

I CORINTHIANS 14:14, 15
"PRAYING WITH THE SPIRIT"

A Critical Monograph
Presented to
the Faculty of
Grace Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of
the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Divinity

by
Donald P. Shoemaker

May, 1969

LIBRARY
GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
WINONA LAKE, INDIANA

PREFACE

This examination into the nature and purpose of the gift of tongues as well as into some of the practical conclusions which the Apostle Paul draws from the verses to be considered has been an interesting and intriguing experience for the writer. Not only has greater insight into the true nature of the gift of tongues been attained, but also a welcome, unexpected knowledge of the psychological importance of the Biblical designations "spirit," "heart," and "mind" as they relate to Christian experience.

Appreciative acknowledgment is given to Dr. James Boyer for his helpful suggestions and observations during the period of research for this paper.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

| | |
|--|----|
| THE GREEK TEXT..... | 1 |
| TEXTUAL VARIATIONS..... | 2 |
| ENGLISH VERSIONS..... | 5 |
| INTRODUCTION..... | 8 |
| The City and Church of Corinth..... | 11 |
| The Relationship of the Tongues Problem to other Problems in the Book..... | 15 |
| Scope of this Study..... | 18 |
| The Immediate Context..... | 20 |
| MINOR PROBLEM: | |
| WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "MY SPIRIT PRAYETH"?..... | 24 |
| "Higher Intellectual Powers" View..... | 26 |
| "Feelings" Interpretation..... | 27 |
| The "Mind" Interpretation..... | 28 |
| The "Spiritual Gift" Interpretation..... | 30 |
| The "Holy Spirit" Interpretation..... | 32 |
| Explanation of the position | |
| Implications of the position | |
| Refutation of the position | |
| The "Human Spirit" Interpretation..... | 39 |
| Explanation of the position | |
| Proof for the "Human Spirit" position | |
| Perversion of the "Human Spirit" Interpretation | |
| MINOR PROBLEM: | |
| WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS, "MY UNDERSTANDING IS UNFRUITFUL"?..... | 48 |
| The Quiescent Interpretation..... | 50 |
| The "Passive" Interpretation..... | 52 |
| The "Active" Interpretation..... | 54 |
| The Writer's Interpretation..... | 56 |
| Proof of this position | |
| Observations on this position | |
| THE IMPORTANCE OF THE "MIND" AND "HEART" IN SCRIPTURE | 63 |
| Introduction..... | 64 |
| The "Spirit" and the "Mind" defined..... | 66 |
| The use of "Mind" in Scripture..... | 70 |
| The Biblical relationship of mind and heart | 72 |
| The use of "Heart" in Scripture..... | 76 |
| Summary..... | 78 |

| | |
|--|----|
| MAJOR PROBLEM: | |
| HOW SHOULD PAUL'S RESOLUTION IN | |
| VERSE FIFTEEN BE UNDERSTOOD? | |
| "I WILL PRAY WITH THE SPIRIT AND I WILL PRAY WITH THE MIND ALSO"..... | 79 |
| The "Two Prayer" Interpretation..... | 81 |
| Explanation | |
| Refutation | |
| The "Tongues-Interpretation" Position..... | 84 |
| Explanation | |
| Refutation | |
| The "One Prayer" Interpretation..... | 87 |
| SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION..... | 92 |
| ENGLISH PARAPHRASE (I Corinthians 14:12-15)..... | 95 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY..... | 98 |

12 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ ζηλωταὶ
 ἔστε πνευμάτων, πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν
 τῆς ἐκκλησίας ζητεῖτε ἵνα περισσεύητε.
 13 διὸ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσση προσεύχεται
 ἵνα διερμηνεύῃ. 14 εἰάν [γὰρ] προσεύ-
 χωμαι γλώσση, τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσ-
 εύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου ἄκαρπος
 ἔστιν. 15 τί οὖν ἔστιν; προσεύξομαι
 τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ
 νοί. ψαλῶ τῷ πνεύματι, ψαλῶ δὲ
 καὶ τῷ νοί.

TEXTUAL VARIATIONS

The American Bible Society text of 1958 notes that some texts omit $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ at the beginning of the fourteenth verse. The most significant omissions occur in papyrus 46 and in Codex Vaticanus (B). The compilers of the United Bible Society text (1966) do not regard this omission as significant, inasmuch as they omit it from the critical apparatus. The inclusion of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ gives continuity to the context and draws a close relationship between the thirteenth and fourteenth verses.

The critical apparatus of the 1958 text also lengthens the omicron in the suffix of $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, thereby making it a subjunctive and the translation: "If I pray (or, Let me pray) in spirit, and I will pray also with understanding." The subjunctive reading occurs in Aleph, A, D, and G. It is significant, however, that the subjunctive variant occurs only in place of $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ and not in place of $\psi\alpha\lambda\omega$ in the last part of the verse. Perhaps a scribal "error of the ear" occurred when an omega was recorded instead of a omicron. Harrison defines this error thus: "As one scribe took dictation from another, one word [in this instance, "letter"] closely resembling another was often substituted for the one actually spoken."¹ He notes the confusion between short and long "o". This variant is also omitted from the text of 1966. Concerning this variant,

¹Everett F. Harrison, Introduction to the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964), p. 81.

Edwards states, that the "future indicative yields a meaning so much more satisfactory that προσέξομαι must be accepted."²

²Thomas Charles Edwards, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886), p. 366.

King James Version; New Scofield Reference Bible

For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it 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.

The Twentieth Century New Testament

If, when praying, I use the gift of "tongues," my spirit indeed prays, but my mind is a blank. What, then, is my conclusion? Simply this--I will pray with my spirit, but with my mind as well; I will sing with my spirit, but with my mind as well.

Revised Standard Version

For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful. What is it 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.

New English Bible

If I use such language in my prayer, the Spirit in me prays but my intellect lies fallow. What then? I will pray as I am inspired to pray, but I will also pray intelligently. I will sing hymns as I am inspired to sing, but I will sing intelligently too.

Phillips

If I pray in a "tongue" my spirit is praying, but my mind is inactive. I am therefore determined to pray with my spirit and my mind, and if I sing I will sing with both spirit and mind.

The Amplified New Testament

For if I pray in a [unknown] tongue, my spirit [by the Holy Spirit within me] prays, but my mind is unproductive --bears no fruit and helps nobody. Then what am I to do? I will pray with my spirit--by the Holy Spirit that is within me; but I will also pray intelligently--with my mind and understanding; I will sing with my spirit--by the Holy Spirit that is within me; but I will sing (intelligently) with my mind and understanding also.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been a great renewal in interest in the nature and purpose of the gift of tongues. Unfortunately, most of this interest has been in the experiential and empirical realms and not in the theological. Thus, many deductions drawn from these investigations must be suspect. What has been claimed as an experience may not be able, in the final analysis, to be substantiated by Scripture.

In the light of this recent interest and in view of some of the claims and teachings being presented by the Pentecostal Movement, it is the purpose of this paper to examine one aspect of the gift of tongues as taught by Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians. This aspect is "Praying in the Spirit" (I Corinthians 14:14, 15).

The problems to be contended with are three:

1. What does the Apostle have in view when he states, "My spirit prayeth"?
2. What is the nature of the "unfruitful" mind?
3. How should Paul's resolution in verse fifteen be understood?

As the writer indulged himself in this study, it soon became apparent that some research into Biblical psychology would be necessary to determine the Pauline usage of "spirit" and "understanding" in this text. Therefore, it is essential that a presentation of the findings of this research be presented also.

Essential background information will be presented in

relation to the problem text. This will consist of a brief discussion of the city of Corinth and the church established there, the relationship of the problems surrounding the gift of tongues to other problems in this epistle, and a general inquiry into the gift of tongues, itself.

It should be emphasized that this paper will concentrate primarily upon the nature of the gift of tongues as developed by Paul in the verses under consideration. The purpose of "tongues" will be discussed in so far as it relates to the discussion at hand. The cessation of the gift of tongues is not under consideration by Paul at all in chapter fourteen, and therefore will in no wise enter this discussion.

THE CITY AND CHURCH OF CORINTH

The city of Corinth, a cultural-social center of the ancient world, or "the cesspool of Greece,"³ depending on one's bias, was the destination of Paul's letter in which are the verses to be considered.

The original, luxury-loving city was destroyed in 146 B.C. by Roman armies, but the strategic geographical location inevitably was to give rise to another city. The new city had been founded just a century later by Julius Caesar and had developed rapidly.⁴ Soon Corinth was famous again for its athletic events, its commerce, its intellectuality, and its immorality.

The commercial greatness of Corinth lay in its unique location--occupying the tiny neck of land which separated inlets from the Aegean Sea on the East and the Adriatic Sea on the West. Seamen, hesitant to venture on the open sea and undesirous to circumvent the Peloponnesus, would dock at the end of the inlet, transfer their goods across the narrow isthmus, and sail from the other inlet. These

³Bruce Manning Metzger, The New Testament, its background, growth, and content (New York: Abingdon Press, 1965), p. 208.

⁴Edgar J. Goodspeed, An Introduction to the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), p. 39, (adapted).

transfers became so refined that some boats could even be moved via wooden rails from one inlet to the other.

Though never attaining to the stature of Athens in intellectualism (Acts 17:21), Corinth came to pride itself in its learning. Evidently the "wisdom of man" was at the heart of the schismatic tendencies counteracted by Paul in chapters one through four of First Corinthians.

The reputation of Corinth was primarily a reputation for immorality. A thousand sacred prostitutes were connected with the worship of Aphrodite, the goddess of fertility, whose temple lay south of the city. Thus, the religious life and moral life of the city were inseparable. Concerning this reputation, Metzger writes,

This city, with a population of half a million persons, was notorious for its profligacy. The worship of fertility goddesses flourished in the most voluptuous and sensual forms, making Corinth a notorious center of immorality. Indeed, its reputation was so bad that the expression "to live like a Corinthian" meant to live an utterly dissolute life.⁵

In the midst of this environment a church was founded by the Apostle Paul on his second missionary journey (Acts 18). The church also had the benefit of the ministry of Apollos.

Concerning the influence of Corinthian immorality on the church itself, one writer notes, "All of this had its inevitable reflection on the life of the church, to which

⁵ Metzger, op. cit., p. 205.

this epistle was addressed."⁶

As to the problems arising from the constituency of this church (I Corinthians 12:2) Tenney observes,

Since it was largely composed of Gentiles who had no training on the Old Testament scriptures, and whose religious and moral antecedents were the exact opposite of Christian principle, much teaching was required to bring them up to the place of spiritual maturity (I Corinthians 3:1-3).⁷

The manifestations of spiritual gifts in this congregation, especially the gift of tongues, was obviously not exempt from distortion. Much teaching was required in this area, also.

The writer was able to find no ground for the contention that the "tongues" of I Corinthians 14 were, in part, reproductions of heathen tongues connected with pagan worship in Corinth. Noting the worship of Aphrodite in Corinth, Richard DeHaan asserts, "The depraved worship in her honor featured among other things ecstatic speaking in tongues."⁸ He therefore contends that, since the church was too immature to bear this "stark naked truth" Paul tried to subdue the gift by suggesting that they do it in private. He thereby hoped that they would cease from it altogether, once the opportunity for public display was

⁶George A. Hadjiantoniou, New Testament Introduction (Chicago: Moody Press, 1957), p. 194.

⁷Merrill C. Tenney, The New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 308.

⁸Richard W. DeHaan, Speaking in Tongues (Grand Rapids: Radio Bible Class, 1967), p. 19.

gone. By the time the second letter was written, "tongues" had ceased in Corinth, for Paul does not mention them.⁹

It is doubtful that "heathen tongues" in the city of Corinth can be proven. It is highly doubtful, if such a demonic evil did exist in the church, that Paul would use some form of underhanded psychology rather than the "stark naked truth."

⁹DeHaan, op. cit., (See pp. 18-20, 29 for his arguments).

