

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??****1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??, on: 2007/5/10 19:52**

Many of you on this site are so incredibly knowledgeable in the Scriptures. I am studying this out myself, but I would value input from those of you who would care to comment.

1 Cor. 14:1 (KJV) Follow after charity, and desire spiritual , but rather that ye may prophesy.

When I look in the interlinear, "gifts" is not there. It would seem that it should read "desire that which is spiritual" or something like that. Why was the word gifts inserted here?

I'm not trying to prove or disprove anything. Just looking for truth.

Dani

Re: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts?? - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/10 20:38

It's simply an insert by translators to help bring clarity to the sentence's flow. Translating it word for word, one could also say: "...and desire spiritual ." Then one could ask, what spiritual things? And in the context of the passage, it is easy inferred the "things" he is talking about in this passage are the gifts of the Spirit.

Re: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??, on: 2007/5/10 21:44

I've been struggling with questions like this myself.

I think it helps to keep the scripture in context by remembering that Paul was writing to former polytheists in Corinth who, I've read elsewhere, worshipped Diana before Jesus.

Consider four chapters before the scripture you cited Paul speaks of his liberty to partake of food offered to idols... to win the heathen to his cause... and to refrain from eating things sacrificed to idols if there's someone nearby he knows might be offended - like a Jew (I COR 10:27).

"Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God: **Even as I please all men in all things, not seeking mine own profit, but the profit of many, that they might be saved.**" (I COR 10:32-33)

If Paul was interacting with the idolatrous heathen, and desperately trying not to offend them by refusing what they offered foodwise - it follows that he was exercising grace, by letting some of their idolatrous behaviour slip, to win them to Christ's cause.

The infamous Oracle of Delphi was the center of the Cult of Diana. There, a virgin priestess would do certain drugs and/or breath in sulfuric fumes from a crack in the ground below the temple. She would foam at the mouth, utter words (prophecy) that no one could understand - but her priests would decipher and interpret.

Therefore, to appease the new converts, he allowed them to speak in tongues:

"He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth edifieth the whole church." (I COR 14:4)

But with subtlety suggests:

"...if I know the not the meaning of a voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian unto me." (I COR 14:11)

He points out the vanity of speaking in unknown tongues:

"For if I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with t

he spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." (I COR 14:14-15)

He then points out that speaking in unknown tongues was a sign for the Jews, not for them, and therefore, they should focus on prophecy, not tongues:

"In the law it is written, WITH MEN OF OTHER TONGUES AND OTHER LIPS WILL I SPEAK UNTO THIS PEOPLE; AND YET FOR ALL THAT WILL THEY NOT HEAR ME, SAITH THE LORD. Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe." (I COR 14:21-22)

Which takes us back to Acts, where the apostles, and the believers...

"...were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because every man heard them speak in his own language." (ACTS 2:4-6)

(Consider the difference between speaking in unintelligible glossolalia vs. speaking the gospel and it comes out in Mandarin for a Chinese fellow, or Swahili for an African woman.)

Then, subtle Paul once again states the dangers of these (meaningless) kinds of tongues again,

"If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?" (I COR 14:23)

He again points to the superiority of prophecy (the preaching of scripture, exhorting and encouraging the believers),

"But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all..." (I COR 14:24)

But, since these ex-cultists still hold to these bad habits, he suffers them to continue speaking in tongues, but only in order, and only with an interpreter (I COR 27). Otherwise, whoever wishes to speak in tongues must remain silent (because it's meaningless gibberish).

Would the Holy Ghost be making all these people speak chaotically meaningless gibberish - in the presence of God (who is not the author of confusion)? For...

"...God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." (I COR 14:33)

To tie all of this in with Diana, and her virgin priestesses-turned-Christians, near the end of the chapter he says,

"Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." (I COR 14:34-35)

Of course, someone is bound to point out that Paul spoke in tongues,

"I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all: Yet in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue." (I COR 14:18-19)

Being a learned Pharisee, and a free Citizen of Rome I assume he knew Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin, and maybe a few other languages - probably far more than any of the folks at Corinth. Being Christ's ambassador to the Gentiles, who knows how he could speak while under the influence of the Holy Ghost?

I, for one, think this scripture is taken way, way, way out of context by those who would make it doctrine.

