
Chapter 12.5

The Biblical Gift of Tongues Was Controlled

Not Pagan Ecstatic Prayer

Table of Topics

A) The Lord Had Commands for How Tongues Was to be Used in the Church

- A.1) Only "two--or at the most three—should speak, one at a time"
- A.2) "If anyone speaks in a tongue someone must interpret"
- A.3) If a translation was not available, the would be "tongue speaker" was to remain silent
- A.4) Women are not to speak in tongues at all in church
- A.5) It was sin against God to violate these commands & leaders allowing this should be ignored

B) Modern Tongue Speaking Matches An Ancient Pagan Practice, Not the Biblical Gift

Extras & Endnotes

Primary Points

- The Apostle gave at least four things about tongues that were "**the Lord's command**," and all of them are consistently violated in *glossaism* today.
- The Apostle said, "**If anyone speaks in a tongue, two--or at the most three--should speak, one at a time**" and modern *glossaists* continually sin against "**the Lord's command**" by violating it.
- Uninterpreted utterances in a tongue can be heard often in their meetings and there is no explanation given for why they feel they can violate "**the Lord's command**" regarding this.
- The inability to produce authentic interpretations of modern tongue utterances is one of the clearest evidences that these modern manifestations are not the real thing.
- Even if we allow the modern redefinition of tongues for the sake of discussion, the Apostle's rules would dictate a *silent* "prayer language," heard by absolutely no one, and not the audible "prayer" practiced today.
- The Apostle's instruction intentionally makes illegitimate tongue speaking a meaningless exercise in the hope that it will be abandoned.
- The prohibition of women uttering tongues audibly and publicly is clear.
- The important question arises: If modern tongues is not biblical tongues, then what is it? Unfortunately, while the modern version of tongues does not match its biblical counterpart, it perfectly matches the pagan version practiced for centuries by all kinds of pagan religions.

A) The Lord had Commands for How Tongues was to be Used in the Church

In the context of how the gift of tongues was to operate in a church service, the Apostle Paul writes near the end of 1 Corinthians 14:

If anyone speaks in a tongue, two--or at the most three--should speak, one at a time, and someone must interpret. If there is no interpreter, the speaker should keep quiet in the church. . . .¹

As in all the congregations of the saints,² **women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak [in tongues, or otherwise in the assembly], but must be in submission, as the Law says. If they want to inquire about something, they should ask their own husbands at home; for it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church.**

Did the word of God originate with you? Or are you the only people it has reached? If anybody thinks he is a prophet or spiritually gifted, let him acknowledge that what I am writing to you is the Lord's command. If he ignores this, he himself will be ignored. (1 Cor 14:27-28, 33-5, 36-8)

There is no doubt that the above rules apply to the use of the gift of tongues in the church, that they are "**the Lord's command,**" and that all of them are consistently violated in *glossaism* today. Accordingly, one should view a typical church service attended by *glossaists* by clicking on the available link (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bkf7DpnnNck>) and notice how many of these biblical commands are treated with contempt. Even if *glossaists* want to insist they possess the biblical gift of tongues today, they must admit that they often do not use it in a biblical way. In what follows, we will discuss each of the instructions that are "**the Lord's command**" concerning the biblical gift of tongues.

A.1) Only "two--or at the most three—should speak, one at a time" (v. 27)

One will notice in the linked video clip above that virtually everyone in the service is making obscure, meaningless utterances. While we do not believe this is the biblical gift of tongues, even those who would claim it is, must admit that it is being used in an unbiblical way. The Apostle said, "**If anyone speaks in a tongue,**

two--or at the most three--should speak, one at a time” (v. 27). The Apostle intended that would-be tongue speakers speak **“one at a time”** and only **“two or at the most three”** in any one meeting. What typically occurs is many more than three speaking simultaneously. There is not much more to say except this rule is a clear biblical command and the modern *glossaists* continually sin against **“the Lord’s command”** by violating it.

