

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain References written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

## BIBLE TONGUES

By Kent A. Field

1986

When we discuss tongues--why don't we classify them as "tongues", okay? And not just 1 Corinthians 14. We'll get into 1 Corinthians 14 as the study progresses. What we are about to study will be the truth. And so, anything we don't touch on in this study cannot and will not contradict the truth that we do learn here. This is an item of critical importance when studying the Bible. Make sure that when we say "Well, this is what this passage teaches--", watch that you don't say "Yes, but this one says this", as if to bring up an opposite point. That would be using the Bible against itself and that's playing the devil's advocate.

When you speak with someone and they show you, for instance, "For by grace you are saved through faith, and that not of works lest any man should boast." Don't say, "Yes, BUT over here in 1 Peter 3:21 it says we're saved by baptism." For then you would be saying baptism is an opposite, a "but", a contradiction; something contrary or opposite to the need for faith. However, faith and Bible baptism are not opposed to one another! They are harmoniously joined. One needs to be able to say, "Yes, AND this." Take the two verses together. Don't use one to wipe out the other. That same principle should not only be applied on the subject of salvation, but also for any Bible subject.

As we progress through our study of tongues we are going to state many positions and then we are going to illustrate them by using the Bible to show you the verses that say these things. We are going to learn that the very purpose of tongues was to be a sign to unbelievers. Tongues are to be a sign not for believers, but for unbelievers.

Tongues were prophesied of as far back as when Joel prophesied. The prophet Joel prophesied in approximately 835 B.C. In Joel 2:28-32, Joel makes his prophecy concerning the time of the Messiah. *"And it will come about after this"* (the King James will say "in the last days" or "in the latter times." Joel 2:28), *"I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and your sons and your daughters will prophesy and your old men will dream dreams and your young men shall see visions, and even on your male and female servants I will pour out my spirit in those days and I will display wonders in the sky above and on the earth beneath. Blood and fire and columns of smoke and the sun will be turned to darkness and the moon into blood before the great and awesome day of the Lord comes. And it shall come about that whoever calls on the name of the Lord will be delivered. For on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem there will be those who escape as the Lord has said even among the survivors the Lord calls."* This is clearly a reference to the "pouring out" of the Holy Spirit, the giving of miracles, prophecy, the seeing of visions and so forth.

A second reference will be Mark 16:17. *"And these signs will accompany those who have believed. In my name they will cast out demons, they will speak with new tongues, they will pick up serpents and if they drink any deadly poison, it shall not hurt them. They will lay hands on the sick and they will recover."* There are several arguments that I could probably put forth from each of these passages. However, here are just a couple of points.

In Mark 16:19 it says, *"So when the Lord Jesus had spoken to them He was received up into heaven and He sat down at the right hand of God."* In Mark 16:20, it goes on to say, *"And they went*

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

*out and preached everywhere while the Lord worked with them and confirmed the word by the signs that followed*". Now, in verses 17 and 18 the Lord is saying that they are going to do some signs. Verse 20 tells us what the Lord was doing by giving those signs. What did the Lord do by giving them the signs? The Lord confirmed the word! That's what it says! The Lord worked with them and confirmed the word. How did He confirm the word? How does God confirm His word? How did He confirm His word to the disciples? Read Mark 16:20! "*By the signs that followed*". So what is the purpose of miracles, including tongues? They are a sign to confirm the word! Keep that firmly in your mind.

In Hebrews 2:3,4, it says, "*How shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation? After it was first spoken through the Lord, it was confirmed--*" past tense, "*...it was confirmed to us by those who heard. God also bearing witness with them both by signs and wonders and by various miracles and by gifts of the Holy Spirit according to His will.*" Again, why was God working these miracles? To confirm the word. Now let me just spend a moment explaining that.

Bob suddenly begins to claim, "I'm a prophet of God, believe me, follow my word--!" You say, "Hey, who are you Jack?" You would have to to this even back in the first century for there were many false Christs and false apostles, and false Messiahs of all kinds; false teachers! And some of them did great works which we are going to talk about in just a moment. So, Bob comes to you saying these things. But what was the proof that you should listen to him? There would have to be a persuading factor to help you decide why you should or should not follow him. And that factor would be whether or not he could do a sign. A certain type of sign.

Let me say that New Testament signs, as we study the characteristics of New Testament miracles, were nothing like the forgeries we see today. The miracles we see supposedly done in Jesus' name today, in character and quality, are being done by Buddhists, Hindus, Muslims, transcendental meditationists, atheists, American Indians, pagans, heathens, and idolaters all over the world. But the New Testament miracle was of such a nature, such a character and a quality, that when it was performed a pagan would give up his religion and listen to this true New Testament miracle worker!, that Christian preacher, because of what he just did. And that was still only to prove that he was a follower of Jesus, and not necessarily that all that preacher's word could be trusted without question.

So the Lord confirmed the Word as they went preaching the Word. When someone would say, "Alright, how do I know you're from Jesus?" They could answer, "Watch this, and they would strike someone blind, raise somebody from the dead, or speak with tongues. The nature of their miracles was such that the evidence was undeniable. All I want to establish at this point is that the purpose for miracles was to confirm the word. New Testament miracles were to validate the preaching in New Testament times.

Also notice how Mark uses the past tense in Mark 16:20 saying "*and the Lord worked with them.*" He is already talking past tense by the time he writes his letter in about 52 A.D.

One more question from Hebrews 2:4. What does the phrase "bearing witness" mean? Giving credence, giving testimony, to bear witness. The denominationalist today uses the term "witness" to tell you what Jesus did in their life--their experience. In the New Testament that was not the only New Testament witness. I'm not saying they didn't say what

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

Jesus did for them in their lives. Paul would talk about how he was converted. But that wasn't his only witness. An apostolic witness also included an eyewitness testimony of the resurrection. And there are passages throughout the New Testament which will talk about the apostolic witness of the resurrection; the eyewitness of the resurrection. One such passage is Acts 4:33 which says, "*And with great power the apostles were giving witness to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus, and abundant grace was upon them all.*" What were they giving witness of? The resurrection! How? With "great power", through miracles!

Now, if I tell you what Jesus did in my life, how much more powerful is that than the Catholic girl who says, "Look what Mary did for me?" Or the Buddhist who lights himself aflame and lives through it and says, "Look what Buddha did for me?" Or if another might say, "Look what Atheism did for me," and so on down the line? In other words, personal testimony about what Jesus did in your life is not the only New Testament witness. It is not. The New Testament witness is to give testimony and confirmation of that testimony...particularly of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Your experience alone doesn't mean a thing. Now hopefully you've had a positive experience. I mean in Christ, a growing experience. Christ has helped you over things. Christ has helped you through things. "*You can do all things through Christ who strengthens you.*" Hopefully Christ has been strengthening you in things. And you can talk about the problems you licked in the faith, because of the strength that God gives, but that was not the only New Testament witness. I can't be a true witness for Jesus other than to give the very same witness that the apostles gave...He was risen! And that's what I do. So I give testimony or witness, but apostolic testimony, I share the apostolic witness from the Scriptures. And I need not perform the accompanying signs seeing that I only give the apostles' testimony, and the Lord already confirmed their word with the signs that followed.

In Acts 2, verse 1 the church is about to form, the day of Pentecost has come, they were all together in one place. Some say that there were fully about 120 people still present in this gathering. Their evidence is Acts 1:15. However, the text will prove that the group in Acts 2:1ff, is not the same group, but the apostles alone! The proof is within Chapter 2. 4"*All those who spake were Galileans*5, so the 120 weren't all speaking in tongues for many of the 120 of Acts 1:15 were from regions other than Galilee! And "*all who spake were from Galilee.*" There are several other identifying characteristics within Acts 2 which we will later consider, and will help to prove that the 120 were not present in the same room when the day of Pentecost was fully come.