That's my understanding. I hope it helps. But don't take my word for it - and no one else's, either. Read your Bible. Do yo

ur own research. And pray to Jesus that the Holy Ghost reveals the truth to you.

God Bless You in your search, brother.

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 18:54

Corey H said

Quote:

-----Then, subtle Paul once again states the dangers of these (meaningless) kinds of tongues again,

"If therefore the whole church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?" (I COR 14:23)

He again points to the superiority of prophecy (the preaching of scripture, exhorting and encouraging the believers),

"But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all..." (I COR 14:24)

But, since these ex-cultists still hold to these bad habits, he suffers them to continue speaking in tongues, but only in order, and only with an interpreter (I COR 27). Otherwise, whoever wishes to speak in tongues must remain silent (because it's meaningless gibberish).

Would the Holy Ghost be making all these people speak chaotically meaningless gibberish - in the presence of God (who is not the author of confusion ? For...

"...God is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints." (I COR 14:33)

Bro Corey, where did you get the idea that uninterpreted tongues is "meaningless gibberish", or "chaotic"? I find it even more strange that you suggest that Paul allowed the Corinthians to carry on this, frankly and obviously demonic, aspect of heathern practice! Eating food offered to idols was a different matter, and could be allowed as long as the person wa sn't being tempted back into idolatry.

In 1Corinthians 12 he makes a clear distinction between the "heathen" version of tongues and the Holy Spirit inspired ve rsion. There is no suggestion that any of it is gibberish, only that one must take heed to the **spirit** that is operating in the utterance.

*"Now ﻿concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I do not want you to be ignorant: ﻿2﻿ You know ﻿﻿that ﻿﻿you were Gentiles, carried away to these ﻿dumb ﻿﻿idol s, however you were led. ﻿3﻿ Therefore I make known to you that **no one speaking by the Spirit of God calls Jesus ﻿accursed, and ﻿no one can say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit.***
(The New King James Version)

In other words, "tongues" spoken by someone under demon influence is totally different from an utterance in the HOLY Spirit. Someone inspired by an alien spirit is also not willing to worship Jesus as Lord. As you say, the Corinthians would have been familiar with this false tongues, and needed to know how to distinguish between that and the genuine. Which is one of the aims of 1Corinthians 12-14.

Of course, any foreign language will seem "meaningless gibberish" if you don't understand it. That's why, as you mentioned, Paul seeks to regulate the use of this gift when there are those present who would find this confusing or disturbing. And with interpretation, as you say, the church is built up.

It sounds as if you have never heard (or maybe never really *listened* to?) someone exercising the genuine Holy Spirit gift. There are words, phrases, sentences, intonation and expression, change of pace and emphasis. In fact, just like any regular language would sound if you didn't understand it.

I have only heard demonic tongues once or twice, but it was so horrible I didn't want to listen long enough to notice if there were words in it. There probably were!

I suppose someone *trying* to do what they imagined was speaking in tongues might start spouting gibberish, or copying other people's words. But that's not true tongues.

In Him

Jeannette

Re: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??, on: 2007/5/11 19:21

Quote:

dclovesjesus wrote:

Many of you on this site are so incredibly knowledgeable in the Scriptures. I am studying this out myself, but I would value input from those of you who would care to comment.

1 Cor. 14:1 (KJV) Follow after charity, and desire spiritual , but rather that ye may prophesy.

When I look in the interlinear, "gifts" is not there. It would seem that it should read "desire that which is spiritual" or something like that. Why was the word gifts inserted here?

I'm not trying to prove or disprove anything. Just looking for truth.

Dani

I have posted this before but for the new ones perhaps it is time to post it again.

FWIW, I know this is the way to satisfaction.

JESUS CHRIST, THE BAPTIZER

“THERE WAS A MAN SENT FROM GOD, whose name was John. . . . The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.... And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him.

“And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining upon him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

“And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God” (John 1:6, 29, 32—34).

Every one of the four Gospels spells out John’s declaration, “I indeed baptize you with water; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.” When the Pharisees asked, “Why baptizeth thou?” he replied, “That he should be made manifest. . . therefore I am come baptizing with water” (John 1: 25, 31). Furthermore, John assured them that he was sent to baptize with water (vs. 33). It was his ministry. This fact was recognized to such an extent that he became known as “John the Baptist.”