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE TONGUES PROBLEM
TO OTHER PROBLEMS IN THE BOOK

The key word in the First Epistle to the Corinthians is "problems." As James L. Boyer outlines the book, these problems fall into three categories:

- I. Problem communicated by Personal Report:
Contentions. Chapters 1-4
- II. Problems Communicated by Common Rumor.
Chapters 5, 6
- III. Problems Communicated by Official Letter.
Chapters 7-16
 1. Regarding marriage. Chapter 7
 2. Regarding meat offered to idols. Chapters 8-10
 3. Regarding church order. Chapter 11
 4. Regarding spiritual gifts. Chapters 12-14
 5. Regarding the resurrection. Chapter 15
 6. Regarding the collection. Chapter 16¹⁰

At the heart of these problems lay personal pride and a desire for self-exaltation. For example, Paul notes that even in the midst of gross immorality the church was "puffed up, and did not rather mourn" (5:2). Evidently, they were so engrossed in intellectual pride and wisdom of men that this immorality was ignored.

The same was true in regard to spiritual gifts. Because of their carnal natures, the Corinthians had made the gift

¹⁰James L. Boyer, An Exposition of I Corinthians, unpublished classnotes (Winona Lake: Grace Theological Seminary), p. 4.

of tongues a symbol of status and probably looked down on those who did not exercise this gift, as do most of their modern counterparts today. Paul had to counteract this spirit by noting that (a) these gifts are sovereignly bestowed (12:11), (b) even "those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary" (12:22), and (c) the gift of tongues cannot be possessed by all (12:30).

The unworthy motives in the exercise of this gift "interfered with the exercise of spiritualized mental endowments; and their exhibition was unedifying."¹¹ The gift of tongues "was overrated by its possessors and used for ostentation, because it excited wonder in the hearers."¹²

Not only did the church err in the motive for the exercise of this gift, but their desire for personal gratification led to error in the methods by which the gift was exercised. Instead of using his gift for the benefit of all, the one who possessed this gift sought only to gain personal benefit. Goodspeed summarizes well the conditions which resulted,

This familiar religious phenomenon . . . was disturbing the Corinthian meetings and giving the brothers great concern. There is always something infectious about it, and when one brother under great religious excitement broke out into an unintelligible babble, others were almost sure to follow his example. The result was bedlam; a stranger coming in would have said that they were mad.¹³

¹¹Samuel Davidson, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1868), p. 52.

¹²Ibid., p. 52.

¹³Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 46.

Paul met this situation by pointing out that although there was personal edification from the gift of tongues solely (14:4), such an exercise in the church was wrong in that the others were not edified. Paul encourages mutual edification by noting (a) the superiority of prophesying, and (b) the need for interpretation of the tongue. Even though Paul, himself, possessed this gift, he avoided using it in the church, preferring even to speak "five words" with his understanding, that he might "instruct others also" (14:19).

In his discussion of the Corinthian Church, John Thom gives an excellent evaluation of the relationship of this problem to others dealt with in this epistle:

The image conveyed to us by this First Epistle to the Corinthians is that of a community in which the first stirrings of a higher life combined with the unsubjected passions of common men,--and the personal distinctions conferred for the Gospel's sake, instead of tending to the destruction of the ambition, spiritual pride, and vainglory of our lower nature, were rather seized upon as especial instruments for their gratification. The various gifts of God's spirit are disposed in rival attitudes, and discussed in their relation to the glory of the individual.¹⁴

¹⁴John Hamilton Thom, St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians (Boston: Crosby, Nichols, and Company, 1852), p. 207.

SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

Pentecostalist traditionally have distinguished sharply between the "tongues" which initially evidence the "baptism of the Holy Spirit" and the "gift of tongues" which a believer may or may not possess. Nichol states this view plainly: "To summarize, a person who is baptized with the Holy Spirit will always signify this by speaking tongues; thereafter, he may never so speak again . . ."¹⁵

Recently, however, a far greater emphasis has been placed on the vital part that "post-baptism tongues" should have in the spiritual life and development of the believer. This is often done in gross violation of Paul's statement in I Corinthians 12:30 that not every believer has this gift. Or, an artificial distinction is made between "tongues" in the assembly--to which the rhetorical question of I Corinthians 12:30 would apply, and "devotional tongues"--exercise of which should be the universal privilege of all believers.

Discussing the nature of tongues, Brumback states:

¹⁵John Thomas Nichol, Pentecostalism (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), p. 13.

The gift of tongues is twofold in its operation: devotional and congregational. The devotional or private phase of the gift attracts less attention than the more spectacular congregational or public phase, but it is none the less important. There are few spiritual exercises more edifying to the individual believer than this miraculous form of communion with God, and it is our earnest hope as we examine its nature and distribution that every glossolalic believer will re-echo Paul's exultant words, "I thank my God, I speak with tongues . . .," and that all others will covet this gift for themselves.¹⁶

The recent emphasis has centered primarily on the devotional aspect of this "gift," and proof for its justification comes primarily from I Corinthians 14:15. Commenting on the supposed benefits derived from this devotional exercise, S. Lewis Johnson writes,

Clergy, as well as laity, are speaking of "a new dimension in life," "a definite enrichment in spiritual life," or "an added, and rewarding method by which to praise and pray."¹⁷

Therefore, this paper endeavors, in dealing with the salient problems of I Corinthian 14:14, 15, to answer contentions concerning both the justification of this practice and the supposed benefits derived therefrom.

¹⁶ Carl Brumback, What Meaneth This? (Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1947), p. 291.

¹⁷ S. Lewis Johnson, "A Symposium on the Tongues Movement," Bibliotheca Sacra, Vol. 120, No. 479 (July-September, 1963), p. 225.

THE IMMEDIATE CONTEXT

The Apostle Paul has just evaluated the attitude of the Corinthian Church in relation to the gift of tongues. He has concluded that they are "zealous of spiritual [gifts]." (verse 12). He now tries to direct this zeal properly. Acknowledging it ("So also ye, since ye are zealous"), he directs it for the good of the congregation ("seek that ye may abound unto the edifying of the church").

Paul then immediately tells them how their zeal should manifest itself, and how they can edify the church. "Wherefore let him that speaketh in a tongue pray that he may interpret" (verse 13). The use of $\delta\iota\omicron$ which is the "strongest inferential conjunction"¹⁸ according to Dana and Mantey, carries the thought of "for this reason," or, "on which account." Thus Paul states that, for the reason that one should be zealous to edify the church, he should pray that he may interpret the tongue.

The phrase "that he may interpret" could be a problem in itself. It can be taken to mean, "Let him pray for the ability to interpret." Or, "Let him utter a tongue that is capable of interpretation."

¹⁸H. E. Dana and Julius R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1955), p. 245.

The former seems the most natural. This chapter knows nothing of a distinction between interpretable and non-interpretable tongues. Lenski states,

What Paul urges upon those who are zealous for gifts is that, if they have the gift of tongues, they also pray for the gift of interpreting whatever they may be given to speak with a tongue.¹⁹

Concerning the use of ἵνα διερχημεύη, Paul Fink states, "The hina is not telic, but rather is sub-final, denoting the content of the prayer. He is to pray for the ability to interpret."²⁰

Paul continues by explaining the reason why a glossolalic should strive to interpret. The purpose for interpretation is discussed in verse twelve, the reason is in verse fourteen: "For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful."

At this point the inclusion of γὰρ at the beginning of verse fourteen becomes evident. Concerning this conjunction, the Expositor's Greek Testament writes, "If genuine, it attaches this verse to verse 13, as giving a further reason why the γλωσσολαλῶν should desire to interpret--viz., that his own mind may partake fruitfully in his prayers."²¹

¹⁹R.C.H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's First & Second Epistles to the Corinthians (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1963), p. 590.

²⁰Paul R. Fink, A Commentary on First Corinthians 14:6-15, unpublished research paper (Dallas: Dallas Theological Seminary 1960), p. 15.

²¹G. G. Findlay, "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians," The Expositor's Greek New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1961), pp. 906, 907.

It appears that there are certain inherent deficiencies in the gift of tongues when it stands entirely by itself. In regards to others, it is utterly valueless. In regards to the speaker himself, the fourteenth verse suggests that, at best, it lacks something. Concerning this fourteenth verse, Hodge notes, "Though the general meaning of this verse is thus plain, it is the most difficult verse in the whole chapter."²²

In no way is the writer questioning the fact that the gift of tongues had some value. Nor does he approach those who seem to come very close to questioning the very wisdom of God in giving this gift in the first place. Nor does he think with Philip Newell that the Corinthian tongues were a degenerate form of the tongues in Acts.²³

However, the writer does feel that the gift is put into proper perspective in these verses. The proper understanding of the problems under consideration does just that. Anthony Hoekema gives what the writer feels is a very concise and accurate analysis of Paul's purpose in these immediate verses:

²² Charles Hodge, An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950), p.287.

²³ Philip R. Newell, Tongues of Confusion (Chicago: Moody Bible Institute, n.d.), p. 3.

. . . Paul is apparently combating the view of some of the Corinthians that worship while one's understanding is quiescent is to be preferred to worship that involves the full use of one's intellectual powers. There seem to have been those in Corinth who thought that one could somehow get closer to God and penetrate more deeply into the supernatural world by leaving his understanding in abeyance--which happened when one spoke in tongues--than by using his understanding.²⁴

This is certainly an excellent evaluation of the problem which existed. Especially can this be realized when one reads the following testimony:

Praying in tongues is an exercise more potent in its own mysterious realm than the mightiest praying with the understanding. Let us humbly [?] say that those not filled with the Spirit know nothing of these supernatural things.²⁵

To such an one Paul would doubtless add, "I speak with tongues more than you all, but . . ."

In establishing the proper perspective which Paul gives this gift, the paper now turns to the first minor problem.

²⁴Anthony A. Hoekema, What About Tongue-Speaking? (Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1966), p. 91.

²⁵Warren Litzman, Pentecostal Truths (Waxahachie, Texas: Litzman Pentecostal Campaigns, 1961), p. 42.

MINOR PROBLEMS

The purpose of the study of this problem is to determine the true meaning of "spirit." In various passages of his epistles, in the course of research, the writer has located six divergent significations, three of them being more worthy of greater consideration.

- A. When interpretations as to Paul's use of "spirit" are:
- 1. Higher intellectual powers.

MINOR PROBLEM:

WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS

"MY SPIRIT PRAYETH"?

- 2. the Holy Spirit.
- 3. the human spirit.

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS

The purpose of the study of this problem is to detect the Pauline usage of "spirit" in verse fourteen of this passage. In the course of research, the writer has isolated six divergent viewpoints, three of them minor, and three worthy of greater consideration.

- A. Minor interpretations as to Paul's use of "spirit."
 - 1. Higher intellectual powers.
 - 2. Feelings.
 - 3. the Mind.

- B. Major interpretations as to Paul's use of "spirit."
 - 1. Spiritual gift.
 - 2. the Holy Spirit.
 - 3. the Human Spirit.

"Higher intellectual powers" view

Though he does not adhere to it, Charles Hodge presents and refutes this viewpoint. This view contends that Paul uses "spirit" to denote the higher intellectual powers of the soul. These powers are to be distinguished from the understanding per se. Hodge does not cite any commentators who would hold this view.

This view is refuted by observing that the ecstatic state in which the speaker existed during such an experience would forbid any expression of the "higher intellectual powers of the soul." The speaker evidently did not even know what he was saying. Furthermore, Scripture knows no difference between man's understanding and his reason, or higher intellectual powers.²⁶

²⁶Hodge, op. cit., p. 287.

"Feelings" Interpretation

This view is held by Albert Barnes and, again, stated and refuted by Charles Hodge. The interpretation contends that "spirit" is to be understood as the "seat of affections and emotions as contradistinguished from the understanding."²⁷

Barnes explains further what this condition would entail:

My feelings find utterance in prayer; my heart is engaged in devotion, my prayer will be acceptable to God, who looks upon the feelings of the heart; . . . but my understanding will be unfruitful, that is, will not profit others.²⁸

The weakness of this interpretation is its incompatibility with the movement of thought in the chapter. As Hodge notes, the view makes sense, but such a meaning for "spirit" is very rare. Hodge understands "spirit" to refer usually to the Holy Spirit. He notes further that nowhere in the discussion is "spirit" used to speak of one's feelings.²⁹

²⁷Albert Barnes, Notes on the New Testament, vol. 5 (London: Blackie and Son, n.d.), p. 265.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Hodge, op. cit., p. 287.

The "Mind" Interpretation

This is a rather novel interpretation which understands "spirit" to be representative of the "mind" of man.

In commenting on this verse, the Comprehensive Commentary states, "My mind prayeth (I understand what I am praying,) but my meaning (the meaning of my words) does not profit another."³⁰ This interpretation understands $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to refer to the meaning of the words.