In Acts 2 and verse 2 it goes on to say, "*And suddenly there came from heaven a noise like a violent rushing wind and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them tongues as of fire distributing themselves, (literally "itself"), and it sat upon each one of them.*" The literal language here may indicate that there may have been just one cloven tongues of fire going around the room, touching each of the apostles, because it is literally in the singular. The cloven tongues were a flickering flame of fire, which rested on each of them.

Verse four goes on to say, "*And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit.*" The word "filled," means to be empowered or influenced by...sometimes miraculous, sometimes non-miraculous. When a person is filled with the Holy Spirit that means he is under the Spirit's influence, whether miraculous or non-miraculous. The context will determine which. A person can be filled with the Holy Spirit today--the way Stephen was in Acts 6. He was a man filled with the Holy Spirit, but this merely means that he was a good godly man; a spiritual man. Must a man have miraculous gifts to have, or be filled with, the Holy Spirit today? No. Because as we'll learn, if the word we preach today was already confirmed there is no further need for the doing of miracles. Keep in mind what

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

we've already learned concerning the purpose of miracles. They were for confirmation of the Word. Notice all of those passages were in the past tense because the job had already been accomplished during the days when the New Testament was given. The job had been accomplished according to the way the New Testament writers were talking by the time they were writing their letters! Also consider the case of John the baptizer. In Luke 1:15, it says that John was "*filled with the Holy Spirit*". While in John 10:41 it also says that "*John never did a single miracle.*"

Back to verse four of Acts two. "*They were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues.*" What were these "other tongues?" Literally, it's "languages." This word "tongues" comes from the Greek word "glossa." We get our English word "glossary" from "Glossa." What is a glossary? Words! That's what it is. The word "glossary" stands for something you look in when you're looking for the words of a book. The glossary of a book is a listing of the words that book especially uses. So the word "glossa" stood for "language" or "tongue". The word "tongue" is also used today to describe a language. You've probably heard it said today that people "speak several tongues fluently." Or concerning a person living in Africa, "What African dialect do they use in that part of Africa?" Or, "what African tongue do they use?" So we use the term "tongue" even in our own modern vernacular. You've probably heard the word used in the context of the phrase "all the many tribes and tongues of the earth." This is talking about languages. So try to keep that in mind as we study through the subject of tongues.

The word "tongue" here in Acts 2:4 doesn't mean some kind of vain babbling of a religious experience. It does not. The word "tongues" in the Bible was never meant to represent the vain babbling of a religious experience. The word "tongue" simply means a language. So what were the apostles doing? Vain babbling? No! What they were doing was speaking in languages. And we can see that point more clearly as we progress through the text.

Where did the denominations get speaking in their so-called tongues from? Where does the babbling come from? It's an emotionally induced experience. It comes on through the same process that even atheists go through on occasion. People that are under intense stress, people who are self hypnotized do it, people who want to do it, some people have been found to experience this simply because they got so worked up--not even in a religious experience or religious setting. You just have to get a person worked up enough. Children are especially prone to it. If you get them really excited enough and really scared, they can just rattle off an entire string of vain babbling nonsense. I've often witnessed children rattle off such gibberish. A child getting so scared his father was about to hit him and wanting to explain himself blurts out this whole big garbleygoop that doesn't make any sense at all. The point of this is, the tongues that people experience today come from an emotional experience.

Psychologists and experts have analyzed today's "tongue speaking" and it is not language of any kind. It has no semblance of order; language must have order. Language is something that is capable of being broken down and understood for communication. Even if it is a so-called "angelic language," as some have claimed, the communication must make some kind of continuous sense. Computer studies have even been done on today's modern so-called "tongues" and they have come up with nothing-- it's just babbling!

Don't they claim that it's God's language? Yes, they do. But if that were true, it would still have some semblance of order. God is not a God of disorder, especially when communicating with man! It would still have to be a language. All tongues of the Bible were actually men's specific languages, not some spiritual or angelic language. This will soon become clear.

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

There is something else I want you to notice as we go through this study. If tongues were to be a sign for unbelievers, which they were, (1 Corinthians 14:22), the unbelievers, in some way, would have to be involved with the interpretation of the tongue, or at least they had to know that the tongue was interpreted by somebody valid. In other words, these tongues would have to be able to be put to the test--we'll see that in a moment.

The point is that the so-called "tongue speaking" that is going on today is also being experienced by many different religious and non-religious groups including pagan African tribes. I know people that have been preaching for 25 years in the South African bush country. They also can tell you about the pagans speaking in "tongues". The Hindus of India do it. The Buddhists of China do it. There are some Moslem sects that do it. Today in religious denominationalism the Mormons do it, Catholic charismatics do it, Pentecostals do it, Church of God, Assembly of God, the holiness churches--they all do it. Baptist churches are doing it too. So the question is this--If the Holy Spirit is behind all that so-called "tongue speaking", is God behind all that religious division, all that confusion? None of these religious groups is told, "Get out of your church and join the true church. Follow the Bible only." I mean, the Holy Spirit is not telling them what he told the people in the first century! Then it must not be the Holy Spirit!

The Corinthians were abusing the gift of tongues and they were told "straighten out, or don't use it!" *"And don't say you can't control yourself or help yourself because 4'the spirits of the prophets are subject unto the prophets."* And that's what that verse in 1 Corinthians 14:32 means! They had the true gift and they were abusing it. What are these religious groups of today abusing? They are not even abusing "language" because they are actually just babbling!

The "Way Ministry"--(you may have heard of this Texas based cult), for a certain sum of money, will teach you how to speak in "tongues". This is how they do it. I was involved with them for a little while so I can tell you first hand. They will sit you down and tell you, "Say Abba" and you say "Abba!" It's made to be a very emotional situation. A lot of people are standing around you and they're saying, "Oh Father, take out with thy wrath of indignation the sin of his soul," and "Oh Father, please make him see the light. Give him the holiness of your word," and they go on and on. Everyone is praying this same kind of prayer all at the same time so you can't even tell what anybody is saying. They are all moving around you and they're starting to rock you and there's a guy holding you and he is saying, "Say Abba," and you say, "Abba," and this goes on until you start to babble. All of a sudden you are saying "**Abba...#?.\$%\*!**"

Ever hear that before? Have you ever gone to a Pentecostal church? The preacher stands there, usually with his hand on your forehead and everyone around him will be speaking in "tongues." Then he'll be praying for this person that he's touching to also start babbling. It is usually a very high pressure situation. What they do is not tongues. This is just one illustration of how one group does it. The point is--if the Holy Spirit is behind this and yet within many denominations, then He's the author of confusion. But we know that *"God is not the author of confusion"* (1 Corinthians 14:33). Therefore, the Holy Spirit is not behind today's "tongue speaking." There's your reasoning, your logic of deduction.