I doubt whether one could find a ten-year-old in Christendom that has not yet learned about John the Baptist. All through the ages, generation after generation, men have learned of this great prophet, but they know him by what he did and not by what he said or prophesied. Yet we know that he was both prophet and baptizer.

In recent times I have been astonished to find that very few Christians have ever heard that Christ is the baptizer in the Holy Ghost. They know Him as the Lamb of God, as Saviour; and as the Son of God, our Lord; but they are unfamiliar with the fact that He was announced to the world as the One to whom God gave the ministry of baptizing with the Holy Ghost.

Jesus Christ is both Saviour and Baptizer. We have no doubt that He is as much the Saviour today as when He died on Calvary as the Lamb of God. Even so, He is still the Baptizer in the Holy Spirit as much as He was when He commenced this ministry on the Day of Pentecost, for He is the “same, yesterday, today and forever.”

I have just traveled in seven countries and addressed over 300 ministers belonging to seven of the major classical Protestant churches. During these three months I have read a great variety of ecclesiastical writings, touching upon almost every subject and event between Easter and Pentecost. From Ascension to Pentecost. I have listened to many radio talks in several languages. Not once did I hear a minister, see in a paper, or hear over the radio any mention that Christ baptized with the Holy Spirit. In conversations many that questioned me or spoke to me expressed some surprise at my strong emphasis upon the message that Christ is the Baptizer in the Spirit. I have heard much about the work of the Spirit, about receiving the Spirit, and even about the coming of the Spirit, but nothing is ever said about being baptized with the Spirit.

The first intimation in history that a baptism with the Spirit was a possible event in the life of a human being came from John the Baptist. However, he did not announce the experience but rather the one who gave such an experience. He announced that the Baptizer was coming. He clearly states that God had told him that Christ would be the Baptizer with the Holy Ghost. He also assures us that the image for this act of Christ was his own act of baptizing in the river. From the very beginning, therefore, all John's converts fully expected an experience that would be as overwhelming as their baptism in the river. These converts had an encounter with the baptizer and not with water or even the river. What they were to expect was an encounter with the Baptizer in the Holy Spirit and not with the Spirit or with the work of the Spirit in their lives.

For every baptism there must be an agent to baptize, and an element with or into which to baptize, and finally a candidate to be baptized. Such a candidate must present himself and ask for baptism. Then there must be a total and complete surrender to the baptizer and not to the element in which he baptizes. The baptism in the Holy Spirit is an encounter with Christ, the Baptizer. The candidates are those who have already had an encounter with Him as the Lamb of God, the Saviour, who took away all their sin and made them worthy temples of the Holy Spirit.

The disciples who left John and followed Christ that He might baptize them with the Holy Spirit discovered that He was full of the Spirit. They saw His miracles to prove it and heard His word to confirm it. Then He gave them power and authority to cast out devils and heal the sick, but that was not the baptism in the Spirit that they expected. Finally they saw Him weak and as a Lamb led to the slaughter, and He opened not His mouth. He died on the cross and was laid in the tomb, and no one had been baptized in the Spirit. What about John's prophecy? Was it all mythical or mystical?

In the evening of that first Easter day of Resurrection, He suddenly and unexpectedly appeared in their midst. Then He breathed on them and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." This was after He had explained, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." But how did His Father send Him? First He came, born of the Spirit (Luke 1:35), and then He was endued with the Spirit (Luke 4: 1) to commence His earthly ministry. So here the disciples became the very first members of a new body, the church. He breathed eternal life into them. Calvary, the all-effective altar of God, had dealt with the sin question, and those who were dead in trespasses and sin now could receive the life-giving, regenerating Holy Spirit. This was for them the occasion where they were baptized into one body by the Spirit (I Cor.12:13).

But John said that God had said that Jesus would baptize with the Spirit, not that He would give the Spirit. I wonder how these disciples thought and felt about all these strange things? However, a few weeks later Jesus again spoke to the same men to whom He had said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Now He confirms John's message. He says to them, "John truly baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts 1: 5). Here Christ accepts and confirms the same image that God had given to John, a baptism in water and a baptism in the Holy Spirit—indeed a river baptism, but the river of life must first begin to flow upon earth.