Likewise, Benson comments, ". . . my spirit indeed prayeth--By the influence of the Spirit of God, I understand the words myself."³¹

This interpretation does not observe that "spirit," in Biblical psychology, is not used to denote the mind. A clearer understanding of these terms will be noted in a later section. Especially is this true when a term clearly understood as "mind" ($\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) is found in the same passage. It is also difficult to comprehend how one could understand the words being formulated in his own mind and yet not be able to make them clear to others. Furthermore, the

³⁰The Comprehensive Commentary on the Whole Bible, V (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1849), p. 305. (footnote).

³¹Joseph Benson, The New Testament of Our Lord & Savior Jesus Christ (New York: T. Carlton & J. Porter, n.d.), p. 193.

text suggests plainly that the speaker did not understand what he said.

Interpretation of the "Gift" Interpretation

This view suggests that when one is exercising the gift of tongues, he is exercising the particular spiritual gift which he possesses. Thus, "my spirit" is taken to mean "the gift which I possess."

Chrysostom was perhaps the earliest to record this opinion. He interpreted the "spirit" to be "the gift which is given me and move by tongues."³²

Charles Hodge, who also accepts this interpretation, says that when a man speaks in an unknown tongue, his spiritual gift is indeed exercised. In other words, the gift of tongues is active in him, but others are not profited. Others who express this view are John Calvin³³ and Henry.³⁴

While this view is much more plausible than others previously cited, there remain two primary objections to it.

³² Chrysostom, *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, trans. by the Christian Literature Co., 1897, p. 211.

³³ Hodge, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

³⁴ John Calvin, *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, trans. by the Christian Literature Co., 1897, p. 211.

³⁵ Henry, *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, trans. by the Christian Literature Co., 1897, p. 211.

The "Spiritual Gift" Interpretation

This view suggests that when one is exercising the gift of tongues, he is exercising the particular spiritual gift which he possesses. Thus, "my spirit" is taken to mean "the gift which I possess."

Chrysostom was perhaps the earliest to record this viewpoint. He interprets the "spirit" to be "the gift which is given me and moves my tongues."³²

Charles Hodge, who also accepts this interpretation, states that "when a man prays in an unknown tongue, his spiritual gift is indeed exercised; in other words, the Holy Spirit is active in him, but others are not profited."³³

Others who express this view are John Calvin,³⁴ and Matthew Henry.³⁵

While this view is much more plausible than others previously cited, there remain two primary objections to it.

³²Philip Schaff, ed., The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, XII (New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1889), p. 211.

³³Hodge, op. cit., p. 287.

³⁴John Calvin, Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948), p. 579.

³⁵Matthew Henry, Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible, VI (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., n.d.), p. 445.

Also, there exists nothing contextually that would recommend this interpretation.

First, while "my spirit" could reasonably be understood to be "my spiritual gift," this verse carefully sets "my spirit" in close relationship to "my understanding," and one would scarcely argue that "my understanding" is anything but "my own understanding," not some spiritual gift bestowed upon me.

Secondly, the vocabulary available to Paul and used by him in this context makes it highly unlikely that "spirit" should be taken here to mean "spiritual gift." Paul could have easily used $\piνευματικός$ rather than $\piνεῦμα$ had he desired to teach this. Therefore, the "spiritual gift" interpretation is not obtained from a natural reading of the text.

The "Holy Spirit" Interpretation

Explanation of the Position

This view contends that when Paul states "my spirit prayeth" he is speaking of the Holy Spirit in him. The spirit, therefore, is the Holy Spirit. This interpretation is held by many commentators. Also, a great many Pentecostalists contend for this view. The ramifications which they draw from their interpretation will be discussed shortly.

Riggs, a Pentecostalist, explains this view thus,

The Holy Spirit stands ready to take control of yielded vessels and pray through them as the Spirit of Supplications. No one knows better than He that for which we ought to pray. As we yield our thoughts and our tongues, He will pray through us according to the will of God. Romans 8:26, 27. When Paul commands that we pray always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, he meant pray in the Spirit.³⁶

Having quoted the verses in I Corinthians 14 which are under examination, he continues,

This particularly designates the gift of tongues as a ministry of prayer in the spirit. The Holy Spirit is so efficient and capable, by reason of the fact that He is God Himself and knoweth all things, that He is pre-eminently qualified to control and guide the prayer life of the believer.³⁷

³⁶Ralph M. Riggs, The Spirit Himself (Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1949), p. 180.

³⁷Ibid., p. 25.

Likewise, Dr. Henry Ness states, "Speaking with tongues is a means by which the Holy Spirit intercedes through us in prayer. (Romans 8:26; I Corinthians 14:14)"³⁸

Non-Pentecostalist commentators who accept this position, though certainly not all the gloss which Pentecostalists add to it, include Hermann Olshausen³⁹ (who cites Bleek and Maier as adherents to this view also), Adam Clarke,⁴⁰ Arthur Stanley,⁴¹ and the Seventh-Day Adventist Bible Commentary.⁴² In addition Godet cites Heinrich and Holsten as proponents of this interpretation.⁴³

³⁸Henry H. Ness, The Baptism With the Holy Spirit: What is it? (Hayward, California: Evangelism Crusaders, Inc., n.d.), p. 28.

³⁹Hermann Olshausen, Biblical Commentary on the New Testament, IV (New York: Sheldon & Company, 1861), p. 365.

⁴⁰Adam Clarke, Holy Bible Commentary & Critical Notes, VI (New York: Eaton and Mains, 1883), p. 151.

⁴¹Arthus Penrhyn Stanley, The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians (London: John Murray, 1876), p. 262.

⁴²The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, VI (Washington: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957), p. 789.

⁴³F. Godet, Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957), p. 278.

Implications of the Position

Having asserted that the prayer in tongues of I Corinthians 14:14 is a prayer in the Holy Spirit, Pentecostalists will draw, through other Scriptures, certain implications in an effort to point out how this experience should be a vital part of every believer's experience.

First, it is asserted that since Scripture states that praying in tongues is praying "in the spirit," therefore the converse must also be true, namely, praying "in the spirit" is praying in tongues. Thus, a prayer in tongues is identical with a prayer "in spirit." Oral Roberts asserts, "When one is praying 'in the Spirit,' he is praying or speaking in tongues."⁴⁴

This is a blatant display of faulty reasoning that even Philip Schaff falls into: "Paul uses also the phrase to 'pray with the tongue' (προσέθεσθαι γλωσσῶν), as equivalent to 'praying and singing with the spirit.'"⁴⁵ Such a position forgets that proving that a prayer in tongues is a prayer "in spirit" does not necessarily prove that a prayer "in spirit" is a prayer in tongues. This would be the same as saying, "Because horses are animals, animals are horses." The former is stated by Scripture, the latter is a

⁴⁴ Oral Roberts, The Baptism With the Holy Spirit and the Value of Speaking in Tongues Today (Tulsa: Oral Roberts, 1964), p. 23.

⁴⁵ Philip Schaff, History of the Christian Church, vol. I, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952), p. 235.

groundless inductive assertion. Praying in tongues is a mere portion of what can be involved in a prayer "in spirit." The two modes of prayer are not equivalent.

Having accepted this faulty reasoning, Pentecostalists make the following general deduction in their use of the "Holy Spirit" interpretation of I Corinthians 14:14.

1. Praying in tongues is praying in the spirit, and praying in the spirit is praying in tongues.
2. The Bible commands believers to pray in the Spirit.
3. Therefore, the Bible commands believers to pray in tongues.

To establish the truth of #2 the Pentecostalist will make an apparently correct interpretation of other Scriptures which either command or stress the importance of "praying in the (Holy) Spirit."⁴⁶

The two primary Scriptures referring to such a prayer are: Ephesians 6:18, "with all prayer and supplication praying at all seasons in the Spirit, and watching thereunto in all perseverance and supplication for all the saints."

Jude 20, "But ye, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit."

⁴⁶Viewpoint expressed by Dr. Hobart E. Freeman; Claypool, Indiana; December 1, 1968.

Concerning the Ephesians passage, Oral Roberts states,

When one is praying "in the Spirit," he is praying or speaking in tongues. Paul uses this term again in Ephesians 6:18, and refers to it as a part of the whole armor of God which the believer is to put on to help him stand successfully against all the wiles of the devil.⁴⁷

Therefore, to the Pentecostalist who takes the "Holy Spirit" interpretation of I Corinthians 14:14, praying in tongues is an essential element of putting on the "whole armor of God."

Commenting on the verse in the Book of Jude, Roberts again states, "There is the need in a group of believers for edification. Edification means to be strengthened and built up in the inner man. Jude refers to this . . ."⁴⁸

As to the benefit of such a prayer, Roberts states, Ephesians 6:18 inspired me to believe that as often as I prayed, which has always been very frequently, I should and could use my new tongue devotionally toward God. I too thank God for the richness and depth and dimension of this experience which is daily in my life. Christ who has been my very life over the years seems to have become even more real. It seems I love Him so much that sometimes my heart feels it will burst. There is more power in my ministry, more self-control, more eagerness and release. This is what makes it valid and valuable to me.⁴⁹

⁴⁷Roberts, op. cit., p. 23.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 54.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 37.

Refutation of this Position

Later the entire concept that one can experience the acme of spiritual reality while in the psychological state of tongue-speaking will be disproven. It remains at this point to observe the weaknesses of the "Holy Spirit" interpretation. To do this is to demolish the implications that have been built upon this interpretation.

The weakness of this view will be seen more readily when the strengths of the writer's interpretation are brought to light. Some observations can be made now, however.

The fact that the definite article occurs in this passage (τὸ πνεῦμα) does not necessarily establish the certainty of this interpretation. Vine states,

The use or absence of the article in the original where the Holy Spirit is spoken of cannot always be decided by grammatical rules, nor can the presence or absence of the article alone determine whether the reference is to the Holy Spirit.⁵⁰

The strongest argument against this interpretation is, once again, the fact that "my spirit" is set in comparison with "my understanding." Since "my understanding" is obviously "my (own) understanding," the most natural

⁵⁰W. E. Vine, An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words (Westwood: Fleming H. Revell, 1966), p. 63.

reading of "my spirit" would be "my (own) spirit." On the significance of this proof, F. W. Grosheide states, "The fact that Paul speaks of his understanding as opposed to his spirit forbids us to think here of the person of the Holy Spirit."⁵¹

⁵¹F. W. Grosheide, Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 325.

The "Human Spirit" Interpretation

The writer has accepted the position that the "spirit" spoken of in I Corinthians 14:14 is the "human spirit." This view does not exclude the Holy Spirit, for, as Edwards states, this view holds that the verse speaks of man's own spirit "in so far as he is under influence of the Spirit of God."⁵² It does insist, though, that $\piνεμα$ is a reference to the human spirit.

The comment by Lenski exemplifies this position: "The possessives 'My spirit' and 'my understanding' are identical. 'My spirit' is my own spirit, the immaterial part of my being in which my ego centers, which is able to receive impressions from God."⁵³

This position is held also by Vincent,⁵⁴ Godet,⁵⁵

⁵²Edwards, op. cit., p. 365.

⁵³Lenski, op. cit., p. 591.

⁵⁴Marvin R. Vincent, Word Studies in the New Testament, III (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1965), p. 269.

⁵⁵Godet, op. cit., p. 278.

Meyer,⁵⁶ Weidner,⁵⁷ Delitzsch,⁵⁸ and Alford.⁵⁹

Besides these, there is a surprising number of Pentecostal writers who contend for this position in contrast to the many of their number who accept the "Holy Spirit" interpretation and all of its implications. In discussing the nature of "devotional tongues" Carl Brumback states that "all speaking with tongues belongs to the realm of the human spirit."⁶⁰ Donald Gee⁶¹ and Warren Litzman⁶² also accept this interpretation. Oral Roberts seems to accept it, but his statements which tie this verse in with Jude 20 make his position unclear.⁶³ There are significant implications which they draw from this position, however, and these will be considered shortly.

⁵⁶ Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1890), p. 321.

⁵⁷ Franklin Weidner, The Doctrine of Man (Chicago: Wartburg Publishing House, 1912), p. 45.

⁵⁸ Franz Delitzsch, A System of Biblical Psychology (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966), p. 217.

⁵⁹ Henry Alford, The Greek Testament, I (Chicago: Moody Press, 1958), p. 593.

⁶⁰ Brumback, op. cit., p. 291.