Let's keep reading in Acts two and verse five. *"Now there were Jews living in Jerusalem, devout men from every nation under heaven and when this sound occurred, the multitude came together."* You have the apostles speaking with other tongues, people heard this going on and said,

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain References written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

"Hey, you have to listen to this..." So a multitude comes over, *"and were bewildered because they were each one hearing them speak in his own language,"* (verse six). Verse 5, *"Now they were devout men from every nation under heaven,"* from all over the world--Jews, but from all over the world. Each of them, of course could recognize their own language. What were they doing in Jerusalem? According to true Judaism, you've got to make that yearly trek back to Jerusalem, to the temple; which a Jew can't do today, because the temple no longer stands. It was destroyed in 70 A.D. There's nothing today to return to. But back before 70 A.D. the Jews were required to annually return to the temple. *"And they, each one, heard him speak in his own language."* Verse seven goes on to say, *"and were amazed and marveled saying, 'Why are not all of these who are speaking Galileans?'"*

Some people may not realize it but this was a reference to their education. Galileans were generally uneducated people. They were ignorant people, they weren't of the school of Jerusalem. It might be like saying, "Aren't all these people from the Bronx?" (and I have nothing against the Bronx seeing I was from the Bronx). The point is--it would be the opposite of saying, "Aren't all of these from Boston?", (a college town), where you would expect several people to have the ability of speaking more than one language.

By the way, remember that question about whether or not the 120 of Acts 1:15 were present at Pentecost? Mary and the women mentioned as part of the 120 in Acts chapter one were from Bethany and other areas. But all of these who were speaking were Galileans. Mary and the other ones were obviously not involved in Acts two. There were not 120 speaking in tongues. Just the apostles who were from Galilee were there at Pentecost in Acts 2:1ff.

Verse eight, *"And how is it that we each hear them speak in our own language?"* Now his own "language" in verse six, and his own "language" in verse 8 were both the word... "dialect", from the Greek word "dialectos." Is dialect a babbling? A dialect is something that you can understand, a DIALECT. It is language. So now you've got the two Greek words behind any word for "tongue" in the Bible. Just these two. Dialect and glossary; which are not vain babbling.

Was this heavenly language? Yes, in that it was given from God. What language was it? Well, let's see, *"there were Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, residents of Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, and Pontus and Asia, and Phrygia, and Pamphylia, Egypt, and the districts of Libya..."* So they were heavenly only in the sense that these languages were given by God. But they were what kind of languages? They were languages of men. What was the purpose of this sign? We've already looked at those verses. Hebrews 2:3,4 and Mark 16:20, state that it's a proof, a confirmation, that God is speaking through them. Tongues are a sign to confirm the word.

Let's continue. *"...Libya, around Cyrene, and the visitors from Rome both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs, we hear them speak in our own tongues..."* that's "glossa" again. Tongues or glossa, glossa or dialectos should be translated tongue or language. That's what they mean. *"...speaking of the mighty deeds of God. And they continued in amazement and great perplexity saying to one another, 'what does this mean?'; but others were mocking saying, 'these men are full of sweet wine!'"*

That sweet wine, by the way, is non-alcoholic. So what they were doing in saying, "These guys are drunk on grape juice." They were really chiding or mocking them, really ridiculing them. They weren't saying these guys were drunk on alcoholic wine, but on sweet wine. If you study Bible

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

wines, you'll find that sweet wine was nearly always understood in history and in the Bible to be non-fermented wine, because it's fresh squeezed sweet juice. You can't ferment it unless you can decrease the sugar content and you have to go through a whole process to do that. It would be like saying for us, "These guys are drunk on grape juice." The sweet wine here is "sweet wine" or "new wine." That means it was just squeezed out of the grape and there was not enough time to ferment the juice.

Verse 14, *"But Peter taking his stand with the eleven..."* Wait a minute! What happened to the 120 people that some say were also there? They weren't there! And this is yet another proof verse that it wasn't the 120, but rather the 12 alone! *"...Peter took his stand with the 11..."* Somebody might say, "Well, there were more than 11 languages, there were 14 languages spoken!" So what? So one of them or two of them spoke a couple of languages. Doesn't that make sense? *"...and raising his voice and declared to them: Men of Judea, and all you who live in Jerusalem, let this be known to you, and give heed to my words. For these men are not drunk, as you suppose, for it is only the third hour of the day; but this" (what this? what they had just seen!) "is what was spoken of through the prophet Joel: 'And it shall be in the last days,' God says, 'That I will pour forth of My Spirit upon all mankind; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; even upon my bondslaves, both men and women, I will in those days pour forth of My Spirit and they shall prophesy. And I will grant wonders in the sky above, and signs on the earth beneath, blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and glorious day of the Lord shall come. And it shall be, that every one who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved."*

Now as far as the "blood and fire, vapor and smoke, and the moon turned to blood and the sun to darkness" --that has happened. If we study Matthew 24 and other such passages we find that this speech is often used to describe the destruction of a nation. The same speech was used in Isaiah 13:1ff which is speaking about the destruction of Babylon. In Matthew 24 it is the destruction of Jerusalem. When the Bible uses the words, "in the last days" we must ask, "Of what? The earth? Or the last days of the Jewish system?"

So when Peter quotes Joel's prophecy concerning the "last days", he's not speaking about the end of the world. Rather Peter stated that Joel's prophecy had then been fulfilled during the last days of the Jewish system. He says "I want you to realize what is happening. God is fulfilling His prophecy and confirming His word."

Now I want us to go into Corinthians because that's where most people have their major questions regarding tongues, and where the largest amount of discussion on the subject is considered. It is quite obvious to most Bible students that the Corinthians were greatly lacking in love. This can be clearly seen in the corrections they received from Paul in 1 Corinthians in every chapter. And because of their lack of love they held one man up above another. They refused to put away the evil and the disobedient; they would sue each other in courts of law. They were being unsubmitive to their husbands and treating their wives like rags. They were destroying their brethren eating things sacrificed to idols and more concerned about their stomach and their enjoyment than the soul of their brother. They were more concerned with their own Christian liberty now that they were free in Christ than being a slave to one another for the sake of Christ. They were having communion with idolaters. They were trying to be Christians and worship idols at the same time. And then again because of their lack of love they were abusing the Lord's Supper--not waiting for one another and so on and so forth. In Chapter 12 we see that they had a completely warped

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

concept of the Body life in Christ and felt that each of them was an island unto himself, that they did not need the local Body into which God had placed each one of them. This is a very important lesson, *"those members of the body which we deem less honorable on these we bestow more abundant honor and our unseemly members come to have more abundant seemliness"*.

In chapter 13, Paul speaks directly about love. He says that they can have all kinds of gifts--*"If I speak in tongues of men and of angels, but I do not have love I have become a noisy gong and a clanging cymbal. If I have the gift of prophecy and know all mysteries and I have all knowledge and if I have all faith as to move mountains but do not have love, I am nothing."* From these verses he is going to go on to share the contrasts between these gifts and love. They were priding themselves in their gifts and not in their love.

One question that needs to be answered is from 1 Cor.13:1. A lot of people say that this is where your "tongues of angels" comes from. But notice he didn't say he spoke in either tongues of men or angels at this point, although he will later on state that he speaks in tongues of men (chapter 14). But that's not his point in chapter 13. His point wasn't that he speaks in tongues of men or angels. Paul's point was *"even if I did and didn't have love, I am nothing"*. So what is he saying? *"If I have the gift of prophecy and know all mysteries and all knowledge"*, which he's gonna say he doesn't, (1 Cor.13:9,12), but *"if I did and have not love it still doesn't profit me anything."* That's his point. So what he was saying in verse 1 is *"even if I speak with"*, (and some versions will add `even if', or `though I' King James), *"tongues of men or of angels. He was elevating it saying "even if I spoke with angelic language and had not love, then I'm nothing!"* So Paul didn't say that he did in fact speak an angelic language, or that anybody else did! But if he did and didn't have love, it's worthless. You become a noisy gong and a clanging cymbal. Just an irritant. You become an irritation! That is all he is saying so far.