A.2) “If anyone speaks in a tongue “someone must interpret” (v. 28)

The second biblical command in this passage, which is commonly disregarded, is the Apostle’s insistence for an utterance in an unknown tongue to be interpreted. There is no such interpretation occurring in the above video clip of *glossaists*, and again, this is very typical in *glossaism* today. Uninterpreted utterances in a tongue can be heard often in their meetings and there is no explanation given for why they feel they can violate **“the Lord’s command”** regarding this.

Still, some have recognized the need for tongues utterances to be interpreted into something meaningful for others if it is to be legitimate and such interpretations are commonly attempted. However, the inability to produce authentic interpretations of modern tongue utterances is one of the clearest evidences that these modern manifestations are not the real thing. There has been little, if any, evidence that modern *glossaists* possess the gift of tongues interpretation, which may explain why they normally do not attempt interpretations. The absence of a gift of interpretation has been proven repeatedly in a number of studies.

Accordingly, J. I. Packer, who is quite sympathetic to *Glossaism*, nonetheless writes:

Uncertainty peaks, as it seems to me, in connection with the [contemporary version of the] interpretation of tongues. By *interpretation* I mean the announcing of the message content that (so it is claimed) a glossolalic utterance has expressed. . . . Interpretations prove to be as stereotyped, vague, and uninformative as they are spontaneous, fluent, and confident. Weird mistakes are made. Kildahl tells how the Lord’s Prayer in an African dialect was interpreted as a word on the Second Coming. ³

Dr. Douglas Judisch, former Professor of Biblical Studies at Concordia Theological Seminary points out that:

Paul A. Qualben, M. D., in an impartial lecture delivered at Concordia Theological Seminary . . . based on years of scientific research, stated and demonstrated from tape recordings that although [*Glossaists*] who claim the gift of interpretation were consistently willing to “interpret” his tapes of “utterances in tongues” by other [*glossaists*], no two “interpretations” of the same utterance agreed. ⁴

Even the pro-*glossaism* D. A. Carson would also seem to be aware of the extensive research that has been conducted on *glossaists*’ claims of the gift of interpretation and says:

Two people with the [supposed] gift of interpretation have on occasion been asked to interpret the same recorded tongues message and the resulting different and conflicting interpretations have been justified on the grounds that God gives different interpretations to different people. That is preposterous . . . because it would force us to conclude that there is no univocal, cognitive [conveying information to be understood] content to the tongues themselves. . . . [T]hese distortions of interpretation are sufficiently frequent, and the interpretations themselves so commonly pedestrian, that at some point the gift of tongues must, *in some cases*, also be called into question. ⁵

Remember that the spiritual gift of tongues interpretation was intended to be readily recognized as a *supernatural* spiritual gift, resulting in a miraculous authenticating sign for unbelievers (cf. 1 Cor 14:22). It was not learned or a result of simply being a native speaker, but rather the *supernatural* ability to translate an utterance in a foreign language that neither the interpreter nor the speaker naturally knew. The fact that it was to be miraculous, demands that there would be one, accurate, verifiable, interpretation of the tongues utterance.

The contradictory and inaccurate interpretations of tongues today are not miracles, and unless *glossaists* can produce such a miracle, they cannot claim to possess the real gift of interpreting tongues. And it would seem certain that if the gift of miraculously *interpreting* tongues is not operating, then the gift of miraculously *speaking* in tongues is not functioning either.

One additional suggestion could be made. If our friends in *glossaism* wish to claim that the gift of tongues interpretation is operating today, then there should be no objection in their assemblies to having two people independently and accurately interpret a tongues utterance. However, this would seem to be something that *glossaist* assemblies will not do, and, it is

suggested, cannot do, because this spiritual gift is no longer operating.