⁶¹ Donald Gee, Concerning Spiritual Gifts (Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.), p. 58.

⁶² Litzman, op. cit., pp. 21, 24.

⁶³ Roberts, op. cit., pp. 23, 54.

Proof for the "Human Spirit" Position

A. The Nature of the Gift of Tongues

When the Scripture speaks of the exercise of this gift a key is often given as to its nature. Paul states in I Corinthians 14:14 that, when one speaks in a tongue, "τὸ πνεῦμά μου prayeth." In other words, the "spirit" of verse fourteen is the actual entity uttering the prayer. If this spirit is the Holy Spirit, then the Holy Spirit, within the believer, speaks in a tongue. If this is the human spirit, then the human spirit speaks in a tongue. The question may therefore be asked, "Does Scripture elsewhere suggest exactly what entity it is that speaks in a tongue?"

Acts 2:4

"And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Acts 10:46

"For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God."

Acts 19:6

". . . and they spake with tongues, and prophesied."

I Corinthians 14:2

"For he that speaketh in a tongue. . ."
(cf. also: vv. 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 18, 27) [emphasis mine]

Two things become evident from these passages. First, the Holy Spirit is never mentioned as the entity which speaks in a tongue. Secondly, speaking in a tongue is always closely connected with the personality of the one who exercises this gift, so much so that those who exercise it

are responsible for their conduct. The gift is never depersonalized.

Therefore, the nature of the gift of tongues argues that the spirit of the individual, not the Holy Spirit, is the entity which prays. Gee states correctly,

The Holy Spirit evidently inspired the human spirit for this sacred exercise. It is incorrect and misleading to talk of "the Holy Spirit speaking in tongues" unless we are careful to understand that thereby we strictly mean that He is the divine Inspirer of the utterance that comes through human lips, and from the depths of the human spirit.⁶⁴

B. The Personal Pronoun

An examination of passages where this phrase (*πνεῦμά μου*) or similar phrases occur will reveal the fact that such a construction suggests that one's own spirit is intended, whether it be God's or man's.

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Mark 8:12 | "he sighed deeply in his spirit." |
| Luke 1:47 | "my spirit hath rejoiced" |
| Luke 23:46 | "I commend my spirit" |
| Acts 2:18 | "I will pour out of my spirit" |
| Acts 7:59 | "Receive my spirit" |
| Romans 1:9 | "whom I serve with my spirit" |
| I Corinthians 5:4 | "ye being gathered together, and my spirit." |
| I Corinthians 16:18 | "they have refreshed my spirit" |
| II Corinthians 7:13 | "his spirit was refreshed" |
| I Thessalonians 5:23 | "your whole spirit" |
| II Timothy 4:22 | "The Lord be with thy spirit" (cf. Philemon 25) |

⁶⁴Gee, op. cit., p. 58.

These usages should certainly provide supporting evidence for the "human spirit" interpretation, although the writer does not regard them as conclusive. The pattern is clear, the phrase $\piνεῦμά μου$ suggests that the human spirit is in view.

If Paul wished to mean "the spirit which is in me" (cf. Olshausen⁶⁵) he could have said " $\tauὸ πνεῦμά μου$ " rather than " $\tauὸ πνεῦμά μου$," especially in a statement including " $νοῦς μου$."

Hodge objects to this interpretation on the basis of verse 32. He states, "The spirits of the prophets means the Holy Ghost as manifested in the prophets, or the spiritual influence of which they were the subjects."⁶⁶ Therefore, he would contend, "my spirit" (v. 14) is the spiritual influence on me (cf. his acceptance of the "spiritual gift" interpretation).

Pertinent comments are here in order. First, the construction is different (v. 32: $\piνεύματα προφητῶν$). This is inconclusive, but it cannot be made conclusive either that the "spirits of the prophets" are not their own spirits, especially since these spirits were subject to them. Finally, verse 32 is dissimilar to verse 14, where the play on personal pronouns is so important.

⁶⁵Olshausen, op. cit., p. 365.

⁶⁶Hodge, op. cit., p. 289.

C. The Psychological Terms of this Verse.

As has been alluded throughout this paper, Paul very carefully compares $\piνεῦμα μου$ and $νοῦς μου$ in this verse. They are placed on an equal psychological plane. When the problem of verse fifteen has been dealt with, it will be seen that Paul pulls these two terms very closely together, thus preventing us from separating them so harshly in this verse as the "Holy Spirit" interpretation does. The statement by Grosheide is again pertinent: "The fact that Paul speaks of his understanding as opposed to his spirit forbids us to think here of the person of the Holy Spirit."⁶⁷

⁶⁷Grosheide, op. cit., p. 325.

Perversion of the "Human Spirit" Interpretation

The general acceptance of the "human spirit" view by many Pentecostals is not without its implications. By refusing the "Holy Spirit" view they divorce themselves from the "benefit" of passages such as Ephesians 6:18 and Jude 20, but through their understanding of the nature of the human spirit they contend for the extreme value of prayer in a tongue. Once again, they also accept the faulty logic that prayer "in the (human) spirit" is equivalent to prayer in a tongue.

Some commentators, though holding the correct understanding of this problem misunderstand the nature of the human spirit. As will be seen, the spirit is the God-conscious, immaterial part of man. It does not become established consequently, however, that the spirit should be relegated to a higher plane and the mind be relegated to some position of relative inferiority. Alford takes this position in explaining verse fourteen: "My higher being . . . filled with the Holy Ghost, is enflamed with bold desires, and rapt in prayer . . ." ⁶⁸

Brumback echoes this view:

. . . our own nature is hidden to us, except through the agency of our spirit which transcends the perceiving qualities of even our intellect. Thus, in a sense, the spirit is the high priest of our

⁶⁸ Alford, op. cit., p. 594.

whole being, knowing the needs of every part and translating them in prayer unto God . . .⁶⁹

While Litzman believes that even believers without the gift of tongues can pray in the Holy Spirit (Jude 20, etc.), he insists that such a prayer cannot begin to compare with a prayer in the "human spirit," i.e. in "tongues."⁷⁰ Regarding prayer that is "merely" in the Holy Spirit, he states: "There are no terms in natural speech appropriate to the excellence of God. In supernatural speech alone we gain an utterance proportionate to our wondrous Lord and equal to our spirit's strong emotion."⁷¹

Again: "such prayer [in the Holy Spirit, but not in tongues] does not reach the realm of the supernatural directed exclusively by the Holy Spirit. (I Corinthians 14: 2). This means that the highest form of prayer is praying in tongues."⁷²

He stresses that being in such an ecstatic state is the only time a believer is "completely yielded."⁷³

⁶⁹Brumback, op. cit., p. 292.

⁷⁰Warren Litzman, Pentecostal Truths, op. cit., p. 41:

"You cannot pray with the spirit unless you speak with other tongues. You can pray in the Spirit with the understanding as in Ephesians 6:18, but such prayer does not reach the realm of mystery and miracle presided over and directed by the Holy Ghost."

⁷¹Ibid., p. 21.

⁷²Ibid., p. 24.

⁷³Ibid., p. 24.

He regards the substance of what is uttered to be greater than revelation itself.⁷⁴ No wonder he considers intercessory tongues to be the "greatest New Testament ministry."⁷⁵

Certain contradictory observations are in order.

1. The spirit is not superior to the mind. "Such a view renders the gift of tongues the most exalted of spiritual conditions."⁷⁶

2. A believer would automatically be less yielded, even in witnessing or Scripture-reading, if "tongues" is the only state of complete yieldedness.

3. The carnality of the Corinthians argues against Litzman.

4. The Bible commands us to pray in the Holy Spirit but never commands us to pray in tongues, yet the latter is supposedly better!

⁷⁴Ibid.

⁷⁵Ibid.

⁷⁶Edwards, op. cit., p. 365.

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS

The apostle Paul is explaining why interpretation of
... should be desired. When speaking in a tongue,
... well and good. The problem lay in
... that his spirit might be deceived. His
... was unfruitful.

This section endeavors to answer Paul's intended

MINOR PROBLEM:

WHAT DOES THE APOSTLE MEAN WHEN HE SAYS

"MY UNDERSTANDING IS UNFRUITFUL"?

The active view
... it is said at this juncture that, on the basis of
... the writer is convinced that all three positions
... Nevertheless, only one is intended in
... Because of the nature of this problem,
... for the correct textual view and reason for
... all three will be given at the end of the section.

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS

The Apostle Paul is explaining why interpretation of tongues should be desired. When speaking in a tongue, his spirit prayed--well and good. The problem lay in the fact that his spirit only was benefited. His $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (mind, understanding) was $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$, barren, unfruitful.

This section endeavors to uncover Paul's intended meaning in the use of $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$. There are three interpretations of this problem:

1. The Quiescent View
2. The Passive View
3. The Active View

Let it be said at this juncture that, on the basis of his study, the writer is convinced that all three positions are correct. Nevertheless, only one is inherent in $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$. Because of the nature of this problem, proofs for the correct textual view and reasons for accepting all three will be given at the end of the section.

The Quiescent Interpretation

In the knowledge of this writer, the quiescent view is held universally by Pentecostals. Unfortunately, their theology in this area is about as $\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$ as the problem itself, being founded upon fanciful experience rather than exegesis.

Litzman contends,

Through complete yieldedness the Holy Spirit takes the place of the mind. The mind becomes quiescent, which means motionless, quite [sic] and a state between being asleep and dead. With the mind so yielded to God, the Holy Spirit comes and occupies and does the work of the mind.⁷⁷

On this psychological condition Oral Roberts comments,

When we pray we sometimes reach a place in our minds where we cannot express what is in our spirits, what is in our total inner man. We have to bypass our mind and make it inactive for the moment. The mind slips into the background during the moments we are praying in tongues and remains in a state of neutrality.⁷⁸

Donald Gee also accepts this view.⁷⁹

This view is also held by a minority of non-pentecostalist commentators. Paul R. Fink expresses it thus: "That is to say that the speaker's conscious reasoning processes do not

⁷⁷ Warren Litzman, The Ministry of Tongues (Dallas: Litzman Pentecostal Campaigns, n.d.), p. 12.

⁷⁸ Roberts, op. cit., p. 42.

⁷⁹ Gee, op. cit., p. 58.

enter into that which is being uttered."⁸⁰ The Seventh-day Adventist Commentary states, "The conscious mind is largely if not entirely inoperative during the exercise of the gift, as in the case of a prophet in vision."⁸¹

Others holding this view are Hoekema,⁸² Meyer,⁸³ Gould,⁸⁴ and Ironside,⁸⁵ although the last is vague.

⁸⁰Fink, op. cit., p. 15.

⁸¹The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, op. cit., p. 789.

⁸²Hoekema, op. cit., p. 91.

⁸³Meyer, op. cit., p. 321.

⁸⁴E. P. Gould, "Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians," An American Commentary on the New Testament, V (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1887), p. 118.

⁸⁵H. A. Ironside, Addresses on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1935), p. 130.

The "Passive" Interpretation

This view, simply stated, contends that the mind of the speaker receives no benefit for itself. Lenski supports this view as follows:

But this activity of my "Spirit," although it is conscious enough, extends no farther; my *voûs* or "understanding" is inactive and thus *ἄκαρπος*, "barren," "unfruitful," producing no distinct thoughts (which is its ordinary function) and thus producing no reception of thoughts in other who hear my utterance, v. 2.⁸⁶

Robertson states, "My intellect gets no benefit from rhapsodical praying that may even move my spirit."⁸⁷

This view is held also by Calvin,⁸⁸ Chrysostom,⁸⁹ and F. F. Bruce.⁹⁰

Edwards opposes the passive interpretation, feeling that it is inconsistent with verse four ("He that speaketh in a tongue edifyeth himself"). He would doubt how a person could be edified if he does not understand what he is praying, his mind being unfruitful. This can be

⁸⁶Lenski, op. cit., p. 592.

⁸⁷Archibald Thomas Robertson, Word Pictures in the New Testament, IV (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1931), p. 183.

⁸⁸Calvin, op. cit., p. 446.

⁸⁹Philip Schaff, ed., The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, op. cit.

⁹⁰F. F. Bruce, The Letters of Paul (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965), p. 109.

explained quite easily. The edification produced by tongue-speaking (v. 4) arises from the subjective psychological benefit derived from the ecstatic nature of the experience itself.⁹¹ It is not an edification of the sort obtained objectively through, for example, a study of the Scriptures, which would require a mind that is productive (*κάρπος*).