Several predictions were confirmed on the Day of Pentecost. The Father gave the promised Holy Ghost, who was heard as wind and seen as fire. Jesus began to baptize in the Spirit and fire. The immediate consequence of this baptism was that the candidates began to speak with other tongues as Jesus had promised (Mark 16: 17). Then the Holy Spirit began to convict of sin, righteousness and judgment as Peter preached to the multitude (John 16:8). But the record says, "They were all filled {overflowed with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts2:4).

It seems that from this very day onward much more emphasis was given to the experience of the disciple

s than to the act of Jesus the Baptizer, and the whole controversy began to revolve around glossolalia—speaking with other tongues—which was the very simple consequence of this baptism in the Spirit. The Holy Spirit was the gift and tongues was the consequence. These tongues were a manifestation of the Holy Spirit and not a manifestation of the ecstasy of the human spirit. Speaking in tongues by the Holy Spirit or, as Paul puts it, “Praying with the Spirit,” is an act of the Holy Spirit upon the human spirit which transcends the understanding (I Cor.14: 14, 15).

Thus it seems clear that on the day of Pentecost the spirit of the disciples was baptized into the Holy Spirit and their bodies were filled with the Holy Spirit—overflowed with the Holy Spirit. The fact that they commenced to speak “with the Spirit” was proof of this overflowing.

In our day many pray for an infilling, an experience, instead of seeking the Baptizer. They ask the Holy Spirit to fill them when they should be asking Christ to baptize them. The baptism will produce the filling. This filling of the body by the baptism of the human spirit into the Holy Spirit produces an overflowing (see John 7:38) which causes the vocal organs to go into action and speak a language that is unknown to the candidate. He may be fully aware of what he is doing but does not know what he is saying (I Cor.14:14).

On the day of Pentecost God gave the Holy Spirit and Christ then baptized His followers into the Spirit, and they began to speak with other tongues as the spirit gave them utterance (Acts 2:4). About 10 years later, according to Acts 10:44—46, when the Apostle Peter dared to preach to the Gentiles for the first time (Acts 11:19), these same Gentiles received exactly the same experience that the apostles and the disciples of Christ had on the day of Pentecost. The record says, “And they of the circumcision were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God” (Acts 10:46). The Jewish Christians in Jerusalem objected to all this. (Acts 11:2). Then Peter in his defense said, “And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost” (Acts 11: 15, 16). In other words, it was the same Baptizer who baptized into the same element, with the same consequences. The consequences were what convinced the Jewish Christians that the experience of the Gentiles was valid, for they heard them speak with tongues (Acts 10:46).

From this record it is quite clear that during the first decade Peter and the church in Jerusalem believed that Jesus is the Baptizer in the Holy Spirit and that “speaking with tongues” was the immediate consequence or confirmation of this baptism. During this last decade in our time the Christian world has become more conscious of the Holy Spirit and many are reaching out for His power and a charismatic ministry. However, it seems to me that unless the church once again lifts up Christ as the Baptizer, many will seek the blessing from the Holy Spirit and fail to find it because He will always honor Christ.

To get the baptism in the Spirit everyone must seek an encounter with the Baptizer, who began this ministry on the day of Pentecost when He truly came back in the Spirit to baptize His disciples. He is the same, yesterday, today and forever (Heb.13:8).

David Duplessis

Re: Prophecy and Tongues - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/11 19:21

This is a very critical discussion to me, and I have questions.

I can speak in tongues, and sing in tongues, and they are two different languages. I can't understand a word of the spoken tongues, but I asked God to understand what I sing about. The language changed, and seems now to be some form of archaic French, so that I, with some training in that language, at least catch the drift of the songs.

Yet, I am rarely prompted of the Holy Spirit to speak or sing in tongues, and I never force the issue. I find singing in tongues to be a great way to sing to God when I've run out of praise songs, or are tired of them, and I am waiting for something, like a tow-truck, and I'm freezing - it seems to block out my physical sensations to a degree - weird!

I know that tongues for me is mere edification of myself, or praise of God, and not the Holy Spirit engendered multi-lang

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

uage understanding that we believe tongues was like that day on Pentecost. Yet I wonder why Paul wanted us to speak in tongues alone - God know's my heart, the Holy Spirit already speaks to God for me, so why tongues?