Some have pointed to the fact that interpretation was needed in Corinth, but not in the accounts in Acts, and have suggested this is evidence that the authentic gift operated differently in Corinth. However, we have already noted elsewhere that the Greek Corinthian church was no doubt primarily locals speaking only the native language, whereas in Acts there were "**Jews from every nation**" (Acts 2:5).⁶ Therefore, the need for interpretation in Corinth, as opposed to Acts, is found in the differing audiences, not some supposedly different gift of tongues.⁷

Finally, it could be asked what the Apostle meant when he suggested that an interpretation of an incoherent utterance, given by the speaker themselves (cf. 14:5, 13) or by "one" interpreter (14:27), could be verified as a supernatural gift of the Holy Spirit and act as an effective deterrent to counterfeit tongues speaking? In other words, if an individual were in the habit of interpreting his own utterances or only one other person always offered an interpretation of the utterance, it would seem there would have been opportunity for fraud.

The fact that the Apostle does not specify rules that would more effectively eliminate the possibility of fraud is admittedly curious. It could be suggested that fraudulent interpreters may be exposed in much the same way they are today when something is knowingly spoken in a foreign language and it is misinterpreted, or when two interpretations do not agree. In addition, it would seem that the Apostle had confidence that no authentic Christian would consistently be a part of such fraud. The NT is full of commands not to lie (cf. Eph 4:25, Col 3:9, 1 Tim. 1:10, 13), and even teaches that no true Christian will be gripped by this sin enough that they might be called "**liars**," for such people are damned to Hell (cf. Rev 21:8, 27; 22:15).

A.3) If a translation was not available, the would be "tongue speaker" was to remain silent (v. 28)

The third clear command of the Lord that modern *glossaism* consistently violates is the fact that, "**If there is no interpreter, the [tongue] speaker should keep quiet [*sigatē*] in the church and speak to himself**" (v. 28). Again, in the video clip above, no interpretations are being given, and apparently no one is keeping quiet. Even if we allow the modern redefinition of tongues for the sake of discussion, the Apostle's rules would dictate a *silent* "prayer

language," heard by absolutely no one, and not the audible "prayer" practiced today.

In addition, the Greek indicates clearly that the would-be tongue speaker should not speak, *and then* see if their utterance is translated into the native language. Rather, they were to "**remain silent**," until they knew with certainty that a translation was available, rather than starting to speak and then "become silent."⁸ In other words, no one could speak publicly in tongues unless they knew for certain ahead of time that either they or someone else would accurately and honestly translate the utterance into the native language.

Someone might ask how the tongue speaker was to know ahead of time that an authentic, miraculous, and meaningful translation would be present? First, the Apostle indicated that the tongue speaker may possess the translation themselves (v. 13), and if so, they were to know what the meaning of their utterance was *before* they spoke it. If others were to translate the obscure utterance, then, evidently there were recognized people who consistently demonstrated the gift of accurately and miraculously translating authentic tongues utterances.

The Apostle Paul expected the Corinthian Christians to know who had the gift of interpretation and to ensure that such a person was present before any public tongues utterance was allowed in the assembly.⁹ This again, of course, argues against the common practice of audibly speaking in an obscure tongue and "hoping" someone interprets. Or the idea that the person who has the gift of interpretation may unknowingly and often change, so that it is impossible to be sure it is present.

The divine command for interpretation of a tongue utterance in the assembly of believers severely limited the gift, especially compared to prophecy which had no such prior requirements. And this was precisely the effect the Apostle desired. He knew that if the real gift of tongues was not present, then the real gift of interpretation would not be either. And if it wasn't, and the Corinthians obeyed his rules, no tongues speaking would be heard. The Apostle's insistence that would-be tongues speakers "**keep quiet**" and confine their utterance to themselves, in the absence of interpretation, reveals his God-given genius.

As we will demonstrate in a subsequent chapter, in 1 Corinthians 12-14 the Apostle is attempting to diplomatically eliminate from the Christian church service, the popular practice in the Greek mystery religions of praying or speaking in a spontaneous, obscure utterance.¹⁰ His instruction accomplishes this wonderfully. If illegitimate tongue speakers were forced to quietly keep their garbled utterances to themselves, the pagan

version of tongue speaking would essentially stop altogether. It is no doubt an empty exercise for a tongue speaker to mindlessly “**speak to himself**” (v. 28) *silently*, in their mind, in meaningless syllables that he does not understand.