⁹¹cf. Thom, op. cit., p. 201, who speaks concerning "the purely psychological relief to emotional tension such a practice may bring..."

The "Active" Interpretation

This position contends that the mind of the tongue-speaker is "unfruitful" because it is "producing no spiritual grace,"⁹² that is, "it is not understood by the hearers and consequently imparts no benefit."⁹³

Alford states this view as follows: ". . . my intellectual part, having no matter before it on which its powers can be exercised, bears no fruit to the edification of others."⁹⁴

This view is held by an evident plurality of commentators including Vincent,⁹⁵ Vine,⁹⁶ Godet,⁹⁷ Weiss,⁹⁸

⁹²Edwards, op. cit., p. 336.

⁹³The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, op. cit., p. 789.

⁹⁴Alford, op. cit., p. 594.

⁹⁵Vincent, op. cit., p. 269.

⁹⁶Vine, op. cit., p. 134.

⁹⁷Godet, op. cit., p. 280.

⁹⁸Bernhard Weiss, A Commentary on the New Testament, III (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1906), p. 245.

Binney,⁹⁹ Benson,¹⁰⁰ Makrakis,¹⁰¹ Hodge,¹⁰² Barnes,¹⁰³ Ellicott,¹⁰⁴ and Lange.¹⁰⁵ Matthew Henry seems to hold this interpretation although he is understandably weak in relation to this entire subject.¹⁰⁶

The active interpretation is also the position held by this writer, and will be established in the following section.

⁹⁹Amos Binney, The People's Commentary (New York: Nelson & Phillips, 1878), p. 467.

¹⁰⁰Benson, op. cit., p. 193.

¹⁰¹Apostolos Makrakis, Interpretation of the Entire New Testament, II (Chicago: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1950), p. 1488.

¹⁰²Hodge, op. cit., p. 288.

¹⁰³Barnes, op. cit., p. 265.

¹⁰⁴Charles John Ellicott, Commentary on the Whole Bible, IV (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1959), p. 342.

¹⁰⁵John Peter Lange, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, X (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1960), p. 287.

¹⁰⁶Henry, op. cit., p. 579.

The Writer's Interpretation

Proof of this Position

The writer has isolated two considerations which argue for the "active" interpretation of this problem.

First, the context of this statement by Paul argues for this position. Calvin opposes this position primarily, as this writer sees it, through a faulty understanding of the immediate situation: "For it does not appear that the mind is here said to be unfruitful, (ἀκαρπὸς ,) on the ground of no advantage accruing to the Church, inasmuch as Paul is here speaking of the private prayers of an individual."¹⁰⁷

The immediate context, however, emphasizes strongly that Paul is thinking primarily of tongue-speaking as it relates to the church as a whole. Note some of the verses in this chapter emphasizing this:

- 14:12 "So also ye, since ye are zealous of spiritual gifts, seek that ye may abound unto the edifying of the church.
- 14:19 "howbeit in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding."
- 14:23 "If therefore the whole church be assembled together and all speak with tongues . . ."
- 14:26 "When ye come together, each one . . . hath a tongue . . ."

¹⁰⁷Calvin, op. cit., p. 446

14:28 "but if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church."

14:34 "let the women keep silence in the churches:"
[emphasis mine]

One of the strongest verses which teach that the public assembly is intended is verse 16: "Else if thou bless with the spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the unlearned say the Amen at thy giving of thanks. . ." Paul is showing here that one blessing "in the spirit (only)" will not benefit the bystander who does not possess gifts which would enable him to understand what was said (cf. ASV margin).

McPheeters emphasizes correctly that the practical aim of Paul in this entire chapter is:

To maintain balance in public worship with due regard to order and decorum, and to be sensitive to the dynamic manifestations of the Holy Spirit. To discriminate between these movings of the Spirit which are primarily for private edification and those which essentially have to do with the edification of the congregation. To remember that the ultimate aim of all the Spirit's manifestations and gifts is the edification of the church.¹⁰⁸

Therefore, the fact that Paul is speaking of a meeting involving the church, not a private situation, suggests that he would use $\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$ in the sense of "produces no benefit for others."

Secondly, the usage of $\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$ in the New Testament argues for the "active" position. One should note

¹⁰⁸ Julian C. McPheeters, The Epistles to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964), p. 64.

especially the Pauline usage of this word.

- Matthew 13:22 "And he that was sown among the thorns, this is he that heareth the word; and the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful."
(cf. Mark 4:19)
- Ephesians 5:11 "and have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them."
- Titus 3:14 "And let our people also learn to maintain good works for necessary uses, that they be not unfruitful."
- II Peter 1:8 "For if these things are yours and abound, they make you to be not idle nor unfruitful unto the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In the Pauline passages especially it is evident that
^{2/} $\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$ cannot make sense if understood in the passive meaning. All of these verses most naturally read in accord with active sense.

Observations on this Position

The writer is convinced that Paul's statement, "my understanding is unfruitful" must be understood in the active sense. This is the correct textual view. However, he also feels that all three positions are probably correct. The writer's position may be stated thus:

A. The Bible states that one who speaks in a tongue produces no benefit for others (14:14).

B. This result occurs because, passively, the mind of the speaker is producing no thoughts for its own benefit.

Concerning this passive condition as it relates to the active, Edwards states that "ecstatic utterance can be of no avail for the edification of others apart from true thoughts."¹⁰⁹ Thus, the compatibility of the passive and active views is evident.

C. The reason that the mind is formulating no thoughts is because it is in a state of suspension, quiescence, neutrality.

It is difficult to explain how a mind could not produce thoughts and therefore be $\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$ as relates to others in any other way.

Edwards, while believing that $\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\varsigma$ must be

¹⁰⁹Edwards, op. cit., p. 366.

understood in the active sense, believes also that "the word implies the ecstatic character of the utterance with tongues."¹¹⁰

Gould shows how the quiescent view is related to the other two:

The man is not unconscious, since he himself is edified; nor is the mind wholly inactive; but that purely intellectual faculty by which the mind is turned upon itself and analyzes its own actions, and so is enabled to present clear and intelligible ideas to others, is dormant and unproductive.¹¹¹

From observations by Delitzsch concerning the nature of this condition, the interrelation of the quiescent, passive, and active interpretations can be seen:

The actuality of the self-consciousness is repressed by the divine influence, which absolutely takes possession of him who is speaking with the tongue: the activity of thought of the *vous*, bringing forth fruit in thoughts and words, benefiting itself and others without any further agency, ceases.¹¹²

Just because the mind is quiescent in such a psychological state, it does not follow that implications of the Pentecostal position are correct at this point. It is one thing for the mind to become quiescent as a direct result of exercising the gift of tongues. It is quite another thing to contend, as many Pentecostalists do, that one should intentionally let his mind lapse into a state of neutrality--this being

¹¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹¹Gould, op. cit., p. 118.

¹¹²Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 218.

relatively easy for some. Newell warns of the serious consequences of such a state:

Since human speech results from brain impulses in the process of conscious thought, utterance of words unknown to the speaker indicates supernatural control of the organs of speech, either divine or demonic. Those actually speaking in unknown tongues should solemnly ponder II Corinthians 11:14, 15.¹¹³

Perhaps the case for demonic influence in this area has been overstated, for it is significant that in the midst of all the Corinthian abuses of this gift Paul never once questions the genuineness of the gift, itself. Yet, it is also true that there is no mention of any false teaching at Corinth that would encourage people to "let themselves go."

When Oral Roberts encourages "seekers" to "bend their intellect," and bypass the mind, he is introducing a new and dangerous element into the entire area of tongue-speaking --an element entirely foreign to Scripture. He even speaks of times when Paul "had to quit talking in his own language and quit thinking in his own mind."¹¹⁴

Warren Litzman states in defense,

The believer need never fear of God permitting a wrong or harmful act to take place. (Luke 11:13) God always protects His own when they are engaged in a step of faith. It is the business of the believer to speak with tongues, it is God's business concerning what comes out.¹¹⁵

Such protection can scarcely be claimed, however, when

¹¹³Newell, op. cit., p. 3.

¹¹⁴Roberts, op. cit., pp. 39, 42.

¹¹⁵Litzman, op. cit., p. 15.

the believer willfully relinquishes contact with the "spirit of a sound mind" (II Timothy 1:7) which God has provided, and enters into a condition totally foreign to Scripture, which must always be our safeguard. The concept that the mental facilities are to be totally suppressed as one seeks for the gift of tongues must be repudiated. This is not the meaning of I Corinthians 14:14.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE "MIND" AND THE "HEART"
IN SCRIPTURE

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE "MIND" AND THE "HEART"

IN SCRIPTURE

Introduction

It has been established that (a) when one speaks in a tongue his own (human) spirit is actively engaged in prayer, and (b) his mind is not producing anything of benefit to others. The latter situation is due probably to the fact that the mind is itself in some sort of quiescent state, some sort of temporary suspension.

Now, it remains to be seen whether such a psychological state is to be as highly regarded and revered as Pentecostals would have one to think. Is the state of ecstatic experience and mental neutrality the acme of spiritual conditions? Is the mind so secondary to spiritual attainment that such attainment can be had without the active participation of the human intellect? In other words, what light does Scripture shed on the relationship of the intellect to spiritual growth and development?

As this discussion unfolds, one should be able to see that, rather than being on the sideline of spiritual development, the intellect of man is in the very center of attention. It should therefore be evident that teachings which encourage a state of mental abeyance are in error, and that the benefits of edification to be gained from such an experience, though not non-existent (cf. 14:4), are minimal.

at best.

This section will probe into psychological aspects of the human spirit, mind, and heart to establish the above assertions.

The Bible is not intended to function as a psychology textbook or dictionary. James's Dictionary of Theology notes that the "Hebrew and Christian views on the nature of the soul were developed in a religious setting; there is no organized or scientific psychology in the Bible."¹⁶

Other works on psychology, such as Feilich's classic, have proven themselves to be overly "flat" in their psychological distinctions. Especially since the rise of behaviorism has traditional psychological assumptions now seem inadequate. Nevertheless, a degree of proper understanding in this area is certainly possible.

One clear Biblical distinction does exist between the "spirit" and "mind" is evident from I Corinthians 14:14 where it has been seen that the spirit can pray at a time when the mind may not. The Primer Commentary notes the significance of the psychological distinction seen in this text.

At 14:15, Paul in the discussion 3rd Paul refers to the distinction between the spirit and the understanding. Such a distinction must be recognized by his argument can be based in the nature of the human mind, and, if there be no distinction in the laws of the mind for this difference between spirit and understanding, the operation of the Holy Spirit in the two forms under notice

¹⁶ James's Dictionary of Theology, pp. 211-12, 222.

The Spirit and the Mind Defined

The Bible is not intended to function as a psychological textbook or dictionary. Baker's Dictionary of Theology notes that the "Hebrew and Christian views on the nature of man were developed in a religious setting: there is no systemized or scientific psychology in the Bible."¹¹⁶

Older works on psychology, such as Delitzsch's classic, have proven themselves to be overly "pat" in their psychological distinctions. Especially since the rise of the behaviorists has traditional psychological assumptions been found inadequate. Nevertheless, a degree of proper understanding in this area is certainly possible.

That some Biblical distinction does exist between the "spirit" and "mind" is evident from I Corinthians 14:14 where it has been seen that the spirit can pray at a time when the mind may not. The Pulpit Commentary notes the significance of the psychological distinction made in this verse:

At this point in the discussion St. Paul refers to the distinction between the spirit and the understanding. Such a distinction must be recognized or his argument has no basis in the nature of the human mind, and, if there be no foundation in the laws of the mind for this difference between spirit and understanding, the operations of the Holy Spirit in the two forms under notice

¹¹⁶Harrison, op. cit., p. 262.

are inconceivable.¹¹⁷

Having seen the importance of a distinction between these two aspects of man, it may be asked, What is the spirit in man?

