examine the words of Luke in their light. The conclusions arrived at as regards Luke's narrative differ widely. Schmiedel, in his article on Spiritual Gifts in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (col. 4,761), holds that "the student who is not prepared to give up the genuineness of the principal Pauline Epistles is in duty stringently bound to consider the account of Paul as the primary one, and discuss it without even a side glance at Acts, and to reject as unhistorical everything in Acts which does not agree with this account." Zeller, Ramsay and Bartlet maintain that the account in Acts has been more or less embellished and distorted. Weiss can find no adequate solution. Wendt holds that Luke's account is a legendary embellishment. Blass thinks Luke's narrative has been influenced by dogmatic subjectivity. Dawson Walker, from whose recently published essay on the Gift of Tongues the above references are mostly taken, writes with the avowed object of vindicating Luke's credibility as a historian. He believes that the phenomena of Pentecost and Corinth were generically the same, but specifically different, the use of foreign languages being the specific characteristic of the glossolalia at Jerusalem. He vindicates Luke's historical accuracy by a full discussion of a possible *modus operandi*, maintaining (as does Wright in his *New Testament Problems*) that under the powerful influence of the Divine Spirit scraps of foreign phrases once heard were raised to the surface out of the subliminal self, and used by the speakers.

Most of the Fathers seem to have taken as their start-

ing-point the more definite words of Acts rather than the more obscure words of Paul, and to have interpreted the latter in the light of the former. This is what Origen does : he extends the gift of Pentecost to include a permanent ability to speak in foreign languages, bestowed with a view to the evangelization of the heathen ; and in commenting on 1 Corinthians xiv. 18, he makes that passage refer to foreign languages, attributing to Paul along with the other Apostles the permanent faculty of proclaiming the Gospel in foreign tongues. In making the Gift of Tongues include this permanent endowment he was followed by several of the Fathers, including Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome and Augustine.

Now this article does not claim to be an attempt to consider the whole question ; it is but a preliminary step to such a task. It is an examination of Paul's references to the glossolalia in 1 Corinthians, with the object of ascertaining whether his words give any countenance to the view that the use of foreign languages formed any part of the phenomenon at Corinth. The obscurity of his language is largely due to the fact that he is answering the questions addressed to him by the Corinthians.

In the work already referred to Dawson Walker says : " It is a matter of the greatest interest to observe that in some of the most recent literature on Acts in English there is a distinctly conservative reaction, a return to the older point of view (i.e., as regards Corinth)—for the view that speech in foreign languages formed an element in the glossolalia at Corinth would seem to be as old as Origen " (p. 37). He adds as his own opinion : " St. Paul's language then is not such as, in itself, to exclude the supposition that foreign languages formed part of the glossolalia at Corinth, provided that this view can be shown to be, on other grounds, probable " (p. 42).

Wright, in the article on the Gift of Tongues in *New Testa-*

ment Problems (p. 285), quotes the late Dean Farrar as saying that "it is impossible for any one to examine 1 Corinthians xii.-xiv. 33, carefully without being forced to the conclusion that at Corinth, at any rate, the gift of tongues had not the least connexion with foreign languages." He then proceeds to say that he has done the "impossible" and has come to the conclusion that "though some of St. Paul's illustrations undoubtedly favour the theory of incoherent noises, yet his application of them does not do so, and, on the whole, foreign languages are certainly implied." On pp. 285-6 he mentions several details in Paul's references which to him are indications of the use of foreign languages; we hope to show that all these point in the opposite direction.

Alford held that the use of foreign tongues was part of the phenomenon at Corinth, and Chase (*Credibility of the Acts*, p. 38) says: "The probabilities of the case then, and the language used by St. Paul, alike give support to the view that speech in a foreign language was one among the many forms of glossolalia at Corinth."

The object of this article is to show from a study of Paul's words that the absence of foreign languages is distinctly implied.

We shall consider, first, Paul's terminology, then, his illustrations, and, finally, his statements concerning the utility of the glossolalia.

The first part of our inquiry will show, as we believe, that Paul's terminology would, considered by itself, indicate the use of foreign languages at Corinth, while the rest of our study will prove almost conclusively that speech in foreign tongues was not an element of the phenomenon. Before considering the illustrations and the utility of the gift, we will anticipate the conclusions of our study of them and suggest a solution of the discrepancy between Paul's terminology and the natural implication of his words.