If one doubts our perspective, then try right now to obey the Apostle’s command. Speak or pray silently in your mind to yourself in meaningless gibberish and see how edifying, spiritual, or wonderful it feels. One only needs to imagine such a thing to expect that those doing so would eventually abandon the practice altogether.¹¹

It is suggested this is precisely why so many *glossaists* refuse to obey the Apostle’s rules. “**The Lord’s command**” (v. 37) here is a *silent* communication to oneself in meaningless syllables, not to be heard by even someone listening nearby. Even the uninterpreted, quiet mumbling that commonly occurs in meetings of supposed tongues prayers and speakers is a violation to “**remain silent**” (v. 28). There is little doubt that the source of the “good feelings” and “psychological release” claimed to come with modern tongues speaking is in the physical and audible *expression* of these utterances, not in their content.

Again, the Apostle’s instruction intentionally makes illegitimate tongue speaking a meaningless exercise in the hope, it would seem, that it will be abandoned. No doubt the same is true today. If modern *Glossaists* actually obeyed “**the Lord’s command**” concerning tongues speaking, many of them too would recognize the meaninglessness of the pagan variety they practice and rightfully abandon it.

A.4) Women are not to speak in tongues at all in church (v. 33-35)

Although the biblical roles of women in the church are beyond the scope of this topic,¹² the prohibition of women uttering tongues audibly and publicly is clear. NT scholar H. Wayne House notes that:

Women had an important place in the mystery cults, especially in the emotional and vocal realm. This was especially true in the Dionysian cult. Livy in his *History of Rome* wrote that the majority of Dionysian worshipers were women. . . . This aspect of the pagan cult could be what Paul was counteracting in 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36.¹³

Accordingly, immediately after the Apostle Paul describes rules for practicing the gift of tongues in the congregation, he states:

As in all the congregations of the saints, women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak [in tongues, or otherwise in the assembly], but must be in submission, as the Law says. If they want to inquire about something, they should ask their own husbands at home; for it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church. (v. 33-5)

This clear divine command is, of course, violated consistently in *glossaism*, and is demonstrated in the video clip above as well. Why would Christian women insist on doing something that the Apostle Paul called "**disgraceful**"? We have no record in Scripture of a woman receiving the gift of tongues, yet it is estimated that 75% of those claiming it today are females.

The fact that *Glossaists* really have no answer for their violation of this biblical command is demonstrated by the common suggestion among them that this statement of the Apostle's is not Scripture, but was added later by a copyist.¹⁴ With all due respect, this seems a rather desperate way in which to justify what the Apostle Paul called "**disgraceful.**"

A.5) It was sin against God to violate these commands & leaders allowing this should be ignored (vs. 36-8)

In verses 36-38 the Apostle of Jesus Christ writes:

Did the word of God originate with you? Or are you the only people it has reached? If anybody thinks he is a prophet or spiritually gifted, let him acknowledge that what I am writing to you is the Lord's command. If he ignores this, he himself will be ignored.

There is some debate regarding whether the Apostle meant in the passage above that the offender would be ignored by God, or the Corinthians. In light of the fact that he is battling false leaders in the Corinthian congregation who are obviously promoting and allowing these practices, it would seem that the Apostle is clearly referring to them. He wants the Corinthians to choose. Are they going to follow leaders who allow and even encourage pagan practices that are contrary to God's word, or will they ignore such leaders? It is suggested that these Scriptures would seem to present the same choice to our *glossaists* friends today.