Delitzsch defines the Pauline concept of the "spirit" as "this region of immediate experience and intuition, the $\piνεῦμα$ as distinct from the $νοῦς$ of man."¹¹⁸

Fletcher gives a more precise religious role to the human spirit. "The highest function attributed to the human spirit by the writers of the New Testament is that of communion with God in the experiences of the religious life."¹¹⁹

Again, he writes,

While the human spirit in the natural man is . . . the faculty of rational self-consciousness, under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit it becomes the means whereby regenerate man attains unto full spiritual self-consciousness. Henceforth it is the organ of service rendered unto God (Romans 1:9, 7:6).¹²⁰

In relation to this problem passage he states, "In the worship of God it may transcend the powers of the understanding in the exercise of prayer and praise (I Corinthians 14:14, 15).¹²¹

¹¹⁷Canon H. D. M. Spence, "I Corinthians," The Pulpit Commentary (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., n.d.), p. 467.

¹¹⁸Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 218.

¹¹⁹M. Scott Fletcher, The Psychology of the New Testament (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.), p. 57.

¹²⁰Ibid., pp. 62, 63.

¹²¹Ibid., p. 63.

Thus, the frequent statement concerning the human spirit is probably accurate: It is the God-conscious part of man. Man, however, is a person, a unit, and therefore a sharp distinction should not be made between the "spirit" and the "mind." Neither should the spirit be elevated above the mind. Both Laidlaw¹²² and Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown¹²³ seem to err by making the human spirit the "highest element" or the "higher being" in man, thereby making "tongues" the highest form of prayer as Edwards so correctly cautioned against.¹²⁴

Instead, the spirit and mind should be judged to be interrelated, though not congruent. Canon Spence asks the question:

But is there an impassable gulf between the two? Certainly not; the spirit may cooperate with the understanding. Left to its own ecstatic freedom, the spirit may soar and shine, but the flight is in loneliness and the resplendency unwitnessed.¹²⁵

Laidlaw considers *νοῦς* to be "a convenient and appropriate term for highest natural faculty in man, moral and intellectual . . ." Furthermore, "it is contrasted with "spirit," when pneuma represents the inner man under

¹²²John Laidlaw, The Biblical Doctrine of Man (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1895), p. 125.

¹²³Robert Jamieson; A. R. Fausset; David Brown; A Commentary, Critical & Explanatory, on the Old & New Testaments, II (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.), p. 290.

¹²⁴Edwards, op. cit., p. 365.

¹²⁵Spence, op. cit., p. 467.

control of a spiritual or prophetic afflatus (I Corinthians xiv. 14, 15, 19).¹²⁶

The human mind, the "faculty of reflective intelligence which receives and is wrought upon by the Spirit,"¹²⁷ man's "discursive faculty,"¹²⁸ is the channel through which the God-conscious part of man receives his knowledge of God. "Religious feelings and activities . . . take their rise in the spirit; normally they pass upward into conception and expression through the intellect. It is the part of nous to share in and aid the exercises of pneuma."

Thus, from the standpoint of Biblical psychology, edification of the spirit apart from the active operation of the mind can be minimal at best. The unity of the human personality and the close relationship of the mind to the spirit in religious development both call for emphasis upon a spiritual process that edifies the entire person.

¹²⁶Laidlaw, op. cit., p. 125.

¹²⁷Vincent, op. cit., p. 82.

¹²⁸Findlay, op. cit., p. 907.

¹²⁹Ibid.

The Use of "Mind" in Scripture

There yet remains another avenue whereby the importance of an active mind in religious development can be seen. From the standpoint of Biblical usage, how great an emphasis does the Bible place upon the "mind" in spiritual awakening and nurture?

The term $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is used twenty-four times in the New Testament. It is translated "mind" seventeen times and "understanding" seven times.¹³⁰ Many of these occurrences are important for purposes of this study.

1. The "mind" is important for spiritual transformation:

Romans 12:2, "be transformed by the renewing of your mind." (Not by a quiescent mind)

Ephesians 4:23, "be renewed in the spirit of your mind."

2. For the understanding of prophecy, there is an appeal to the mind for wisdom.

Revelation 17:9, "and here is the mind which hath wisdom . . ." (cf. also Revelation 13:18)

3. False doctrine affects the mind.

¹³⁰Robert J. Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.), p. 81.

II Thessalonians 2:2, "That ye be not soon shaken in mind . . ."

4. The mind can become defiled and reprobate.

Romans 1:18, "God gave them over to a reprobate mind . . ." (cf. also I Timothy 6:5, II Timothy 3:8, Titus 1:15)

5. The mind is the source of moral decision.

Romans 14:5, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

6. Through the understanding men can comprehend the Scriptures.

Luke 24:45, "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures."

7. Exercise of understanding is preferred over speaking in tongues.

I Corinthians 14:19, "I had rather speak five words with my understanding . . . than ten thousand words in a tongue."

From these Scriptures the importance of the mind in spiritual experience and nurture is plain.

The Biblical Relationship of Mind and Heart

As the writer studies the psychological usage of "heart" (καρδία) in the Bible, he becomes more and more convinced that "heart" and "mind" are very closely related, though not perfectly synonymous. If, upon analysis of the facts, this is found to be true, then a host of additional Scriptures which emphasize the vital importance of the "heart" in Christian experience become applicable to the problem at hand. Thus, the possibility that an ecstatic experience which alienates the mind would be a vital necessity for spiritual nurture would become even more remote.

In the Old Testament "heart" was represented by \aleph and $\aleph\aleph$. The Hebrew terms had five primary uses:

- a. Physical or figurative (29)
- b. Personality, inner life, or character in general (257)
- c. Emotional states of consciousness (166)
- d. Intellectual activities (204); attention (Ex. vii. 23); reflection (Dt. vii. 17); memory (Dt. iv. 9); understanding (I Ki. iii. 9); technical skill (Ex. xxviii. 3).
- e. Volition or purpose (195).¹³¹

¹³¹J. D. Douglas, ed., The New Bible Dictionary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962), p. 509, (adapted).

Even in the Old Testament the close relationship between the heart and the intellect can be seen.

The two testaments are very similar in their concepts of "heart." In regard to the close relationship of

καρδία to Old Testament terms, the New Bible Dictionary states:

The New Testament usage is very similar, and C. Ryder Smith writes of it as follows: "It (the heart) does not altogether lose its physical reference, for it is made of "flesh" (2 Cor. ii. 3), but it is the seat of the will (e.g. Mk. iii. 5), of the intellect (e.g. Mk. ii. 6, 8), and of feeling (e.g. Lk. xxiv. 32).¹³²

The New Testament term *καρδία* is much closer to "mind" than the present-day use of "heart," which usually describes the emotions of man rather than his intellect.

The New Bible Dictionary states,

There is no suggestion in the Bible that the brain is the center of consciousness, thought, or will. It is the heart which is so regarded, and, though it is used of emotions also, it is more frequently the lower organs (bowels), in so far as they are distinguished, that are connected with the emotions.¹³³

Again,

"Mind" is perhaps the closest modern term to the biblical usage of "heart," and many passages could well be translated (e.g. Ec. i. 17; Mt. v. 28). The "heart" is, however, a wider term, and the Bible does not distinguish the rational or mental processes in the way that Greek philosophy does.¹³⁴

Thus, though the "heart" and "mind" are very similar in

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

Scripture, the term $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ places even greater emphasis on reflective intelligence than $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ does. This may explain Marvin Vincent's suggestion as to why Paul uses $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ rather than $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ in I Corinthians 14:14. "He [Paul] uses it to throw into sharper relief the function of reflective intelligence and moral judgment which is expressed generally by $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ heart."¹³⁵ Thus, Paul chooses $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to emphasize the gulf that exists between a prayer in tongues and active reflective intelligence and judgment, which are so important.

Fletcher regards "heart" as an all-inclusive term, as far as the intellect is concerned:

The one term used throughout the whole of the New Testament for the mind of man is "heart." Or rather, the heart was regarded as the one organ of the mental life and all its manifold activities. The practice was carried on by all the New Testament writers, even though other words were employed by some of them for special aspects of the mental life.¹³⁶

In the same vein, Delitzsch boldly asserts, "All that Hellenically and Hellenistically is called nous, logos, suneideisis, thomos, is involved in kardia . . ."¹³⁷

From this discussion it can be seen that "mind" and "heart" are nearly synonymous in Scripture. Therefore, once again Scripture will be examined to see the vital role that the "heart" plays in spiritual nurture and development. With each scriptural citation, the possible

¹³⁵Vincent, op. cit.

¹³⁶Fletcher, op. cit., p. 74.

¹³⁷Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 296.

benefit received from a psychological condition which would put the mind in abeyance is minimized.

The Use of "Heart" in Scripture

The word לֵב occurs 544 times in the Old Testament. It is translated "consent" once, "heart" 494 times, "mind" twelve times, "brain" eleven times, and "wisdom" thirteen times.

The word קֶלֶב occurs 235 times. It is rendered "heart" once, "consent" once, "heart" 224 times, "mind" four times, and "understanding" three times.

לֵב וּמִדָּה occurs 153 times, and is uniformly translated "heart."

1. The Heart is the place of moral decision.
 Daniel 1:8, "But Daniel resolved in his heart that he would not defile himself with the king's delicacies."
 2. It is the place of memory.
 Daniel 7:10, "I kept the matter in my heart."
 3. Its usage in the New Testament shows its close proximity to thinking.
 Matthew 13:15, "and should understand with their heart."
 Luke 2:9, "Why reason ye these things in your hearts?"
 Luke 2:19, "That Mary pondered in her heart."
 Luke 2:25, "... the thoughts of many hearts."
 4. Colossians 4:5, "... the consent of the heart."

The Use of "Heart" in Scripture

The word \aleph occurs 544 times in the Old Testament. It is translated "consent" once, "heart" 494 times, "midst" twelve times, "mind" eleven times, and "wisdom" six times.

The word \beth occurs 235 times. It is rendered "breast" once, "courage" once, "heart" 224 times, "midst" twice, "mind" four times, and "understanding" three times.

$\kappa\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ occurs 158 times, and is uniformly translated "heart."

1. The Heart is the place of moral decision.

Daniel 1:8, "But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the king's dainties . . ."

2. It is the place of memory.

Daniel 7:28, "I kept the matter in my heart."

3. Its usage in the New Testament shows its close proximity in meaning to $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$.

Matthew 13:15, "and should understand with their heart."

Mark 2:8, "Why reason ye these things in your hearts?"

Luke 2:19, "But Mary . . . pondered in her heart . . ."

Luke 2:35, ". . . the thoughts of many hearts . . ."

I Corinthians 4:5, ". . . the counsels of the heart . . ."

4. Salvation comes through a decision of the heart.

Romans 10:10, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness."

Just this small sampling of texts should establish both the nearness in meaning of "heart" and "mind" and the fact of God's dealings with an individual through the active participation of the heart. The spiritual benefit, therefore, to be gleaned at a time when the "heart" is in abeyance is minimal.

The writer concludes with the passage in the fourteenth chapter of I Corinthians: "As we have said, though Paul in these chapters of I Corinthians does assign some value to glossolalia, this value is quite carefully circumscribed. He certainly does not get the impression from these chapters that tongue-speaking is the gift the new converts receive--the gift which is indispensable for almost personal devotions, words and prayer, intercession, or full-orbed visions besides living. The predominant impression one receives from a careful study of these chapters is rather that if one is seeking the very best gifts, he will probably not seek glossolalia."

SUMMARY

The mind (νοῦς) or heart (καρδία) of man is indispensable to vital Christian experience. Having studied the spiritual importance of these psychological aspects of man, the writer concludes with the same thoughts as those of Anthony Hoekema after he expounded the fourteenth chapter of I Corinthians:

We conclude that, though Paul in these chapters from I Corinthians does assign some value to glossolalia, this value is quite carefully circumscribed. One certainly does not get the impression from these chapters that tongue-speaking is the sine qua non of mature Christianity--the gift which is indispensable for vibrant personal devotions, warm and fervent intercession, or full-orbed victorious Christian living. The predominant impression one receives from a careful study of these chapters is rather that if one is seeking the very best gifts, he will probably not seek glossolalia.¹³⁸

¹³⁸Hoekema, op. cit., pp. 100, 101.

MAJOR PROBLEM:

HOW SHOULD PAUL'S RESOLUTION IN

VERSE FIFTEEN BE UNDERSTOOD?