As for the glossalalia, I got that thrown at me at my baptism, and the devil used it to scare me away from the church and draw me into the occult. Consequently, I see little benefit in it for myself.

Tongues as prophecy must be something different, but I've never heard of an instance of it happening to anyone I know at any church. Does it really happen often, or is it a rare thing?

And on top of those questions, is the ability to interpret dreams part of prophecy? For often, when people tell me their dreams and visions, I instantly hear an interpretation of it. But I have never prayed for prophetic gifts, so I don't understand why this happens to me.

Any ideas on all of this? I'd be grateful to know more on the topics.

Blessings,

Forrest

Re:, on: 2007/5/11 19:29

Quote:

UniqueWebRev wrote:

This is a very critical discussion to me, and I have questions.

I can speak in tongues, and sing in tongues, and they are two different languages. I can't understand a word of the spoken tongues, but I asked God to understand what I sing about. The language changed, and seems now to be some form of archaic French, so that I, with some training in that language, at least catch the drift of the songs.

Yet, I am rarely prompted of the Holy Spirit to speak or sing in tongues, and I never force the issue. I find singing in tongues to be a great way to sing to God when I've run out of praise songs, or am tired of them, and I am waiting for something, like a tow-truck, and I'm freezing - it seems to block out my physical sensations to a degree - weird!

I know that tongues for me is mere edification of myself, or praise of God, and not the Holy Spirit engendered multi-language understanding that we believe tongues was like that day on Pentecost. Yet I wonder why Paul wanted us to speak in tongues alone - God know's my heart, the Holy Spirit already speaks to God for me, so why tongues?

As for the glossalalia, I got that thrown at me at my baptism, and the devil used it to scare me away from the church and draw me into the occult. Consequently, I see little benefit in it for myself.

Tongues as prophecy must be something different, but I've never heard of an instance of it happening to anyone I know at any church. Does it really happen often, or is it a rare thing?

And on top of those questions, is the ability to interpret dreams part of prophecy? For often, when people tell me their dreams and visions, I instantly hear an interpretation of it. But I have never prayed for prophetic gifts, so I don't understand why this happens to me.

Any ideas on all of this? I'd be grateful to know more on the topics.

Blessings,

Forrest

Would you accept it from me if I contributed? I have seen the good, bad and the ugly and it hasn't change my opinion on it as to what Paul meant for us to understand as a venue of intimacy with the Father.. If I said nothing else, that should be enough.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/11 21:33

Yes, dear Brother, I would.

I may have strong opinions about your style, and questions about your motives, but since I instantly go to God on spiritual pride, and know how deadly it is in me, I never hold a grudge.

By the way, I spent hours talking to talking to God about both recent posts, and yes, I did fly off the handle.

So, you pray for me, and I'll pray for you.

Please see P.M I am about to send you, and take it into consideration.

Blessings,

Forrest

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 3:40

Quote:
-----Bro Corey, where did you get the idea that uninterpreted tongues is "meaningless gibberish", or "chaotic"? I find it even more strange that you suggest that Paul allowed the Corinthians to carry on this, frankly and obviously demonic, aspect of heathen practice! Eating food offered to idols was a different matter, and could be allowed as long as the person wasn't being tempted back into idolatry.

Read I Corinthians in context and consider the people he was writing to. They were fornicating, eating foods sacrificed to idols, they were "speaking in tongues" chaotically... He wrote this church twice, and subtly tried to correct their heathen practices. He was not telling the rest of Christendom (us included) to do what the ex-Diana worshippers were doing in the early church in Corinth - he was compromising to win them to Christ. He also absolutely forbid convert priestesses from speaking during the service.

Quote:
-----In other words, "tongues" spoken by someone under demon influence is totally different from an utterance in the HOLY Spirit. Some one inspired by an alien spirit is also not willing to worship Jesus as Lord. As you say, the Corinthians would have been familiar with this false tongues, and needed to know how to distinguish between that and the genuine.

Are you saying wolves can't say they're sheep? And apostates can't name the name of Jesus?