It would seem at this point, the Apostle is momentarily taking off the kid gloves with these Christians. He knows what a difficult thing it will be for some of them to follow rules that will curb

something they are fond of, and maybe for some, even addicted to. So he shoots straight with them and tells them that this issue is not in the realm of his personal wishes, nor is it a minor, secondary suggestion just to make things better in Corinth. God Himself despises the idolatrous, counterfeiting, meaningless, self-edifying practice of praying in a pagan tongue, and He wants it stopped. And it is again, an alarming thing to witness how consistently and *casually* our *glossaist* brethren allow God's rules for the practice to be violated.

Accordingly, Dr. Unger wrote something several years ago that would seem to continue to be true today:

The Apostle, therefore, inquires of the Corinthians (with something of sarcastic indignation) whether they are the source from whence God's Word came, or whether they consider themselves its sole recipients, that they should set themselves above the other churches and above him.

The same spirit of arrogant pride against sound Bible teaching is widely manifest in charismatic movements today. Being unscriptural, the movement tends to engender the same spirit of insubordination to the Word. Many promoters of the revival of glossolalia today act as if the Word of God originated with them or that they are its sole recipients. It is common for these assemblies to set themselves above other sound churches and above apostolic regulation. They tend to pride themselves in thinking they have so much more truth and power than churches that do not practice tongues. Conceit is one of the common sad results of glossolalic error. It is often coupled with a spirit of defiance of plain scriptural regulations of doctrine and conduct.¹⁵

If modern *glossaists* do not wish to be thought of as taking the Scriptures lightly, they can start right here, proving otherwise. Is it a sin to violate "**the Lord's command**" concerning the use of tongues in the church? The Apostle had hinted at the sinfulness of what was occurring regarding tongues earlier in the passage when he told the Corinthians, "**Brothers . . . in regard to evil be infants** [i.e. innocent]" (14:20). The issue of tongues, then, was not just a matter of worship style, but a matter of sin, and it is today as well.

Pastoral Practices

- If you are leading a church that does believe tongues is abundantly operating today, are you enforcing the Apostle's

rules for their use? Are you willing to endure the consequences of curbing the use of “tongues” in your church, especially in regards to those who may not agree and for whom the practice has become more important than following Scripture? Remember, you are first and foremost a servant of the King, and the rules above are “**the Lord’s command**” (1 Cor 14:37). And we believe that if these rules are enforced, that any fake tongues in your congregation will be eliminated, and any real gift will surface, which is precisely what the Apostle intended.

B) Modern Tongue Speaking Matches An Ancient Pagan Practice, Not the Biblical Gift

In essence, then, the gift of tongues was the God-given ability to miraculously speak in a real foreign human language for the purpose of supernaturally authenticating new divine revelation particularly to the Jews. This description of the gift of tongues is admittedly somewhat cumbersome, but it summarizes the characteristics found in the Bible for the gift. Accordingly, it is clear that the modern version of tongues does not reflect these biblical attributes, and subsequently, is not biblical, and therefore not even Christian, regardless of all the wonderful feelings its practitioners claim.

Because the biblical gift involved real, although foreign human languages, it was referred to in the early Church as the gift of “tongues” (*glossais*) which meant that very thing. Even the first of the modern “tongues speakers” in the early twentieth century believed this. Yet the modern version of tongues has nothing to do with human languages as the biblical version did, and therefore it is to be rejected.

Because the biblical gift of tongues was the ability to speak in a real foreign human language that the person did not know, it was readily recognized as a miracle. There is nothing miraculous about the modern version of tongues, and as discussed further elsewhere, it is indistinguishable from the incoherent and emotional “tongue speaking” and praying practiced by all sorts of non-Christian, and even occultic religions around the world.¹⁶

Because the biblical gift of tongues was a miracle, it was intended by God to be another form of miraculous authentication of messengers of new divine revelation. Because the modern version can easily be faked it authenticates nothing.

Because the biblical gift of tongues was the miraculous ability to speak in a real human language, it contained meaningful content that could be translated if necessary. The modern version of

“speaking in a tongue” has no meaning to anyone, being merely an exercise of the vocal cords, but not the mind.