Now he continues to teach concerning what love is. Verse 3, *"And if I gave all my possessions to feed the poor, and if I deliver my body to be burned and I do not have love, it profits me nothing."* So Paul taught that love was doing, and giving, and feeding, and giving your body to be burned, but at the same time you can do all that without loving. You can do that for the praise of men as the Pharisees did in Matthew 6. And you'll get your reward, you'll get people to see you, and that's it. Paul will go on to tell us what love is. *"Love is patient, love is kind, and is not jealous; love does not brag and is not arrogant, does not act unbecomingly;..."* Donna does not seek her own, Kent is not provoked; Marie does not take into account a wrong suffered, John does not rejoice in unrighteousness, but rejoices with the truth; Mary bears all things, and believes all things, and hopes all things and endures all things. The Church never fails. We're supposed to love, right? Love never fails. That's why Paul is going to say, "Look, put your emphasis where it needs to be. You're worried about tongues; you're worried about prophecy. Put your emphasis where it needs to be. Love. Love never fails!"

Paul has told us why we should emphasize love. He has demonstrated it in verses 1-7. You must be concerned about love because if you don't have love, all these other things don't mean a thing; they are worthless; it profits you nothing. He's going to say, 4"love never fails"5, `but the things you put hope in--they're gonna fail!"

1 Corinthians 13:8-13 clinches the fact that there would be a time when tongues would end. *"Love never fails. But if there are gifts of prophecy, they will be done away with."* Isn't that what it says? When it says *"if there will be prophecies they will"*, (the King James says), *"fail."* It literally

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

means they will be done away with or fulfilled. The idea is completion. The idea is they are done away with because they have fulfilled their purpose. The New American Standard will say "*they will be done away*". So "*whether it be gifts of prophecy, it'll be done away with, tongues, they shall cease, whether it be knowledge, it'll be done away with*". Knowledge will be done away with? Yes, the revealed knowledge or revelation.

Another good verse to use with this thought is Ephesians 3:3-5. In these verses Paul said "*that by reading you may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ.*" Verse 5 goes on to say "*which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit*". How is revealed knowledge given? Through the Holy Spirit. To who? Unto his holy apostles and prophets, that's who.

But clearly from 1 Cor.13:8-10 there was going to come a time when the gifts of prophecy and tongues and knowledge will cease. When? Verse 9, "*for we know in part*", literally, "*for our knowledge is incomplete or imperfect*". The word there is the opposite of what he is going to say in verse 10. He's saying right then, (back in the early days of the Corinthian church), "*our knowledge is incomplete*", 'we don't know everything right now'. Now qualitatively did they have the Word of God? Yes! Quantitatively did they have all the Word of God? No! They were still getting revelation from God. For instance, in the early days of the New Testament church the apostles would establish a local church by baptizing a group of people, and then the apostles had to lay their hands on them before they left to make sure they had the gift of prophecy and revelation and the ability to speak in tongues, (which were given by the laying on of the apostles' hands).

Allow me to elaborate on that point a bit. Acts 8, Acts 19, and Acts 6 all demonstrate that through the laying on of the apostles' hands the gift of prophecy and/or tongues was given--gifts of the Holy Spirit were given through the laying on of the apostles' hands. Now those who claim to have such gifts today would have to have some pretty old apostles lying around, or they're pretty old themselves! Simon the Sorcerer went to Peter and John and asked them to lay their hands on him, he saw that through the laying on of the apostles hands the Holy Spirit was given, that is what the verse says. Philip was the one who converted the Samaritans in Acts 8. But he couldn't give them the Holy Spirit. And they couldn't receive Him by praying. Peter and John had to come up and give them the gift of prophecy. Is that why the denominations say you have to receive the Spirit today too? Yes, they're saying that because they want to go beyond the Bible. There's more to what they're doing than meets the eye. They need continued revelation to authorize their deviation from the Bible. If they have continued revelation and continuing gifts then they feel they've got authorization to go beyond what the New Testament Scriptures say. They can say the Holy Spirit is continuing to reveal new and different things to them. And that's why they have the gifts, it's more than what meets the eye.

Back to 1 Cor.13:9ff, "*For we know in part*", literally "*our knowledge is partial or imperfect or incomplete, and we prophecy imperfectly*" or *incompletely or partially*. It's the same word. Why didn't he mention tongues there? Because tongues wasn't a quantitative thing. Tongues confirmed what? The word. What was the word? The knowledge and the prophecy. Notice that tongues are sandwiched between prophecy and knowledge in verse 8. Why? You have to answer with Mark 16:20. Answer with Hebrews chapters 2, 3, 4. Answer with 1 Cor. 14:22. Because they are a sign to confirm the word. To confirm what word? The knowledge and the prophecy! That is why the tongues would end when the prophecy was completed. And notice that's the way it's worded too. It doesn't say, "prophecy will cease, tongues will cease, knowledge will cease", it says, "*prophecy will*

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

*be done away with, tongues will cease, knowledge will be done away with.*" Done away with, cease; one means "fulfilled" the other means "stop". Why aren't tongues mentioned as being partial? Because tongues were just speaking forth the glorious works of God, it was not quantitative. That is, it was not something to be fulfilled other than for the purpose of confirming the Word.

When they spoke in tongues was it so that others of different dialects would understand them? Yes, and as a sign to the unbelievers. Yet it was not for the purpose of speaking to others in their own language in order to communicate. All the Jews of Acts 2 spoke Hebrew, and the known world also spoke Greek at that time. Most of the people back then did speak several languages. Even the Galileans would have spoken at least two languages, Greek and Hebrew, because they were only allowed to speak Hebrew in the temple during the service. They could speak Aramaic amongst themselves and speak Greek in the world market. That's why you'll see Jesus speaking in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. When we read most of the New Testament Jesus is speaking most of that in Greek. He's not speaking Hebrew.

Let's get back into the text of 1 Cor.13:8ff. So *"we know in part and we prophecy incompletely."* Again I want to explain in verse 9 why Paul didn't mention tongues. Because tongues are not something you do in part or in whole. They were something you did to confirm the knowledge and the prophecy.

Verse 10, *"But when the perfect comes, then the partial will be done away with"*. See the word partial again there? It's the same word, by the way, as "in part" in verse 9. Somebody says--and most denominations say--that Jesus is "the perfect" here. They teach that when Jesus comes then the tongues and the prophecy will be done away with. The tongues and the prophecy and the knowledge. That's how some get their authority for tongues speaking today. They say, "the perfect there is Jesus, and the partial will be done away with when Jesus comes. So until the 2nd coming of Christ, tongues, prophecy, and knowledge will be around." And that's where they get their justification from.

Number one, the perfect is not a noun to describe a person, but a condition. It comes from the Greek word "tolelion", which means "complete or completeness; Maturity" It is the same word that is used in other passages talking about maturity or mature. To be a mature man is to be a "tolelion" man. If the verse was supposed to mean Jesus wouldn't it have said the perfect one? Yes, it would be more of a personal pronoun involved, but it isn't!