"I WILL PRAY WITH THE SPIRIT AND

I WILL PRAY WITH THE MIND ALSO" (14:15 RSV)

VARIOUS INTERPRETATION

By the use of $\tau\acute{\iota}\ \o\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\upsilon$ Paul makes it clear that he is going to offer his advice, his preference, his solution as to the way the problem exposed in verse fourteen might be corrected. Edwards emphasizes that this phrase "introduces an expression of personal decision."¹³⁹

Paul's solution to the problem of verse 14 has been understood in three ways:

- A. The "Two Prayer" Interpretation
- B. The "Tongues-Interpretation" Position
- C. The "One Prayer" Interpretation

This problem is regarded as "major" in the sense that it is the "goal" problem of the entire passage, not because of the complexity of the problem. It is the resolution toward which Paul has been moving and is the climax of his logic in these verses.

Edwards, op. cit.

The "Two Prayer" Interpretation

Explanation

This view contends that Paul is speaking of two distinct forms of prayer in verse 15. There is a prayer "with the spirit" (i.e., in a tongue), and another form of prayer "with the understanding" (i.e., the content of the prayer determined by normal mental processes).

This viewpoint will usually introduce a time element into the verse. The prayer "with the spirit" is done in private devotions for personal benefit, whereas the prayer "with the understanding" may be done for personal benefit or may be done in the church for the benefit of the whole church.

This view, while evidently universal among Pentecostalists, is held also by a few non-Pentecostalists. F. W. Grosheide states that

the main point is that both are good, the speaking in a tongue, i.e., with the spirit, and the speaking with the understanding. For a Christian both are sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Circumstances will dictate which particular course of action must be followed.¹⁴⁰

This view is held by Roberts, who states,

¹⁴⁰Grosheide, op. cit., p. 326.

There are actually two ways to pray. One is when the mind in harmony with one's inner being speaks to God; the mind forming the thoughts and words. This is often successful. Just as often, it is not successful. The mind is sometimes able to reach into the inner depths of our spirit sometimes it is not. The other way is through tongues.¹⁴¹

He gives what he feels was the Apostle Paul's experience:

It seems that often, after Paul had prayed in the Spirit, he followed that prayer with prayer with his intellect and in his own language. Both ways are scriptural. Both are vital to our spiritual health.¹⁴²

The sharp distinction made between these two forms of prayer can be seen from Brumback's statement: "Prayer in an unknown tongue and prayer with the understanding are both excellent forms of prayer, but they are not one and the same."¹⁴³

Litzman¹⁴⁴ and Riggs¹⁴⁵ also hold this view. Though he does not deal with this verse specifically, Walvoord seems also to distinguish between prayer with the spirit and with the understanding: "While the Corinthians are permitted to pray in an unknown tongue in private, Paul indicates that prayer with understanding is better (I Corinthians 14:15)."¹⁴⁶

¹⁴¹ Roberts, op. cit., p. 23.

¹⁴² Ibid., p. 50.

¹⁴³ Brumback, op. cit., p. 292.

¹⁴⁴ Litzman, Pentecostal Truths, op. cit., p. 41.

¹⁴⁵ Riggs, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁴⁶ John F. Walvoord, The Holy Spirit (Grand Rapids: Dunham Publishing Company, 1958), p. 85.

Refutation

The basic weakness of this position lies in its misunderstanding as to what comprises the prayer "with the spirit." It assumes that a prayer in a tongue is equivalent to a prayer with the spirit. The faulty reasoning of this has been proven.

A proper understanding of prayer "with the spirit" (as being much broader than just in a tongue) makes this position meaningless.

A second weakness is that this view allows the basic deficiency of an uninterpreted prayer in a tongue to persist. To understand Paul's resolution to be, "I will pray in a tongue at times, other times I will pray with my understanding," is to leave unsolved the dilemma exposed by Paul's evaluation on tongue-speaking (v. 14) in the first place.

The "Tongues-Interpretation" Position

This view contends, with those who hold the "two prayer" interpretation, that a prayer "with the spirit" is equivalent to a prayer in a tongue. This view, however, holds that Paul, in stating that he would pray "with the understanding also," would be sure to interpret his prayer in a tongue.

Meyer accepts this view on the basis of his interpretation of verse 13: "Let him pray with a view to interpret."¹⁴⁷

Morgan also supports this view by understanding "spirit" to mean "tongues," and "understanding" to mean "interpretation."¹⁴⁸

In support of his position Thom states, "The first constructive consequence that follows from edification is that with the matter of speaking in tongues shall be associated the further gift of interpretation. Then possibly edification will follow."¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷Meyer, op. cit., p. 321.

¹⁴⁸G. Campbell Morgan, The Corinthian Letters of Paul (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1946), p. 175.

¹⁴⁹Thom, op. cit., p. 201.

Lenski shows how "interpretation" is tied to the "understanding:" "This means that, as far as Paul is concerned, he will not speak with tongues unless he can also interpret, for when he is interpreting, the understanding is used."¹⁵⁰

Other who accept this position are Dake,¹⁵¹ Godet,¹⁵² Weiss,¹⁵³ and Lange.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵⁰Lenski, op. cit., p. 593.

¹⁵¹Finis J. Dake, Dake's Annotated Reference Bible; The New Testament (Atlanta: Dake Bible Sales, Inc., 1961), p. 186.

¹⁵²Godet, op. cit., p. 280.

¹⁵³Weiss, op. cit., p. 245.

¹⁵⁴Lange, op. cit., p. 288.

Refutation

The "Tongues-Interpretation" position is much more adequate than the former position in that it solves the glaring deficiency of a prayer uttered solely "with the spirit" (v. 14). However, it remains a weak interpretation for at least two reasons.

First, this view perpetuates the error of making a prayer "with the spirit" equivalent to a prayer in a tongue.

Secondly, this writer feels that the "Tongues-Interpretation" view wholly misunderstands the usage of $\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\varsigma$ in this verse. This will be discussed under the next heading.

The "One Prayer" Interpretation

This interpretation, which is the interpretation that the writer accepts, contends that Paul has one, not two prayers in mind in verse 15. His firm resolution to solve the dilemma of verse 14 is that he will exercise a prayer that activates both his spirit and his mind. He will not be content to edify only his spirit, nor will he pray with the mind at the expense of the spirit. Various avenues of proof will be given to establish this position.

Besides those works to be cited, this interpretation is held by Hoekema,¹⁵⁵ Makrakis,¹⁵⁶ Hodge,¹⁵⁷ Hobbs,¹⁵⁸ Thom,¹⁵⁹ and Fink.¹⁶⁰

A. Psychological considerations

The very fault of the prayer in a tongue was that it failed to reach the intellect. This interpretation gives the best possible solution to this problem.

Concerning the importance that Paul places here on the intellect, Robertson comments, "Paul is distinctly in favor

¹⁵⁵Hoekema, op. cit. p. 92.

¹⁵⁶Makrakis, op. cit., p. 1488.

¹⁵⁷Hodge, op. cit., p. 289.

¹⁵⁸Herschel H. Hobbs, The Epistles to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963), p. 67.

¹⁵⁹Thom, op. cit., p. 210.

¹⁶⁰Fink, op. cit., p. 17.

of the use of the intellect in prayer. Prayer is an intelligent exercise of the mind."¹⁶¹

This view is also noteworthy for the place of emphasis which it gives to the spirit. While not stated in so many words, the first view really diminishes the importance of the spirit by condoning a type of prayer that would utilize the mind apart from the spirit. While such a prayer would be free from some of the dangerous possibilities arising from a "neutral" mind, it would, nonetheless, be an undesirable prayer also. Paul not only wants a prayer that reaches the intellect, but one that "stirs the emotions"¹⁶² as well.

In giving due credit to both mind and spirit, Leon Morris states,

The Christian life is considerably more than a mental exercise. But the man whose mind is unfruitful is not being true to his Christian calling. This passage is very important for its insistence on the rightful place of the intellect. Notice that this is secure without any diminution of spiritual fervor. Paul is not arguing for a barren intellectualism. There is a place for the fervor so strikingly exemplified in the use of "tongues." But it must be allied to the use of the mind, and this "tongues" does not provide.¹⁶³

Likewise, Calvin states that

it is lawful, indeed, to pray with the spirit, provided the mind be at the same time employed, that is, the

¹⁶¹Robertson, op. cit., p. 183.

¹⁶²Ibid., p. 183.

¹⁶³Leon Morris, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963), pp. 194, 195.

understanding. He allows, therefore, and sanctions the use of a spiritual gift in prayer, but requires, what is the main thing, that the mind be not unemployed.¹⁶⁴

In connection with psychological proofs, one should recall the comments of the Pulpit Commentary.¹⁶⁵ The spirit and mind are cooperative elements of human nature. They are not opposites.

B. The Nature of the Gift of Interpretation

A proper understanding of the gift of interpretation will not only disprove the "Tongue-Interpretation" position, but will also enhance the "one-prayer" interpretation.

It is the writer's conviction that the "prayer with the mind" cannot be merely the interpretation of a tongue. When Paul uses $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ he simply does not mean "interpretation," for the exercise of the ability to interpret bypasses the mind as much as the prayer in a tongue does. Walvoord identifies the gift of interpretation as "the divinely wrought ability to translate the speech of those speaking in tongues (I Corinthians 12:10; 14:26-28)."¹⁶⁶

C. Logical Implications of the Context

Verse 14 clearly states that the mind is unfruitful at the time one speaks in a tongue. This being the case,

¹⁶⁴ Calvin, op. cit., p. 447.

¹⁶⁵ See page 67, footnote 117.

¹⁶⁶ Walvoord, op. cit., p. 85.

it would also be evident that the interpretation of the tongue could not be the product of the mind if the mind, itself, could not understand the tongue. Furthermore, if an interpretation was a product arising from the natural intellect of the person speaking in a tongue it would be senseless and unnecessary to "pray that he may interpret" (v. 13).

A consistent translation of $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ as "interpretation" becomes absurd in other places within the context. Verse 14 would read: "For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my interpretation is unfruitful." Verse 19 would read: "Howbeit in the church I had rather speak five words with my interpretation, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." On the contrary, both of these passages obviously use $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ as descriptive of natural intellectual facilities and not of a "divinely wrought ability to translate" a tongue, as Walvoord defined it.

D. Grammatical considerations

A supporting argument for the "one prayer" interpretation is the use of the conjunction $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the verse. It is not used in the simple connective sense, for the particle $\delta\epsilon$ serves that purpose.

Its position, however, before $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\nu\omicron\iota$ does suggest that it is used in the adjunctive sense. In that case it would closely align the noun it precedes ($\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$) with preceding material ($\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$). This

usage of the conjunction would argue for the "one prayer" concept. That this is an adjunctive use of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is attested by Machen: "When it is thus used, it stands before the word with which it is logically connected."¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁷J. Gresham Machen, New Testament Greek for Beginners (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961), p. 71.

Through the course of this study certain facts have become evident.

1. The gift of Tongues involves only the spirit of man in its exercise. Therefore, it has only the speaker's own limited, subjective power.

2. The human mind benefits nobody during the exercise of this gift. Neither does it benefit itself, for it is in abeyance. From the standpoint of biblical psychology, this condition is not desirable as far as spiritual benefit is concerned.

3. Paul's resolution is that he prefers an experienced prayer that utilizes simultaneously both spirit and mind.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Therefore, the writer concludes that Paul, though in the "forbidding" passage, definitely does not encourage the local assembly.

The problem passage does not seem to discourage directly the private exercise of this gift. Especially does this seem evident in the light of the apostle's positive statement regarding this gift (verse 18): "I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all." This may have been the private exercise of the gift in view of his next statement to the church: "I would rather not speak in tongues."

Yet, the writer is convinced that, by implication, this passage prohibits the benefit to be derived from a private exercise of this gift. The deficiency of verse 18 is that it does not state whether the gift is exercised in the public or in

Through the course of this study certain facts have become evident.

A. The Gift of Tongues involves only the spirit of man in its exercise. Therefore, it can edify the speaker only in a limited, subjective sense.

B. The human mind benefits nobody during the exercise of this gift. Neither does it benefit itself, for it is in abeyance. From the standpoint of Biblical psychology, this condition is not desirable as far as spiritual benefit is concerned.

C. Paul's resolution is that he prefers an experience of prayer that utilizes simultaneously both spirit and mind. This edifies the whole man.

Therefore, the writer concludes that Paul, though in no wise "forbidding" tongues, definitely does not encourage it in the local assembly.

The problem passage does not seem to discourage directly the private exercise of this gift. Especially does this seem evident in the light of the Apostle's positive statement regarding this gift (verse 18): "I thank my god, I speak with tongues more than ye all." This must have been a private exercise of the gift in view of his next statement, "Yet, in the church [I would rather not speak in tongues]."