Because the biblical gift of tongues contained meaningful content, it was to be miraculously translated if no one present knew the foreign human language spoken. The modern version is constantly uttered in public assemblies with no translation even attempted, let alone a miraculous one actually demonstrated. Nonetheless, “tongues speakers,” including women, publicly “speak” anyway, in direct violation of “**the Lord’s command**” (1 Cor 14:37) to be “**quiet**” (v. 28).

Because the biblical gift of tongues was a *sign gift* specifically for the Jews, it was a relatively minor gift for the early Church, the Apostle Paul listing it last in three separate lists, and the post-apostolic Church testifying universally that the gift had ceased in the second century. The modern version is extolled as a superlative, if not absolutely necessary spiritual experience for all Christians, becoming a measuring stick for spirituality, and ignoring the fact that God never intended all Christians to receive the gift.

Because the biblical gift of tongues was a miraculous *sign gift* it was also rare, the Apostle Paul confidently claiming that he exercised it more than all the Corinthians *combined*. No doubt he would say the same today to any other tongues congregation because the real gift is not being exercised.

Because the biblical gift of tongues was truly a gift, it was sovereignly given to individuals by the Holy Spirit. Anyone can obtain the modern version through coaching, peer pressure, practice, and faking it.

All of the above characteristics are biblical, but none of them can be demonstrated by the modern “tongues” phenomenon occurring in the Church today, whether it be the public, audible, version, or the “private prayer” version. There simply is no warrant for some to attach a biblical name to something that clearly is not biblical.

The important question arises: If modern tongues is not biblical tongues, then what is it? Unfortunately, while the modern version of tongues does not match its biblical counterpart, it perfectly matches the pagan version practiced for centuries by all kinds of religions. In particular, speaking and/or praying in incoherent speech was a common occurrence in the Greek mystery religions practiced in Corinth. Accordingly, commenting on 1 Corinthians 12:2 the *New Bible Dictionary* says:

Gentile converts [in Corinth] may have come directly from paganism. . . . Ecstasy, including speaking in tongues, was a common phenomenon in Graeco-Oriental religions, and this may help account for the Corinthians’ misuse of Christian

spiritual gifts, and possibly for the ecstatically-produced blasphemy of 1 Cor. 12:2f.¹⁷

Likewise, it is worth repeating the quote from the rather secular *Encyclopedia of Religion* which states:

Glossolalia (from the Greek *glosse*, "tongue, language," and *lalein*, "to talk") is a nonordinary speech behavior that is institutionalized as a religious ritual in numerous Western and non-Western religious communities. Its worldwide distribution attests to its antiquity, as does its mention in ancient documents. . . . There are references to it in the [Hindu] Vedas (c. 1000 BC), in Patanjali's *Yoga Sutras*, and in Tibetan Tantric writings. Traces of it can be found in the litanies (*dhikrs*) of some orders of the Islamic Sufi mystics. . . .

[Tongues speaking] occurred in some of the ancient Greek religions and in various primitive religions. . . . Paul urged restraint in the practice . . . since such a spectacular spiritual gift could be abused. Edification, as opposed to personal satisfaction, was set as the test of acceptable glossolalia. If the meaning could not be disclosed, Paul regarded it with suspicion."¹⁸

With such information at hand, we have a very good explanation for the non-biblical version of tongues being practiced today. It is nothing more than the same non-miraculous, self-centered, meaningless speech that has been uttered for millennia in all types of religions. More specifically, muttering prayers and utterances in gibberish was highly prized in Corinth as a sign of spirituality.

Therefore, as we demonstrate in a subsequent chapter, careful study of 1 Corinthians 12-14 will reveal that the Apostle was actually distinguishing between 1) the pagan variety of speaking in a tongue (singular) that was incoherent, meaningless, meant for selfish exaltation, and useless to anyone, and 2) the real gift of tongues (plural) that had meaningful content, could be translated, and was a miraculous sign to unbelievers.