I. TERMINOLOGY.

The terms used by Paul in reference to the phenomenon are *γλώσσαι* (xiii. 8), *γένη γλωσσῶν* (xii. 10 and 28), *γλώσση λαλεῖν* (xiv. 13), and, even when referring to a single individual, the plural *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* (xiv. 6); of the interpretation he uses *ἐρμηνεία* (the MS. L reads *διερμηνεία* in xii. 10—a word not found elsewhere); but the verb he employs is the compound *διερμηνεύειν*.

Now what is the most natural meaning to give to the word *γλώσσαι*? We need not make more than a passing reference to the view of Ernesti and Herder (referred to by Edwards, in his Commentary, p. 320) that they were “unusual, antiquated, figurative and poetical expressions,” or to Meyer’s view that the *γλώσσα* in these chapters is the bodily member; as Edwards pointedly remarks, on this latter view no meaning can be attached to *γένη γλωσσῶν* and *ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν*. Edwards remarks that the religious use of *γλώσσα* to designate the ecstatic response of an oracle is more to the purpose than some of the explanations offered (p. 321), but finds “the reason for the name in the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost in the shape of tongues as of fire” (p. 323). Though we cannot adopt this as the real explanation of the use of the word, we believe that the name given to the phenomenon at Pentecost was employed long after the nature of the phenomenon had changed. We will return to this point presently.

The only two meanings that can naturally be applied to the word *γλώσσαι* are: (1) languages, (2) utterances. Of the meanings given in Liddell and Scott these are the only ones at all applicable here. If we had only the word *γλώσσαι* to consider, there would be no difficulty in taking it to mean *utterances*, but the combination of *γλώσσαι* and the compound *διερμηνεύειν* cannot easily be accounted for except on the supposition that the words refer to *languages* and

their translation. It is true that *διερμηνεύειν* is without doubt used in one passage in the New Testament (Luke xxiv. 27) in the sense of "to explain" or "expound," while the simple verb means "to translate" in two passages (John ix. 7 and Heb. vii. 2; it is not the correct reading in John i. 38); still it is almost impossible to conceive of any one taking this combination, standing alone, as referring to anything but languages. The expression *γένη γλωσσῶν*, twice used by Paul in his enumeration of the charismata, shows that the phenomenon was by no means uniform, and may be taken to suggest that the glossolalia at Corinth was different from that of Pentecost.

Our explanation of the Apostle's use of a terminology which implies speech in foreign languages, when his words give us clearly to understand (if we may anticipate the conclusions of the rest of our study) that foreign languages were not an element of the phenomenon, is that the terminology is a relic of former days. In the quarter of a century that had elapsed between Pentecost and the time when I Corinthians was written, the glossolalia had greatly changed. At Pentecost those filled with the Spirit spoke in foreign languages and the listeners (whether acquainted with the *Κοινή* or not) heard them praising God in their own tongues—the languages they best knew. Now the gift was continued in the Church, as the references of Acts x. 44-46, xi. 15 and xix. 6 show, and the truths uttered could be directly understood and appreciated by persons knowing the language or languages employed. The natural term to use for a person that translated from one language to another would be *διερμηνευτής*, and the original speakers would be said *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν*. Gradually the use of foreign tongues ceased to be a part of the phenomenon; when Paul wrote this letter it formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth. However, the old terminology was retained, and

in 1 Corinthians *διερμηνεύειν* means to expound the significance, and, by spiritual sympathy, to interpret the condition of ecstatic rapture. Such was the nature of the gift at Corinth; the persons who spoke with tongues in their ecstasy addressed themselves to God in prayer and praise, but not at all to their fellows.

We now proceed to show from a consideration of Paul's illustrations and his references to the utility of the gift that foreign languages formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth.

II. PAUL'S ILLUSTRATIONS.

In chapter xiv. 7 f. Paul uses three illustrations or comparisons, a careful examination of which will show that the use of foreign languages was not part of the *γλωσσολαλία*.