There are many "alien spirits" calling on the name of our Lord Jesus every day, speaking in tongues, and interpreting all sorts of wonderful blessings that are going to rain down from heaven on the congregation. I've seen it. I've seen people ask Jesus for houses, cars, money, jobs - in essence, I've seen "the abomination of desolation" standing in the pulpits of the West. Lucifer knows the Bible backwards and forwards, just like the pharisees, and just like megachurch pastors. He's well spoken, charismatic, and well-dressed like them, too. Glossolalia doesn't have to sound like a seance ritual to come from the "Angel of Light".

Whenever I've witnessed glossolalia, it's been meaningless gibberish - and when it's been translated it's been nothing but blessings, profits, and good news.

Quote:
-----I have only heard demonic tongues once or twice, but it was so horrible I didn't want to listen long enough to notice if there were words in it. There probably were!

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

I've heard this kind, too. But keep in mind that Buddhists, Hindus and many other mystics speak in types of glossolalia, too - and they don't all sound "evil". Just like Delilah didn't look evil.

Re: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts?? - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/12 15:33

The 1 Cor 12 section has these verses...1Cor. 12:1 (KJVS) Now concerning spiritual *gifts*, brethren, I would not have you ignorant.

1Cor. 12:4 (KJVS) Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. The first of these references does not have the word 'gifts' in the original, but the word 'gift' does appear in verse 4. However the word 'gift' in verse 4 is part of a threefold description of 'the manifestation of the Spirit'... "Now there are diversities of **gifts**, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of **administrations**, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of **operations**, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." (1 Corinthians 12:4-7 KJVS) In this section Paul is turning from practical and human matters to those which are 'spiritual'. It has become the norm now for Pentecostals and Charismatics to think that when Paul speaks of the spiritual things he is speaking about the 'gifts'. I prefer to think that he is referring to 'gifts and ministries and functions'. To me these are all part of the 'manifestation of the Spirit'.

The key thing is that it is the Holy Spirit, manifesting or revealing his presence in the assembly, this presence is not only seen in what we term 'the gifts' but also in the 'ministries and functions'. All three are 'spiritual things' and all three are the diverse ways in which the Spirit reveals his presence in the assembly.

To make that clear... I think in 1 Cor 12:1 when Paul says 'the spiritual things..' he is not only speaking about the listed 9 'gifts' but to every manifestation of the Spirit, including those manifestations of the Spirit evidenced in 'ministries and functions'.

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 16:51

Quote:

Corey_H wrote:

Whenever I've witnessed glossolalia, it's been meaningless gibberish - and when it's been translated it's been nothing but blessings, profits, and good news.

Quote:

-----I have only heard demonic tongues once or twice, but it was so horrible I didn't want to listen long enough to notice if there were words in it. There probably were!

I've heard this kind, too. But keep in mind that Buddhists, Hindus and many other mystics speak in types of glossolalia, too - and they don't all sound "evil". Just like Delilah didn't look evil.

Hi Corey, There are several points you mentioned that I wanted to comment on, but the last part seems most important at the moment!

First it does seem that you have never witnessed the real Holy Spirit gift, so it's understandable that you lump it all together as being not of God.

Second, demonic tongues don't necessarily *sound* horrible to the outward ear. I'm talking about the revulsion that one feels *spiritually* when something is demonic, because of the Holy Spirit who dwells in us).

You also said:

Quote:

-----when it's been translated it's been nothing but blessings, profits, and good news

I've often heard this kind of "interpretation", of both true and counterfeit tongues.

There was one occasion (mentioned somewhere on another thread) when someone gave a beautiful utterance in tongues - really in the Holy Spirit. It was obviously meant to be interpreted. My heart leapt, and shouted AMEN! as the utterance came, though I didn't understand the meaning. It was like a trumpet call to the church, and I sensed that it was a str

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

ong, challenging word of exhortation.

There was a short silence, so I began to ask the Lord for the interpretation.

Then someone else "interpreted" but it wasn't the true interpretation. It was, as you said, "nothing but blessings, profits, and good news". It sounded good but it just wasn't what the Lord was saying!

Again I asked the Lord for the *true* interpretation, and it was as if He shrugged ruefully, and said "Forget it! They won't listen now"

The problem I believe is that honest souls like yourself hear and sense the shallow, man-made, hype, and frank demonic counterfeit and get put off the whole thing. Like someone deciding not to use banknotes any more because of being cheated in the past with counterfeit currency!