So while it can be demonstrated that modern versions of tongues speaking do not reflect the biblical variety, it does resemble the pagan variety. J. I. Packer concludes the same and asks, and answers, the very same question we have:

Can charismatic glossolalia, which is frequently a learned skill and technique, which lacks language structure, and which its own practitioners regard as mainly for private use, be convincingly equated with the tongues of 1 Corinthians 12-14, which were for public use, which were a "sign" to unbelievers, and which Paul thought about as a language, conveying

meaning and therefore capable of being interpreted? . . .
Surely not.¹⁹

Extras & Endnotes

A Devotion to Dad

Our Father in Heaven, we ask that you would help tongues speaking congregations recognize how they are violating Your word, that they would repent, and honor You in this. May You set more and more people free from the lie about tongues today, and be glorified as a result.

Gauging Your Grasp

- 1) What are some of "**the Lord's command[s]**" (1 Cor 14:37) that are habitually violated in churches that practice the modern version of "tongues"?
- 2) What are the reasons we claim that if the rules for tongues were followed in a congregation, most would-be tongue speakers would practice a silent "prayer language" that would probably be abandoned? Do you agree or disagree and why?
- 3) We claim that the Apostle's prohibition of women speaking in the public assembly applies to uttering a tongue. Do you agree or disagree and why?
- 4) We claim that the modern version of tongues does not match its biblical characteristics. Do you agree or disagree and why?
- 5) We claim the modern version of tongues mimics a widespread and ancient practice in non-Christian religious environments. Do you agree or disagree and why?

Publications & Particulars

¹ The full statement here has the Apostle saying that the tongues speaker is to "**speak to himself and to God**" (v. 2). We argue elsewhere that he is simply being diplomatic, because neither he nor the tongue speaker

could possibly know whether their meaningless tongue utterance was addressed to God. Accordingly, a few verses later the Apostle describes the same people as "**Just speaking into the air**" (v. 9). For further discussion on verse 14:2 see chapter 12.9.

- ² There is a great deal of debate concerning whether the Apostle meant "**as in all the churches**" to apply to "**God is not a God of disorder but of peace**" stated before it, or does it apply to what follows: "**women should remain silent in the churches.**" The clearest answer is that it doesn't matter. Of course God is a God of peace in all the churches. And the universal application of women's silence in the assemblies does not depend on the phrase that precedes it, for the Apostle says again that this is the way it is to be "**in [all] the churches.**"
- ³ J. I. Packer, *Keep in Step With the Spirit* (Revell, 1984), 212.
- ⁴ Douglas Judisch, *An Evaluation of Claims to the Charismatic Gifts* (Baker, 1978), 15.
- ⁵ *Showing the Spirit: A Theological Exposition of 1 Corinthians 12-14* (Baker, 1987), 87 (emphasis in the original).
- ⁶ Regarding the claim that the Greek Corinthian church was primarily locals speaking only the native language, and therefore needing interpretation, whereas in Acts there were "**Jews from every nation**" (Acts 2:5), see section 12.3.B.1
- ⁷ Accordingly, Dr. Ferguson notes:
The difference between Pentecost and Corinth lies in the fact that those who heard tongues in Jerusalem already possessed the key for their interpretation: they understood the foreign languages since they were their native tongues (Acts 2:11); no translation was required. By contrast, in Corinth it was necessary for an interpreter to speak. But there is no reason for thinking that there was any essential difference between the nature of the tongues spoken in the two contexts (*The Holy Spirit* [Intervarsity, 1996], 214).
Likewise, Robert H. Gundry remarks:
Without the translation the tongue might appear to be meaningless gibberish. The effectiveness of glossolalia as an authenticating [sign]. . . depended on its difference from the ecstatic gobbledegook in Hellenistic religion! On the other hand, the amazement factor on the day of Pentecost consisted in the recognition by non-Palestinians of their native languages as they were being spoken by Galileans who ordinarily could not have spoken them. ("Ecstatic Utterance," *JTS* 17 (1966): 303)
- ⁸ Dr. Thiselton notes the Apostle's use of the present imperative *sigatē* "which is best translated **let them** [singular] **remain silent** (in contrast to *become silent*)" (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [Eerdmans, 2000], 1139).
- ⁹ Accordingly, even the Pentecostal Dr. Fee writes, "Only when someone known to be gifted with interpretation is present may it be exercised in

the assembly.” (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians (NICNT)* [Eerdmans, 1987], 692).