(a) *The Musical Instrument*.—Paul mentions the *αὐλός* and the *κιθάρα* as examples of the "things without life" which he uses as illustrations (verse 7). *Φθόγγος* in this verse means simply "sound." Liddell and Scott refer to several passages in which it means the *sound* of an instrument as distinguished from a *voice*. It is difficult to think that *διαστολή* is here used in any technical, musical sense. The only musical meaning given in Liddell and Scott is "pause," and their only reference is to this passage. The word means (cf. *διαστέλλω*) "separation," "distinction" (so R.V.), and Paul's meaning is that if the sound emitted by the flute or lyre is not broken up into notes, if it is nothing but mere sound, it will convey no meaning. If the sound is but one unvarying noise, not separated into the proper notes, it will answer no good purpose. There is not the least suggestion in Paul's words that the person who hears the sound would not be capable of appreciating good music if the instrument gave out such; indeed the contrary is implied. The reason that no sense of harmony reaches the hearer is not his inability to welcome it, but the fact

that the instrument does not produce it. The fault is in the instrument, not in the hearer. Now if at Corinth the speaker with tongues gave utterance to the mysteries of God in any *language*, and the hearers failed to apprehend their significance because of their ignorance of that language, then Paul's comparison would be most inadequate and even misleading. Had the case been one of inability to understand what was uttered in a foreign tongue, would not Paul have written after this manner: "If a flute or a lyre gave forth the sublimest music imaginable, but the person who listened had no ear for music and were unable to appreciate it, the music would be lost"? Surely the very form in which the comparison is given proves that the utterance of coherent statements in any language formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth.

(b) *The War-trumpet* (verse 8).—The same applies to this second comparison. The value of a war-trumpet depends upon the understanding between the person that blows it and the person that hears it as to the significance of pre-arranged notes. There is no suggestion in this verse that the soldiers were unable to distinguish and understand the different signals when correctly given. As in the first illustration, the fault lies with the instrument, not with those who hear it. The soldier is not ignorant of what to expect, but the *σάλπιγξ*, instead of giving out its *φωνή* according to the prearranged understanding, gives out an *ἄδηλος φωνή*, that is, one that conveys no clear meaning to the hearer; it is a mere sound to him. Again we submit that if the speaker with a tongue at Corinth was wont to utter great spiritual truths in a foreign language, and if nothing but ignorance of the particular language employed prevented the other members of the Church from understanding what was said, it is inconceivable that Paul should have stated the comparison in the way he does. Would he not

rather have spoken of the war-trumpet giving forth a clear signal to advance, and of the soldier who does not stir because he understands not the meaning of the signal ?

(c) *Human Speech* (verses 9 ff.).—In verse 9 Paul commences his application to the glossolalia of the foregoing illustrations, introducing it with the words *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς*. It is the same, he says, with sound uttered by the human tongue. If this be nothing but sound, it conveys no meaning and answers no purpose. *Τῆς γλώσσης* almost certainly refers to the bodily member, and not to the Divine gift, as some affirm; for one thing, *γλῶσσα* is invariably anarthrous when used of the charism. Paul, however, has not proceeded far with his application when the reference to human utterance suggests to his active mind a third illustration. As is his wont, he immediately grasps the new thought, and expands it in verses 10 and 11. For the moment he forgets his application, and has to resume it by means of the *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς* of verse 12. This second *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς* proves beyond all doubt that the reference to the *γένη φωνῶν* in verses 10 and 11 is of the nature of a comparison or illustration, and not a part of the intended application. “Think,” says Paul, “of the innumerable dialects in a world like this (anarthrous *κόσμος*); each answers the purpose of a dialect.” This seems to be the natural rendering of *καὶ οὐδὲν ἄφωνον*. The rendering of R.V. misrepresents the Greek, as *φωνή* can hardly mean “signification.” It is true that it is used in Sophocles (*Ant.* 1206) for articulate as opposed to inarticulate sound, but even there its reference is to the *sound* and not to the *signification*. “Dialect,” however, is one of its recognized meanings in the classical writers, and there is nothing strained in Paul’s use of the singular in verse 11 for “an utterance in a dialect.” “Now,” says the Apostle, “an utterance in any of these dialects answers no good purpose, conveys no thought to me, unless I know its mean-

ing." *Δύναμις* is frequently found in Plato in the sense it bears here.

We come to the conclusion then that Paul refers to different languages or dialects *as an illustration* of the *γλωσσολαλία*. Would he do so if the *γλωσσολαλία* itself were foreign speech? A comparison implies a difference as well as a similarity. We do not use identical things to illustrate each other. The very fact that Paul makes the comparison of verses 10 and 11 proves that speech in foreign languages was not part of the *γλωσσολαλία* at Corinth.