Read the verse in the context. *"Our knowledge is partial and our prophecy is partial, but when impartialness comes, the partiality is done away."* Read the 2 verses. Literally, the perfect there means impartial or perfect or complete. It is the opposite of the word partial. So what Paul is saying is that knowledge is going to cease, *"the knowledge is going to be done away with"* ...Why? Well look, *"we know in part, we prophecy in part"* right now, ("now" being in the 1st century). Because they had still, quantitatively, not received it all yet. Although qualitatively they did. *"But when completeness comes, when perfect comes, when maturity comes, when impartialness comes, the partial"* --WHAT WAS THE PARTIAL? THE KNOWLEDGE AND THE PROPHECY WAS PARTIAL, CORRECT? *"THEN THE PARTIAL WILL BE DONE AWAY WITH!"* This statement is so simple, yet people have made it say all kinds of things. By the way, that word for perfection does not mean without flaw. In our English vernacular we might think that it is talking about Jesus, being without flaw as "the perfect One". Some Pentecostal groups would say that, because our word for perfect concerns what? Not the amount!, but the quality. And that is not what this Greek word for

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

perfection means. This Greek word is talking about quantity, rather than quality. Because it's coming from God, it's qualitatively perfect too. But one thing is for certain, the "perfect" is not a person, (ie. Jesus), but rather a condition.

There is another position. Some people like it, I don't. I know a preacher who holds to this position. I don't agree with him. Some say that the perfect here is "love", "when love comes, the partial will be done away with." This doesn't make sense to me. They go through passages in the New Testament and show you how the perfect is love. "Perfect love and so forth in God and Christ..." Yet to do this violates what is actually being said in Greek in the verse. It violates the context. And not only that, it justifies the present day use of tongues, which the same preachers don't believe are for today. They say, "well, that's love. When love comes, perfect love, ... love comes and the partial will be done away." Okay, so what about a congregation that doesn't love? Then they get tongues? That's a terrible doctrine to have. Congregations will only have prophecy and knowledge when they don't have love?

Let me ask you something now. When are tongues going to end? When what comes? Completeness or maturity! When the impartialness is done away. Impartialness of what? Read the text, verse 9. When inspired knowledge and prophecy were completely given. In other words, the knowledge, the prophecy, and tongues will all have to end at the same time. When is that? When the knowledge and the prophecy are complete? Correct!

Let's see if Paul is talking about perfection as a person, (ie. Jesus), or as maturity. Which is he going to illustrate? That is the question. Wouldn't that be a logical question? Since there is discrepancy on it, is he talking about perfection as being maturity, like I say, or love as somebody else says, or Jesus as yet someone else says? Some people take a position, because they have been raised in Pentecostalism. They get converted, they want to hold to some old doctrines of Pentecostalism and they say this is Jesus and do you know what else they say? That this perfection is talking about Jesus, but that he came in AD70. So they still come up with ultimately the same final position. They come up with the position that tongues ended about AD70 or thereabouts toward the end of the 1st century. But how they got there was kind of like being able to hold on to this in the past and grasp that in the future and tie them together. I think they're just straining too much. They're going beyond what the text demands. Stay within the context and see if that's what Paul illustrates.

Lets see if Paul is illustrating Jesus as perfection, or maturity as perfection. Let's see if he is illustrating love as perfection, or maturity as perfection . I say he is illustrating maturity or completeness.

Verse 11, "*When I was a child, (that is immaturity), I used to speak as a child, think as a child, reason as a child. When I became a man, I did away with childish things.*" What is he saying then? What is his becoming a man equal to? "*When that which is perfect comes*", right? So what is his illustration of?, love or maturity?

By the way, did you happen to notice what Paul equated with childish things? The tongues, knowledge, and the prophecy are the childish things! Why are they called the childish things? Because these were the gifts of the Holy Spirit to the church while it was yet in its infancy stage. These were the gifts that were necessary to the growth and development of the newly formed, first century New Testament church. These gifts would continue until the church passed out of its

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

infancy stage around the time when the New Testament was completed. What is going to be done away with? Knowledge!, the revealed knowledge!, is a childish thing! Not that the knowledge is childish, but the revealing of it was in the infant stage of the church. The church didn't have a New Testament. For just about the first 70 years of the church there was no New Testament to carry around. The apostles were the New Testament? Yes, and the prophets, those the apostles laid their hands on, and their letters as they were being distributed, and the preachers who memorized what was being preached, and preached it. That was the first century New Testament.

Anyway, let's see if he is still talking about maturity or completeness in knowledge, or is he talking about love, or is he talking about Jesus. "*For we see in a mirror dimly*". In other words, it is not making complete sense. Ever look in a bathroom mirror after you've taken a shower? Its all steamed up, foggy, you can't see clearly. You can't see yourself very well. Do you see the analogy? The verse goes on to say, "*But then*", when? "*When the perfect comes*", when he "*becomes a man*". What is he illustrating? Maturity is the answer! The verse goes on to say, "*then face to face*". So there was going to be a time when we would see it clearly. Some people say, that is talking about Jesus, "face to face" with Jesus. But that is not right! Who do you see in a mirror? Yourself! What is James 1:24-25 talking about? God's word is a mirror, you can see your reflection in it. At that point, though, when 1 Corinthians was written, you couldn't see your spiritual reflection clearly. It was foggy, blurred, it was incomplete. "*But then, face to face! Now I know in part*", what is he talking about? Immaturity! "*My knowledge is immature, my knowledge is incomplete*". I'm not saying Paul was immature. I'm saying his knowledge was, or imperfect, or in part, or partial. That is what he himself says. "*But then*", when? When you see yourself *face to face*; when you *become a man and put away childish things*; when *that which is complete comes and the partial is done way with*; When the *tongues end*, although *love continues*.

Verse 12, "*Then I shall know fully just as also I have been fully known.*" What is he going to say? There was going to come a time when Paul would know the full revelation. And this will happen, at the end of his ministry. He will talk about the mystery that had been entrusted unto him and that he has entrusted unto Timothy and so forth, having received the complete revelation of God.

"*But now abides faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.*" Now the reason why the greatest of these is love is once you are in heaven you don't need faith and hope. Hope is swallowed up in reality, and faith is too. Faith is realized. Heaven is a reward of trust or faith.

By the way, if you don't love God, can you have faith? Our love of God, is what everything else is dependent upon. Living in the faith and being obedient to the faith, trusting God, and so forth. Many people say they have faith, but they really don't love God. They are fooling themselves, they are going through a ritual. Their religion is dead. They don't trust. They do not have faith! They say they do, they say they trust, but they really trust in themselves. But Paul is telling the Corinthians to `Put your hope in love! These other gifts are going to be done away with when they are made complete. These things are only going to last for a time during the childish stage of the church. But when the maturity comes, these things are going to fulfill their purpose!'

Now I put the question back to a Pentecostal minister if I'm studying with him. I say, "Can a person be a Christian today, and go to heaven, knowing all the will of God, with the Bible, without having tongues, revelation, or prophecy?" And nine times out of ten they say, "yes." And I say,

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

"case closed. Childish things have been done away with. We've got the maturity now. If we have the complete knowledge, I have all that I need right in the Bible to go to heaven and what you are saying is over and done with since the Bible was given. Amen! That is what I've been saying all the time."