¹⁰ Regarding our claim that the Apostle is attempting to diplomatically eliminate from the Christian church service, the popular practice in the Greek mystery religions of praying or speaking in a spontaneous, obscure utterance see chapter 12.7

¹¹ Accordingly, Dr. House writes:

Paul gave the previous safeguards so that the spurious tongues would fall away, since they would be recognized as false by not agreeing with the guidelines he set. The true gift of tongues would then properly operate in alignment with the other gifts of the Spirit and edify the body of Christ (H. Wayne House, *“Tongues and the Mystery Religions at Corinth” Bibliotheca Sacra*, 140, [1983], 146-7).

¹² For further discussion of women prophesying see section 9.7.F.

¹³ House, 141.

¹⁴ For example, Dr. Fee remarkably and conveniently claims that the verses prohibiting women from speaking in the assembly here are not even Scripture:

On the whole, therefore, the case against [the authenticity of] these verses is so strong, and finding a viable solution to their meaning so difficult, that it seems best to view them as an interpolation [human addition to the original text]. . . . Thus, in keeping with the textual questions, the exegesis of the text itself leads to the conclusion that it is not authentic. If so, then it is certainly not binding on Christians. If not, the considerable doubts as to its authenticity ought to serve as a caution against using it as an eternal prohibition (*First Corinthians*, 708).

The very respected, although Pentecostal NT scholar devotes no less than 10 pages to this argument in his well regarded commentary on I Corinthians. Let it first be said that Dr. Fee is one of very, very few who has “considerable doubts as to its authenticity,” and his arguments are not worth pursuing here in detail. An important part of Dr. Fee’s exegesis relies on the assumption that the Apostle’s mention of female prophesying in 1 Corinthians 11:5 was allowed to happen in the public assembly. There is no need to assume this as the Apostle immediately addresses abuses of the Lord’s Supper which commonly occurred in homes. For further discussion see section 9.7.F.

A succinct answer to the textual issues is given by D. A. Carson, Douglas Moo, and Leon Morris who comment:

In I Corinthians, the view that 14:34-35 is a gloss [human addition to the inspired text] was very much a minority position, until Fee defended it in his recent commentary. Fee’s stature as a textual critic has served to make this view more acceptable. The fact remains that although some [manuscripts] place verses 34-25 after verse 40, not one [manuscript] omits it; and despite Fee, convincing reasons can be given not only as to why a minority of [manuscripts]

transposed this passage to the end of verse 40, but also as to how it should be understood within the context [of I Cor 14]". (*Introduction to the New Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1992], 283; cf. Thiselton, 1148-50 and D. A. Carson in *Recovering Biblical Manhood & Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, John Piper and Wayne Grudem, eds. [Crossway, 1991], 140-53).

¹⁵ Merrill F. Unger, *NT Teaching on Tongues* (Kregel, 1971), 128

¹⁶ For further discussion of the demonic nature of modern *glossaism* see section 12.14.D.

¹⁷ *New Bible Dictionary*, J. I. Packer *et al.* eds., 3rd ed., (Intervarsity, 1996), 225-226. However, it is suggested that the Apostle probably was not describing an actual "ecstatically-produced blasphemy" in 1 Cor 12:3. Again, it is suggested that the Apostle's concern is obscure utterances of which the content is unknown. He simply wants the Corinthians to recognize that such a thing could happen and that not every spiritual looking manifestation is holy.

¹⁸ *Encyclopedia of Religion*, Mircea Eliade ed., 16 vols., (Macmillan, 1987), Vol. 5, 562-563.

¹⁹ Packer, *Spirit*, 207.