Yet, the writer is convinced that, by implication, this passage minimizes the benefit to be derived from a private exercise of this gift. The deficiency stated in verse 14 exists whether the gift is exercised in the church or in

private. In either case, the mind is not benefited.

Also, even granting for a moment that one can possess today the self-edifying gift of tongues, it does not follow that its exercise is necessary, since the believer now has the completed canon of Scripture by which to edify himself in a much more satisfactory manner.

ENGLISH PARAPHRASE

(I Corinthians 14:12-15)

The Corinthians are eager to manifest the spiritual gifts which you have received. Since you have had regard for the church, I wish that you would direct it in such a way that all in the church may be benefited. The trouble has been that what you have had has been utilized at the expense of the church.

How can you direct properly your ability to speak in a language you have never learned? By making God to supply you through the gift of interpretation, with the meaning of what you say.

ENGLISH PARAPHRASE

(I Corinthians 14:12-15)

You must give you a reason for desiring the ability to interpret. You must be in a course, in the spirit, that God-conscious and emotional part of the church participates in the prayer. This is fine as far as it goes. The problem is that his mind, which is most vital in spiritual growth and should certainly be active in prayer, is unproductive. That is, it cannot benefit others. This is because it is unable to produce any true thoughts, and is inefficient, in a state of suspension.

In view of these facts, what is my decision as to how I personally will be engaged in prayer? I will not give that which is not understood by the church. I will not give that which is not understood by the church. I will not give that which is not understood by the church. I will not give that which is not understood by the church. I will not give that which is not understood by the church.

You Corinthians are eager to manifest the spiritual gifts which you have received. Since you have this eagerness, I wish that you would direct it in such a way that all in the church may be benefited. The trouble has been that often only one has been edified, at the expense of everybody else.

How can you direct properly your ability to speak in a language you have never learned? By asking God to supply you, through the gift of interpretation, with the meaning of what you say.

Let me give you a reason for desiring the ability to interpret. You see, when one of you speaks in a tongue, his own spirit, that God-conscious and emotional part of him, participates in the prayer. This is fine as far as it goes. The problem is that his mind, which is most vital for spiritual growth and should certainly be active in prayer, is unproductive. That is, it cannot benefit others. This is because it is unable to produce any true thoughts, for it is quiescent, in a state of suspension.

In view of these facts, what is my decision as to what I personally will do in regards to prayer? I will not be content to see only my spirit benefited (and that being a subjective benefit) anymore than I would be satisfied with a purely intellectual prayer. I will utter a prayer that utilizes both my spirit and my mind. I want them both

to be fully active, and fully edified. Even when singing, I will not benefit just a part of me at the expense of another part, but I will sing in such a way as to benefit both mind and spirit.

- BARRETT, ALBERT. Notes on the New Testament. Vol. V. London: Blackie and Son, 1911.
- BURTON, JAMES ALAN. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911.
- FRYER, WILLIAM G. "The Confusion of Tongues." Religious Studies. Vol. 13, no. 477. (April-June, 1954).
- FRYER, JOHN ALBERT. Commentary on the New Testament. Vol. II. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press and Higgins, 1960.
- FRYER, JOHN ALBERT. The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. New York: T. Carlton and J. Porter, n.d.
- HUNT, JAMES. The People's Commentary. New York: Nelson A. Rockefeller, 1952.
- HUNT, JAMES. An Exposition of I Corinthians. (Unpublished class notes). Winona Lake: Grace Theological Seminary.
- HUNT, JAMES. The Letters of Paul. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.
- HUNT, JAMES. What Means This? Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1957.
- HUNT, JAMES. Commentary on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1966.
- HUNT, JAMES. A Layman's English Greek. New York: The Blessed Trinity Society, n.d.
- HUNT, JAMES. Holy Bible Commentary on Colossians. Vol. 13. New York: Baker and Taylor, 1961.
- HUNT, JAMES. Baker's Annotated Reference Bible. The Bible Society. Chicago: Baker Book House Co., 1961.
- HUNT, JAMES. and HUNT, JAMES. A Manual Commentary of the Holy Bible. New York: The American Bible Society, 1911.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

- ALFORD, HENRY. The Greek Testament. Vol. I. Chicago: Moody Press, 1958.
- Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- BARNES, ALBERT. Notes on the New Testament. Vol. V. London: Blackie and Son, n.d.
- BEEB, JOSEPH AGAR. A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1892.
- BELLSHAW, WILLIAM G. "The Confusion of Tongues." Bibliotheca Sacra. Vol. 120, no. 479. (April-June, 1963).
- BENGEL, JOHN ALBERT. Gnomen of the New Testament. Vol. II. Philadelphia: Perkin Pine and Higgins, 1860.
- BENSON, JOSEPH. The New Testament of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. New York: T. Carlton and J. Porter, n.d.
- BINNEY, AMOS. The People's Commentary. New York: Nelson & Phillips, 1878.
- BOYER, JAMES L. An Exposition of I Corinthians. (Unpublished class notes). Winona Lake: Grace Theological Seminary.
- BRUCE, F. F. The Letters of Paul. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1965.
- BRUMBACK, CARL. What Meaneth This? Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1947.
- CALVIN, JOHN. Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1948.
- CHRISTENSON, LARRY. A Lutheran Pastor Speaks. Van Nuys: The Blessed Trinity Society, n.d.
- CLARKE, ADAM. Holy Bible Commentary and Critical Notes. Vol. VI. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1883.
- DAKE, FINIS J. Dake's Annotated Reference Bible: The New Testament. Atlanta: Dake Bible Sales, Inc., 1961.
- DANA, H. E., and MANTEY, JULIUS R. A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.

- DAVIDSON, SAMUEL. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. London: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1868.
- DEHAAN, RICHARD. Speaking in Tongues. Grand Rapids: Radio Bible Class, 1967.
- DELITZSCH, FRANZ. A System of Biblical Psychology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1966.
- DOUGLAS, J. D., ed. The New Bible Dictionary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- EDWARDS, THOMAS CHARLES. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1886.
- ELLICOTT, CHARLES JOHN. Commentary on the Whole Bible. Vol. III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1959.
- ERDMAN, CHARLES R. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1928.
- FARNER, TIMOTHY H. I Corinthians 14:21. (Unpublished critical monograph). Winona Lake: Grace Theological Seminary, 1967.
- FINDLAY, G. G. "St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians." The Expositor's Greek New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.
- FINK, PAUL R. A Commentary on First Corinthians 14:6-15. (Unpublished research paper). Dallas: Dallas Theological Seminary, 1960.
- FLETCHER, M. SCOTT. The Psychology of the New Testament. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.
- FROST, ROBERT C. Aglow with the Spirit. Northridge, California: Voice Christian Publications, 1965.
- GEE, DONALD. Concerning Spiritual Gifts. Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, n.d.
- GODET, F. Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing house, 1957.
- GOODSPEED, EDGAR J. An Introduction to the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

- GOULD, E. P. "Commentary on the Epistles to the Corinthians." An American Commentary on the New Testament. Vol. V. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1887.
- GROMACKI, ROBERT GLENN. The Modern Tongues Movement. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1967.
- GROSHEIDE, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- HADJIANTONIOU, GEORGE A. New Testament Introduction. Chicago: Moody Press, 1957.
- HARRISON, EVERETT, ed. Baker's Dictionary of Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1960.
- _____. Introduction to the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.
- HASTINGS, JAMES. A Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.
- HENRY, MATTHEW. Matthew Henry's Commentary on the Whole Bible. Vol. VI. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, n.d.
- HOBBS, HERSCHEL H. The Epistles to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1963.
- HODGE, CHARLES. An Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950.
- HOEKEMA, ANTHONY A. What About Tongue-Speaking? Exeter, Devon: The Paternoster Press, 1966.
- IRONSIDE, H. A. Addresses on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1938.
- JAMIESON, ROBERT; FAUSSET, A.R.; BROWN, DAVID. A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments. Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.
- JOHNSON, S. LEWIS. "A Symposium on the Tongues Movement." Bibliotheca Sacra. Vol. 120, no. 479. (July-September, 1963).
- LAIDLAW, JOHN. The Biblical Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.

- LANGE, JOHN PETER. Commentary on the Holy Scriptures.
 Vol. X. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company,
 1960.
- LENSKI, R. C. H. The Interpretation of St. Paul's First
 and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. Minneapolis:
 Augsburg Publishing House, 1963.
- LITZMAN, WARREN. Pentecostal Truths. Waxahachie, Texas:
 Litzman Pentecostal Campaigns, 1961.
- _____ The Ministry of Tongues. Dallas: Litzman
 Pentecostal Campaigns, n.d.
- MacDONALD, WILLIAM G. "Glossolalia in the New Testament."
Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society.
 Vol. 7. no. 2. (Spring, 1964). Wheaton: Wheaton
 College.
- McPHEETERS, JULIAN C. The Epistles to the Corinthians.
 Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964.
- MACHEN J. GRESHAM. New Testament Greek for Beginners.
 New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.
- MAKRAKIS, APOSTOLOS. Interpretation of the Entire New
 Testament. Vol. II. Chicago: Orthodox Christian
 Educational Society, 1950.
- METZGER, BRUCE MANNING. The New Testament, its Background,
 Growth, and Content. New York: Abingdon Press, 1965.
- MEYER, HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM. Critical and Exegetical
 Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians. New York:
 Funk & Wagnalls, 1890.
- MORGAN, G. CAMPBELL. The Corinthian Letters of Paul. New
 York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1946.
- MORRIS, LEON. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.
 Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1963.
- NESS, HENRY H. The Baptism with the Holy Spirit: What is it?
 Hayward, California: Evangelism Crusaders, Inc., n.d.
- NEWELL, PHILIP R. Tongues of Confusion. Chicago: Moody
 Bible Institute, n.d.
- NICHOL, JOHN THOMAS. Pentecostalism. New York: Harper &
 Row, 1966.
- OLSHAUSEN, HERMANN. Biblical Commentary on the New Testa-
 ment. Vol. IV. New York: Sheldon & Company, 1861.

- PENTECOST, J. DWIGHT. The Divine Comforter. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1958.
- PFEIFFER, CHARLES F. and HARRISON, EVERETT F., ed. The Wycliffe Bible Commentary. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962.
- RIGGS, RALPH M. The Spirit Himself. Springfield: Gospel Publishing House, 1949.
- ROBERTS, ORAL. The Baptism with the Holy Spirit and the value of speaking in tongues today. Tulsa: Oral Roberts, 1964.
- ROBERTSON, ARCHIBALD THOMAS. Word Pictures in the New Testament. Vol. IV. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1931.
- SCHAFF, PHILIP. History of the Christian Church. Vol. I. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1952.
- _____, ed. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. Vol. XII. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1889.
- SPENCE, CANON H. D. M. "I Corinthians." The Pulpit Commentary. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, n.d.
- STANLEY, ARTHUR PENRHYN. The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians. London: John Murray, 1876.
- STOLEE, H. J. Speaking in Tongues. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing Company, 1953.
- TENNEY, MERRILL C. The New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- The Comprehensive Commentary on the Whole Bible. Vol. V. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Company, 1849.
- The Interpreter's Bible. Vol. X. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1953.
- The Seventh-Day Adventist Bible Commentary. Vol. VI. Washington: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1957.
- THOM, JOHN HAMILTON. St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, and Company, 1852.
- UNGER, MERRILL F. Unger's Bible Dictionary. Chicago: Moody Press, 1961.
- VAN ELDEREN, BASIL. "Glossolalia in the New Testament." Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society. Vol. 7. no. 2. (Spring, 1964). Wheaton: Wheaton College.

- VINCENT, MARVIN R. Word Studies in the New Testament.
Vol. III. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
Company, 1965.
- VINE, W. E. An Expository Dictionary of New Testament
Words. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revel, 1966.
- WALVOORD, JOHN F. The Holy Spirit. Grand Rapids: Dunham
Publishing Company, 1958.
- WEIDNER, FRANKLIN. The Doctrine of Man. Chicago:
Wartburg Publishing House, 1912.
- WEISS, BERNHARD. A Commentary on the New Testament. Vol. III.
New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1906.
- WILLIAMS, ERNEST S. Systematic Theology. Vol. III. Spring-
field: Gospel Publishing House, 1953.
- YOUNG, ROBERT J. Analytical Concordance to the Bible.
Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, n.d.