It's so tragic, because the real thing is *also* out there!

Please believe it Brother, you could be missing out on precious tools of the Holy Spirit, that we will all need in the days that are coming.

Love in Jesus

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 16:59

Quote:

----- Ormly said:
JESUS CHRIST, THE BAPTIZER

Thank you for reminding us that we need to focus on the Giver, not the gift.

At least I think that's what you meant! I don't always quite understand what you are wanting to convey. :-?

Blessings

jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 17:21

Quote:

----- UniqueWebRev wrote: I can speak in tongues, and sing in tongues, and they are two different languages. I can't understand a word of the spoken tongues, but I asked God to understand what I sing about. The language changed, and seems now to be some form of archaic French, so that I, with some training in that language, at least catch the drift of the songs.

Hi again Forrest

It is lovely that you find you can worship in that way. That is certainly one use of true tongues.

Quote:

----- As for the glossalalia, I got that thrown at me at my baptism, and the devil used it to scare me away from the church and draw me in to the occult. Consequently, I see little benefit in it for myself.

I'm a bit puzzled by this. Glossolalia is the same as tongues, (= "tongues" in Greek) but you seem to be making a distinction :-?

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

What did they do at your baptism? (You don't have to answer, but it sounds as if it wasn't a good experience!)

I've heard people try to get someone to speak in tongues by telling them to "repeat after me", which is all wrong. I also had someone pray for me and put their hand on my head, (quivering the hand violently at the same time, in what they seemed to imagine was spiritual excitement!) and pushing hard to try and make me fall down. Being a stubborn cuss, and not feeling like collapsing on that occasion, I planted my feet and refused to fall down, so the chap gave up after a while!

I wonder if the Holy Spirit would honour such a performance with His presence. It might possibly even pass on an evil spirit if the person being prayed for is especially vulnerable for some reason. Although I think that the time it happened to me was merely the foolishness of man, trying earnestly to make me "get the power".

Love in Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 17:25

Quote:

philologos wrote:

The 1 Cor 12 section has these verses...1Cor. 12:1 (KJVS) Now concerning spiritual *gifts*, brethren, I would not have you ignorant.

1Cor. 12:4 (KJVS) Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. The first of these references does not have the word 'gifts' in the original, but the word 'gift' does appear in verse 4. However the word 'gift' in verse 4 is part of a threefold description of 'the manifestation of the Spirit'... "Now there are diversities of **gifts**, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of **administrations**, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of **operations**, but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." (1Corinthians 12:4-7 KJVS)
In this section Paul is turning from practical and human matters to those which are 'spiritual'. It has become the norm now for Pentecostals and Charismatics to think that when Paul speaks of the spiritual things he is speaking about the 'gifts'. I prefer to think that he is referring to 'gifts and ministries and functions'. To me these are all part of the 'manifestation of the Spirit'.

The key thing is that it is the Holy Spirit, manifesting or revealing his presence in the assembly, this presence is not only seen in what we term 'the gifts' but also in the 'ministries and functions'. All three are 'spiritual things' and all three are the diverse ways in which the Spirit reveals his presence in the assembly.

To make that clear... I think in 1 Cor 12:1 when Paul says 'the spiritual things..' he is not only speaking about the listed 9 'gifts' but to every manifestation of the Spirit, including those manifestations of the Spirit evidenced in 'ministries and functions'.

A great point made there! Thanks, we often don't think of putting these three things together.

People talk about the nine gifts because there happen to be 9 in the list. There must be others. Supernatural strength for example, like Samson?

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 17:56

Quote:

UniqueWebRev wrote: Tongues as prophecy must be something different, but I've never heard of an instance of it happening to any one I know at any church. Does it really happen often, or is it a rare thing?

Depends what meetings you attend! I don't think its especially rare.

Paul talks about "different kinds of tongues". I would interpret that to mean different languages and also different kinds of uses for this gift.