Now let's look at Chapter 14. "*Pursue love*," isn't that Paul's point? That is what he says, "*Pursue love, yet desire earnestly spiritual gifts*". He is saying, 'now look, don't overreact.' Did they desire the spiritual gifts? They sure did. They desired them more than love. So he tells them, 'Look, pursue love, yet desire spiritual gifts. But especially that you may prophecy.' What was their thing? Speaking in tongues. All their problems come from their desire to speak in tongues. They were more concerned about speaking in tongues than learning the word of God. Instead of learning the word of God, which you do from prophesying, wouldn't you? Speaking in your own language to your people the word of God?! Know what they wanted to do? Speak in different languages. That was more exciting because that was more impressive to people. If all of a sudden I could just rattle off in Spanish, Chinese, or Russian tonight I could really impress you as opposed to just speaking in Kent's language as usual and saying this is what the Word of God says. That isn't as sensational. Can you see that? Maybe they were impressed by it themselves? That is what I'm saying, they were impressed by it, but for what purpose? They wanted to be impressive. You'll see that more clearly as we go on. Was their interest from what we've already seen in chapters 13 and 14 love?, or was it spiritual gifts, prophecy, and speaking in tongues and so forth? Not love! And he told them, "*if I do these things and I don't have love, I'm nothing*". But "*love never fails*". "*Pursue love!*" "*But now abide these three, faith, hope and love, the greatest of these is love*".

1 Corinthians 14 and verse 1, "*Pursue love, yet earnestly desire spiritual gifts but especially that you may prophecy*". Take these in their context, look at the chapter, look at the setting in which it is, in the present tense that Paul is writing to the Corinthians. Did Paul have all prophecy? No! Then was tongues to be spiritual gifts still in force at the time he is writing? Yes! Why? Did they have a New Testament written? No! What was their New Testament? The revelation and prophecy that was given! They'd be foolish not to "desire the spiritual gifts." They would have to desire the spiritual gifts. For what purpose were spiritual gifts given? To confirm the word and to give the word! To give the word and to confirm it!

"*But especially that you may prophesy*"...Why? Because they needed revelation. They needed direction and guidance. They needed to speak forth the Word of God.

1 Corinthians 14 is the primary text which Pentecostals go to for justification of the speaking in "tongues" today. Yet it teaches just the opposite of what they go to it for! Chapter 14 will be a general correction and condemnation of the abuses of tongues. The Apostle Paul is going to tell them that they better not speak in tongues except in the case when unbelievers are present. What today's "tongue" speakers are doing is pulling everything out of context using the verses to say the exact opposite of their obvious intended meaning.

Why does Paul tell them to "*desire spiritual gifts, but especially that you may prophesy*"? What are most Pentecostal groups trying to do? Not prophesy! They're trying to speak in tongues. Why? Because even they themselves realize that they have the prophesy of God in the Word of God, the Bible. Most Pentecostals will first admit that the Bible is all we need. But once they say that, they have also unwittingly admitted that the inspired knowledge through prophesy has been made perfect or complete, (2 Peter 1:3; Jude 3; 2 Timothy 3:16,17; Revelation 22:18ff). Here's the

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

argument: Ask a Pentecostal, "Is the Bible all we need?" Most of them will say, "Yes." When they say yes, then they're saying that we don't need prophecy today because prophecy was to give us the Word of God!, (Ephesians 3:5).

When prophecy ended, so did tongues, that's just what 1 Corinthians 13:8 says! If we've received all the knowledge we need, then tongues have ceased as well. Tongues were a sign to confirm the Word, as the Word was given, and were not to continue through the centuries. Once the Word was confirmed, it is always confirmed. You don't see God still turning rods into snakes, do you? He did that with Moses to confirm the fact that Moses was speaking from God. You don't see pillars of smoke and fire today or God still confirming Moses' word! Why? Because Moses' word was confirmed when Moses preached it! You don't see God confirming Jesus and His apostles word today. Why? Because He confirmed it when they preached it. You could see that confirmation when Jesus and His apostles and prophets were speaking their message. That is why John said in John 20:30, "*Many other things Jesus did in the presence of His disciples which are not recorded in this book. But these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing you may have life in His name*".

Let's continue with verse 2 of 1 Corinthians 14. "*For anyone who speaks in a tongue does not speak to men but to God; for no one understands, but in his spirit he speaks mysteries.*" Let's back up to verse one for a moment. Paul just finished telling them "*Pursue love*". What do you do when you pursue love? You keep after it--he says be relentless about practicing love. Yet desire spiritual gifts. It doesn't say pursue spiritual gifts. This shows a contrast of interest between tongues and love.

"*But especially that you may prophesy.*" Why? "*The one who speaks in a tongue does not speak to men but to God. Indeed, no one understands him; he utters mysteries with his spirit.*" What Paul was saying here is that this is what the Corinthians were doing! He is stating their abuse, and you have to get that down! In v.2 he was not saying what should actually happen when one spoke in tongues. He was describing what was indeed happening when they, the Corinthians, were doing it. This is the way they were doing it! But Paul corrects them on this point as he progresses through the chapter. His point was, "if nobody understands you, then shut up!"

A number of people today will use verse 2 to say, "we're not speaking to men, but to God". When one corrects them saying, "there is no one interpreting", or "you are not using the language of man (Acts 2:5-11)" they say they are not using the language of man. I say then, lets go to Acts 2 and see that they were speaking men's languages. According to their doctrine, are they speaking the language of God or of man? The Biblical practice of tongues was speaking in a LANGUAGE, a known language, a knowable language of man!

When Paul said to the Corinthians, "*when you speak in tongues, you are not speaking to man but to God,*" he is STATING WHAT THEY WERE DOING! But he was not saying it was the right thing to do! Just as in chapter 11 of 1 Corinthians he says "*when you gather together, it is not to take the Lord's Supper, for as you eat, each of you goes ahead without waiting for anybody else. One remains hungry, another gets drunk.*" What was he stating? How they should do the Lord's Supper? No!

And so in 1 Corinthians 14 Paul is stating what they were doing, their abuse! Now he is going to correct it with the next verse. So he is stating their abuse, telling them, "Look, go after

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

prophecy.' Why? `Because the way you are speaking in tongues, nobody understands what your saying!' When you speak in mysteries you are speaking something which is hidden. BUT, in contrast to that, "*the one who prophesies speaks to men for edification, exhortation, and consultation*". Why does he say to go after prophecy? Because they were jabbering in tongues and no one was getting edified! So what is verse 2? Verse 2 is a STATEMENT OF THEIR ABUSE. What do Pentecostals use it for? A statement of condoned practice by God. When will they learn?

Verse 3, "*The one who prophesies speaks to men for edification and exhortation and consolation. One who speaks in a tongue edifies himself; but one who prophesies edifies the church.*" Again, Paul is stating the abuse in verse 4-- "4the one who speaks in a tongue edifies himself5". Somebody says, "well, we speak in tongues." So I say, "why are you speaking in tongues if there are no unbelievers?" They say, "because I get edified". I say "you are not supposed to get edified yourself"; (Paul will state all through the chapter, their abuse, and then the correction). Verse 4a, "*The one who speaks in a tongue edifies himself*". Now Paul is going to correct this evil concept; it is a concept that has no love; this edifying yourself!

Verse 4B, "*But the one who prophesies edifies the church.*" Why? What is prophecy? The message of God. Do you prophesy in tongues? NO! It is speaking forth the Word of God. What is he telling them to do? `Shut up! Stop babbling and jabbering and start prophesying--you need the Word of God!' Isn't that what the Apostle Paul is saying?

Verse 5a, "*Now I wish that you all spoke in tongues, but EVEN MORE that you would prophesy*". So what do Pentecostals do? They say Paul is saying, `I wish you all would speak in tongues.' Isn't that wonderful? They don't realize he is saying, `Hey, look, I want you to prophesy more than I want you to speak in tongues!'

Verse 5b, "*And greater is one who prophesies than one who speaks in tongues unless he interprets, so that the church may receive edifying.*" In other words you don't speak in tongues unless you interpret, that the church can be built up. Even still that's not the purpose of tongues. The point is this. Is the purpose of tongues for edifying? No! But if you do it, you still must interpret that somebody else can be edified.