III. THE UTILITY OF THE GIFT.

We still have to consider Paul's remarks on the utility of the Glossolalia. Our study will, we believe, serve to strengthen our conviction that speaking in foreign languages formed no part of the phenomenon. It is evident that Paul had no high opinion of its usefulness at Corinth. It is only to be tolerated (xiv. 39). Though ranked first, seemingly, by the sensation-loving Corinthians, Paul gives it a very low place in the list (xii. 10). He does not regard it as one of the "greater charisms" (xii. 31). He emphasizes its inferiority to prophecy in all probability because the Corinthians in their church-letter had questioned him as to the relative value of these two gifts.

One reason why Paul disparages the Gift of Tongues as compared with the other gifts is that it was only of partial utility for the speaker himself. His *πνεῦμα* only was concerned; his *νοῦς* was *ἄκαρπος* (xiv. 14). The intellectual side of the man was not touched. But more than this, the gift had in itself no value for the other members of the Church, and for the conversion of the unbeliever it was practically ineffective. Let us consider these two points: (a) its partial value for the Church, (b) its ineffectiveness for the conversion of the outsider.

(a) *Its partial value for the Church.*—Again and again Paul calls attention to the fact that, without interpretation, speaking in a tongue cannot “build up” the hearers. The speaker, it is true, builds himself up (xiv. 4) in that he feels the nearness of God during the ecstatic trance. It is a matter of the heart rather than of the mind. He indeed speaks the mysteries of God—but “in spirit” only (verse 2). The lips give out meaningless sound as though endeavouring to utter the emotions of the soul. He speaks to God, not to men, for no one hears understandingly (*ἀκούει*, verse 2). Unless the person speaking interprets these mysterious emotions, or another for him, the Church derives no benefit. If the *πνεῦμα* alone is employed in praising God (as is the case in the glossolalia), then the person who is without the gift is not influenced: how can he say the customary “Amen” (*τὸ Ἀμήν*)? (verse 16). Paul goes on to say that in his own private life he made greater use of the gift than any of them, “but,” he adds, “*in a church-assembly* [emphatic by position] I had rather speak five words with my *νοῦς*, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue” (verses 18, 19). We see also from verses 26 [ff. that the exercise of this gift without interpretation is of no benefit to the Church, for the general principle “Let everything be carried on with a view to edification,” is followed by a number of restrictions as to the use of glossolalia; not more than two or three were to speak in the church-assembly, but if there was no one present to interpret, the speaker was to be silent in the church and speak to God in the privacy of his own home. Paul could see no value in the glossolalia for the Church-members.

Now at Corinth all the nationalities of east and west would meet; here, if anywhere, the Church would include persons of different races speaking many languages. The slave-population of Corinth was large and varied; as elsewhere,

slaves were attracted in numbers to the Christian Church. What could be of greater benefit to the worshippers than to hear the mysteries of God declared in their native tongues? Most of them would be more or less acquainted with the *Κοινή*; but how it would quicken their interest and stimulate them in every way to hear the praises of God uttered in the language of their childhood! Welsh people in England, who use English all the week, prefer to worship on the Sunday in their native Welsh. If the gift at Corinth included the use of foreign languages, would not Paul be quick to see its value? would he not foster it, instead of merely tolerating it? The fact that Paul sees no value in it for the rest of the Church in a place such as Corinth goes far to show that speaking in various languages formed no part of the manifestation.

(b) *Its ineffectiveness for the conversion of the outsider.*—This is Paul's subject in that difficult section xiv. 20–25, in which occurs the quotation from Isaiah xxviii. The words *ὥστε* (verse 22) and *οὖν* (verse 23) point to the logical unity of this section. At first sight Paul seems to contradict himself, for he says that Tongues are *εἰς σημεῖον τοῖς ἀπίστοις*, and then proceeds to show that the *ἀπίστοι* derive no benefit from it, while Prophecy is *εἰς σημεῖον οὐ τοῖς ἀπίστοις ἀλλὰ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*, but benefits the *ἀπίστοι* as well as the *πιστεύοντες*. Is it possible to arrive at an exposition of these words that will harmonize with all the statements of the section? Before endeavouring to explain the words let us state some conditions which a correct exposition must satisfy—

- (1) It must take cognizance of the fact that Jehovah's use of the Assyrian speakers in Isaiah's day was punitive.
- (2) It must repeat *εἰς σημεῖον* in the second clause of verse 22.
- (3) It must give *εἰς σημεῖον* the same meaning in both clauses.