Verse 6a, "*But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking in tongues what shall it profit you?*" Paul's point is, "*nothing*"! He will profit me nothing by speaking in tongues!

Verse 6B, "*Unless I speak to you either by way of revelation or of knowledge or of prophecy or of teaching?*" That's what I need to speak to you, and I have all that in the Bible alone! Paul is saying unless I come to you with revelation or knowledge or prophecy it's NOTHING! In other words you profit nothing through tongues. Pentecostal groups will say, "didn't God bless us? The Holy Spirit was upon us and we had many slain in the spirit." And the point is, that's not the point of tongues at all!

Verse 7, "*Yet even lifeless things, either flute or harp, in producing a sound, if they do not produce a distinction in the tones, how will it be known what is played on the flute or on the harp?*" Paul is saying, `make sure people understand what you are saying!' Make sure there is a distinct sound in your speaking so that people can clearly understand you." What is he illustrating here? They were making alot of noise and no sense, and the only person being edified was the one speaking.

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain References written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

Verse 8, "*For if the bugle produces an indistinct sound, who will prepare himself for battle?*" Nobody knows that is going on! Verse 9, "*So also you, unless you utter by the tongue speech that is clear, how will it be known what is spoken? For you will be speaking into the air.*" So in all actuality it is not to God, but to the AIR that they are speaking! Therefore, this verse better helps us to understand that the point made in verse 2 of this chapter was that since no one else could understand you only God knows what's coming out of your mouth, and that was not the right or proper thing to do!

Verse 10, "*There are, perhaps, a great many kinds of languages (or tongues) in the world,*" What kind of language is he talking about? God's tongues? NO! "languages in the world". "*And NO KIND IS WITHOUT MEANING.*" The reason I'm stressing this so strongly is because of today's "tongue speaker's" claim to be speaking in tongues of angels or of God. Experts have attempted to analyze it on a computer as a language. The conclusion reached is that today's tongues are not a language of any kind. There is no structure, pattern, or order. It is just vain gibberish and babbling. And now let's apply verse 10 and note that "*there is no tongue*", (true tongues, that is), "*without meaning!*" What do some groups say they speak? "Tongues of angels or of God." Where do they get that from? From the fact that the tongues they speak are without meaning except to them! But there is no true Bible tongue without meaning!,(verse 10).

Verse 11, "*If then I do not know the meaning of the language, I shall be to the one who speaks a barbarian, (or a foreigner) and the one who speaks will be a barbarian to me.*" Paul is saying, `if you don't know me from a hole in the wall, and I speak another language, it doesn't accomplish any good. You haven't proven a thing to me!"

Verse 12, "*So also you,*" (he is giving the correction just like in v.9) "*since you are zealous of spiritual gifts,*" (they weren't zealous for love. Paul had to tell them "*pursue love, be zealous for love*"), "*seek to abound for the edification of the church.*" `Since you are zealous for spiritual gifts, seek the spiritual gifts that make for edification! Which gifts are they? He'll tell you in verses 3,5,12,13,22,26... "*prophesy! and not tongues!*" So don't seek after tongues then. And in contrast to that he says, "*but the one who speaks in tongues, doesn't speak to men but to God and no one understands him but in his spirit he speaks mysteries.*" The Pentecostals use this to justify speaking in mysteries, but by now you should be able to see that Paul was saying their practice in verse 2 was wrong.

Verse 13, "*Therefore let one who speaks in a tongue pray that he may interpret.*" Interpretation must follow speaking in tongues. Keep this in mind as well. The tongue, in order for it to be a sign to an unbeliever must be accompanied by certain conditions. The unbeliever must first of all know the tongue speaker, just as in Acts 2:7, the Jews there said "*aren't all these who are speaking Galileans?*". You have to know the speaker didn't know or study the language in order for it to be a sign. I would also have to know that he is speaking my language or another specific language and not just babbling. I'd have to be able to understand what is said, would I not, for it to be a sign to me? That is exactly what Paul is going to say, `Without an unbeliever present for tongues to be a sign to, you should not do it.' And if an unbeliever is there and he doesn't know you or what you are saying, Paul says, "*be quiet*", shut up, because "*he is going to say your are crazy!*" Which is exactly what happens when a rational person walks into Pentecostal churches! Creedmore Institution is half empty not because there are not anymore crazies out there, but because they are in Pentecostal churches. It's true! You have a whole society out there that hears voices telling them

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain References written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

what color dresses to wear to work and they're getting all kinds of visions! Fifteen, twenty years ago they would have been getting some good psychiatric help. There are people who are prone to that direction and are now being fed and encouraged in that direction. And the sad thing is that Paul was really teaching exactly opposite to the points some people see today.

Verse 14, "*For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my mind is unfruitful.*" That was another abuse. He says praying in tongues is useless, or "unfruitful," without any kind of interpretation. Why? Spiritually, there was something going on there, the Holy Spirit was there. Paul said their spirit was praying, and they were praying in tongues, but their mind was unfruitful. Is Paul glad about that? Or was he trying to teach them to do the opposite? Does he want them to have a fruitful understanding? Of course! Well then, how? By not speaking in a language you don't understand!

Verse 15, "*What is the outcome then? I shall pray with the spirit and I shall pray with the mind also.*" What he's saying is, 'I'm not going to pray in tongues!' "*I shall sing with the spirit and I shall sing with the mind also*", or with "*the understanding*," (King James version). He's saying you can sing and pray and do it in your own language, do it with your understanding and not in tongues!

Verse 16, "*Otherwise if you bless in the spirit only*", (that is without any understanding and in tongues), "*how will the one who fills the place of the ungifted say the "Amen" at your giving of thanks, since he does not know what you are saying?*" Paul's saying, "*I'm going to pray with the spirit and pray with understanding and I'm going to sing with the spirit and sing with understanding*" -- 'I'M NOT GOING TO DO IT IN TONGUES!'

What do Pentecostals get out of that verse? "Do it in tongues!" They have gotten the exact opposite of its clearly intended meaning! They think singing with the understanding and praying with the understanding are done in tongues. That is not what Paul was teaching. He clearly says you can't do that. He says that unless one interprets when one does speak in a language it is useless. And in verses 15 and 16 he is drawing a contrast between singing and praying in a foreign language and singing and praying in your own language. He said, 'I'm going to do it in my own language.'

Verse 17, "*For you are giving thanks well enough, but the other man is not edified.*" Is he talking about tongues? Yes. What happens when you give thanks in tongues? The other man is not edified. But verses 3, 5, and 12 clearly state that we are to seek for those things which edify the church. The Pentecostal church claims it is edified with speaking in tongues, but true edification for the Lord's church comes with understanding, not with ignorance. Edification for the Pentecostals comes from mysteries, from ignorance. You try and figure that out.

Verse 18-19, "*I thank God, I speak in tongues more than you all: however, in the church I desire to speak five words with my mind, that I may instruct others also, rather than ten thousand words in a tongue.*" So speaking with the mind is identified as or equated with not speaking in tongues! Speaking with tongues is contrasted with having understanding.

So what was he saying when he said, "*I thank God I speak tongues more than you all*"? Do you know why he said that? Because they were boasting that they were greater than Paul. They were all puffed up (in Second Corinthians you'll notice that). They thought they were more spiritual than Paul. He thanks God he speaks in tongues more than all of them. But why would he need to speak in tongues? Because he went around the whole world establishing churches. But in the church

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

what would he rather speak? In his own language! In a language everybody understands. So when he goes to other nations that have their own home dialect (glossa) the sign to them was the gift of tongues. But in the church what would he rather do? Speak in tongues? No! Would the Pentecostals rather speak in tongues? Yes! Obviously Paul wasn't a member of today's Pentecostal church.