(4) It must take *ἄπιστος* in the same sense in verses 22, 23 and 24.

Most of the expositions given seem to come short of satisfying one or more of these conditions.

In Isaiah xxviii. the prophet declares that the punishment which has fallen on Samaria is to fall on Jerusalem as well. His words are met with scorn. The rulers at Jerusalem think themselves superior to the plain message of prophecy, delivered "precept upon precept, line upon line" (verse 10). Because of their stubbornness Jehovah will enforce His lessons by cruel masters using the Assyrian tongue. Their refusal to hear the direct message of prophecy proved their unworthiness to receive such a message and rendered them still less worthy to receive and less able to appreciate it. God, therefore, in retribution, brings His method to their level and speaks to them "by men of strange lips and with another tongue." Now each of these messages from God was a *σημείον*: the object of the strange words, though they were partly punitive, was to lead men to put their trust in Him, but the second *σημείον* was less calculated to serve this purpose than the first. All this suggests to the Apostle's mind a double comparison. The plain prophetic message and the strange words of the Assyrian invaders correspond to the gifts of Prophecy and Tongues at Corinth, the one being an intelligible declaration of God's will, the other nothing but meaningless sound. He also likens the believing Church-members at Corinth to the rulers of Jerusalem when worthy to receive the plain words of prophecy and the unbelieving outsider to the same persons when, hardened by their obstinacy, they were unable to value the words of the prophet and were worthy only to hear punitive words delivered in an unknown tongue. The comparison must not be expected to hold good in all its details. Paul is not comparing the believer and the outsider in regard to moral

responsibility, but only as regards spiritual attainment. "Now," Paul seems to say in verse 22, "I recognize that both Prophecy and Tongues are *σημεία* from God; both are signs of His presence; the object of both is to influence men for good. But Prophecy stands on a higher level. It is a *σημείον* such as God would send to those who believe, while the glossolalia is such a *σημείον* as He would send by way of chastisement to unbelievers." Naturally, then, we should expect Prophecy to have a more elevating influence than Tongues, not only on the *πιστεύοντες* but on the *ἄπιστοι* as well. "And is not that what usually happens?" asks Paul: "unbelieving outsiders look in from curiosity at your church-assemblies. When they see and hear you speak in tongues they are hardened; they scoff and say you are mad; but when they hear the clear words of prophecy they are led to recognize the presence of God among His people" (verses 23-25).

We are aware that objections may be raised to this interpretation of the section, but it seems to us to be the one that best harmonizes with all the facts of the case. Whatever be the precise interpretation, it is evident that Paul could see no great value in the gift of Tongues for the conversion of the outsider.

Again and again at Corinth a foreign sailor or a foreign slave, knowing his native language better than he knew the *Κοινή* would by chance find his way to the church-assembly. What would touch the heart of such a person as much as to hear the mysteries of God in his own tongue? There are many cases on record of persons being greatly influenced by unexpectedly hearing spiritual truths declared in their own tongue. If the gift had included ability to speak in foreign languages, would Paul have disparaged it *at Corinth*? Would he not rather have valued it highly as a divinely sent means for the evangelization of the vast foreign population of that

heathen city? Again we are driven to the conclusion that the use of foreign speech formed no part of the glossolalia at Corinth.

The result of our investigation of Paul's language, then, is that the Glossolalia was an ecstatic spiritual rapture—a state of deep emotion during which utterance was given to meaningless incoherent sounds, such sounds not taking shape in the intelligible words of any language. We have suggested too that the expressions which seem to point to the use of foreign languages are the relics of an older terminology belonging to a time when the use of such was an element in the phenomenon.

JOHN H. MICHAEL.

THE DRAMATIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

THE dramatic progress of the Fourth Gospel is a testimony to the frequently challenged organic unity of the work. In his description of the Master's action and passion the writer's art is no less conspicuous than in the manner in which he has set forth the growth of His teaching. As in the *Ædipus Tyrannus*, the masterpiece of Attic tragedy, superb delineation of character is here united with the highest constructive skill. In his presentation of the drama of the "Word-made-flesh" the art of the writer secured that the climax should be approached by scenes of rising interest, a development of plot, character and purpose, a process which arises naturally out of the conditions of the tragedy itself, depends not upon artificial intervention and culminates at the supreme moment in a surprising reversal of fortune, a *περιπέτεια* which in this Gospel is the choice—"Not this man, but Barabbas."