V.20, "*Brethren, do not be children in your thinking; yet in evil be babes, but in your thinking be mature.*" `Wise up!"

Verse 21, "*In the Law it is written, `By men of strange tongues and by the lips of strangers I will speak to this people, and even so they will not listen to me,' says the Lord.*" He was talking about Gentiles speaking to Jews, and preaching the Gospel, and still they wouldn't listen, (a reference to the Assyrian captivity). What is verse 21 talking about? He's saying tongues are a sign to convince people, its a "sign to unbelievers." You're preaching the word to them and they won't believe, most of them won't believe. The point is verse 22, "***So then tongues are for a sign, not to those who believe, but to unbelievers; but prophecy is for a sign, not to unbelievers, but to those who believe.***" So when an unbeliever comes around you don't start by prophesying, because they don't believe; there is no sign in that, there is no proof. Did Peter prophecy in Acts 2? Yes, only after he spoke in tongues. The word that he was about to speak in prophecy was confirmed with a sign--tongues!

Verse 23-25, "*If therefore the whole church should assemble together and all speak in tongues, and ungifted men or unbelievers enter, will they not say that you are mad?*" The unbeliever will say you are nuts, this is gibberish! "*But if all prophesy*", (that is speaking the word of God where they can understand it), "*and an unbeliever or an ungifted man enters, he is called to account by all; the secrets of his heart are disclosed*", By what? The Word! The Word is able to judge the thoughts and intentions of the heart, Heb. 4:12, "*and so he will fall on his face and worship God, declaring that God is certainly among you.*"

Verse 26-28, "*What is the outcome then, brethren?*" Now he has stated all their abuses and the corrections for these things. What is your action supposed to be--"*When you assemble, each one has a psalm, has a teaching, has a revelation, has a tongue, has an interpretation. Let all things be done for edification.*" What have we learned about tongues? They are hardly edifying at all. "*If anyone speaks in a tongue, it should be by two or at the most three, and each in turn, and let one interpret*". Is this what you have in the Pentecostal church today? No! "*But if there is no interpreter, let him keep silent in the church; and let him speak to himself and to God.*" `Keep it to yourself!' Pentecostals use this verse to say is, "I'm not speaking to men, I'm speaking to God and myself." But Paul was saying in contrast to that, instead of speaking in tongues "*let him speak silently to God and himself, let him keep silent in the church.*"

Verse 29, "*And let two or three prophets speak, and let the others pass judgment.*" That judgement was to be passed on what they just said. A Christian needs to pass judgement by the way. You need to judge if it is, in fact, the Word of God. When I speak forth the Word of God from the pulpit, don't you judge if that is the Bible or not? Don't I ask you to look at the verse? Don't you see whether it's in the Bible or not? "*Let the others pass judgment*". That doesn't mean--"well, we'll decide later whether or not we're going to accept that"--you are passing judgment on whether or not its the Word of God. Others had the gift of prophecy as well. They could tell if it matched up exactly with the truth. You would compare it to what you've heard before to see whether it was consistent with the rest of the Word of God. At that time there was the gift of the discerning of

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain references written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

spirits as well as other gifts they had also. This could have also been quite helpful in passing judgement accurately on both the speaker as well as on what was spoken.

Verse 30, "*But if a revelation is made to another who is seated, let the first keep silent*". In this situation the Holy Spirit was working through some person, he was prophesying the Word of God and then there's a revelation made known to another person. So the second person stands up and the first one is to sit down. The point is, you had control. It wasn't that they didn't have control and suddenly stood up and started quoting 2 Timothy 3:16, "*All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for...*" It didn't go like that. There was none of this, "I couldn't help myself, the Spirit got control and took me over." We're going to see why not in a minute.

Verse 31, "*For you can all prophesy one by one so that all may learn and all may be exhorted.*" There's love again, isn't it? Where are all the tongues?

Verse 32, "*And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets;*" (prophets are in control of themselves!) Don't tell me you don't have control. "I just couldn't help myself, I didn't know what I was doing. I ran around the auditorium three times..." Wait a minute, I thought you didn't know what you were doing? How did you know it was three times? "I couldn't control myself..." Well if that was the case, then it wasn't the Spirit of God! Paul's argument is that "*the spirits of the prophets are subject unto the prophets. For God is not a God of confusion, but of peace as in all the churches of the saints.*" What would you call what you see in the Pentecostal churches today? Confusion! You know God is not the author of that. God is not behind that! Is God behind tongues that are being spoken today? No way. If there is Bible tongues for today, they sure aren't being spoken!

And then here's another beautiful thing some choose to ignore. This is still pertaining to tongues and prophets. Verse 34-35, "*Let the women keep silent in the churches, for they are not permitted to speak, but let them subject themselves, just as the Law also says. And if they desire to learn anything, let them ask their own husbands*" (literally, "men") *at home; for it is improper for a woman to speak in church*". Well, that must mean that if you are not married you can jump up then? Right? No! "Ask your man" at home whether it be a brother, husband, father, uncle. In the context what is that word "speak" involving? Prophesying, preaching, revelation or tongues!

Verse 36, "*Was it from you that the Word of God first went forth? Or has it come to you only?*" Neither one of those questions can be answered "yes". Number one, it didn't come from them, and number two it didn't go to them only. Why did Paul ask that? Because that was the Corinthians' immature, ungodly response. They thought the Word of God originated with them, or so they behaved. You would think that from the way they were behaving. Their response would be to indignantly say "wait a minute, is he saying we're not Christians? We have the gifts of God here! What is this, he's saying we're improper?" So Paul asks, "*did the Word of God come from you?*" No! Who brought it to you? 'I did', Paul reminds of this fact with this question. "*Did it come to you only?*" No, it was proclaimed in all the world! 'Get off your high horse! Don't say you can't control it, and don't say that you were the only one that had it or that you are this great source of spiritual leadership for the whole church to look at.'

Verse 37-38, "*If any one thinks he is a prophet or spiritual, let him recognize that the things which I write to you are the Lord's commandment. But if any one does not recognize this*" -- God will still accept him, right? Wrong!-- "*he is not recognized! Therefore, my brethren, desire earnestly*

The following is another of many topical studies and Biblical Chain References written by Dr. Kent A. Field starting in 1976 to the present day. Do you question the validity of topical studies? Think again! Consider the very purpose of the New Testament Letters. The Book of 1John was a topical study combating Gnosticism; Galatians combats the binding of circumcision; and so on...

*to prophesy, and do not forbid to speak in tongues. But let all things be done properly and in an orderly manner.*" What do the Pentecostals do? They quote verse 39 which says, "do not forbid to speak in tongues" and forget about the rest of the chapter that tells them how to do it, when to do it, where to do it, and what it was for and how long it (tongues), would continue. What are they doing today? Are they speaking Biblical tongues? No!

From this study it would be fair and accurate to conclude that tongues were given by God, as a sign to unbelievers, to confirm the Word being revealed in the first century; that there was a time when the gift of tongues was to cease, and that time was when God had completely revealed His will as it is now recorded for us in the New Testament. We must therefore also Biblically conclude that what is being spoken today is babbling gibberish brought on by, at best, a hyper-emotionalism, and not the Holy Spirit. "For God is not the author of confusion, but of peace in all the churches of the saints."