Quite often one can tell, on hearing (genuine) tongues, what the purpose is. You said yourself that you use this gift in pri

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

vate worship, and that is one use. so is public worship. I shall never forget the first time I heard a congregation singing together in tongues. I didn't have that gift then, and was a bit scared of it at first, (just because it was strange and "super natural", not because it was really scary), but this was like being in the centre of a giant harp, sounding out the glory of God - a foretaste of the worship of heaven. Usually this seems not to need interpretation, although someone may receive a song in a known language as interpretation. (I've heard that, though never had it myself).

Another function of tongues is prayer and intercession. Often we don't know what the real need is, or we run out of words to express what is on our heart, so the Lord gives us words. It sounds different from worship. And prophecy is different again, though its impossible to explain the difference, one often just knows that its God speaking, rather than us praying.

I've almost never given anything in tongues (at least publically) that needs interpretation, but one time it was obviously prayer, not prophecy, and I had to speak it out loud. There was no interpretation at the time, but later in the meeting a young man prayed and I knew (don't ask me how) that this was the interpretation.

Perhaps this kind of use, tongues and interpretation, is as teamwork, in the church, or maybe the tongue triggers off a prophecy in someone's heart, which isn't an actual interpretation of the tongue. I don't really know, these are just observations from practical experience of this gift's use.

Quote:
-----And on top of those questions, is the ability to interpret dreams part of prophecy? For often, when people tell me their dreams and visions, I instantly hear an interpretation of it. But I have never prayed for prophetic gifts, so I don't understand why this happens to me.

This shows how flexible spiritual gifts are. Would one class this as prophecy, or interpretation? Do we really have to categorise it? Amazing that you actually *hear* the interpretation of a dream as the person shares it. This gift isn't mentioned in the New Testament. (Paul's dream of the man of Macedonia gave them guidance, but the interpretation was so clear that time that it didn't need a special gift.) It quite often comes in the Old Testament of course. Joseph and Daniel had a special gifting of dream interpretation, similar to yours.

In Him

Jeannette

Re:, on: 2007/5/12 21:03

LittleGift said
Quote:
-----I'm a bit puzzled by this. Glossolalia is the same as tongues, (= "tongues" in Greek) but you seem to be making a distinction

There *is* a distinction. The "tongues" the apostles spoke with in Acts allowed nearby witnesses to comprehend the scripture in their own language.

Contrast this to COR 14 where glossolalia's described - unintelligible gibberish.

God is not the author of confusion.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/12 23:41

Quote:

Contrast this to COR 14 where glossolalia's described - unintelligible gibberish.

God is not the author of confusion.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

Indeed, 1 Cor 14 does describe unintelligible gibberish, and 1 Cor 14 describes this as one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, known as tongues. And Paul is not against such gibberish. What Paul is against is that such gibberish happens in the context of a public assembly without an accompanying interpretation to make sense of what was said, so as to bring about the edification of the saints. Otherwise, if nobody with the gift of interpretation is present, the tongue speaker will sound as a Barbarian to the rest of the congregation, for, nobody will understand him. And if nobody can understand him, what is the point of him standing up in a public assembly to speak? And God forbid everybody does this at one time. Such will result in confusion.

That is why Paul says each person is to wait their turn and not speak on top of each other. Paul never doubts the genuineness of their gifting to speak in tongues or prophesy. All he does is call for some better sense in the expression of these gifts in a public assembly.

Re: - posted by ADisciple (), on: 2007/5/13 0:11

I am bearing witness with what LittleGift and KingJimmy are saying. Tongues is real, and a beautiful gift, to be received with thanks from the Giver. Of course there is the question of how much of what we come across is pure, and real. There is a lot of the counterfeit out there. But as the old saying goes, you never hear of a counterfeit three dollar bill: no such thing as a real three dollar bill. But there are lots of counterfeit twenties and hundreds out there. If you can get a copy of What Really Happened At Asuza Street, and read Frank Bartleman's account of when he first began to speak in tongues, and the "release" it brought him into... what a precious gift!

AD

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/13 3:39

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

Quote:

Quote:
----- UniqueWebRev wrote: I can speak in tongues, and sing in tongues, and they are two different languages. I can't understand a word of the spoken tongues, but I asked God to understand what I sing about. The language changed, and seems now to be some form of archaic French, so that I, with some training in that language, at least catch the drift of the songs.

Quote:
-----Hi again Forrest

It is lovely that you find you can worship in that way. That is certainly one use of true tongues.

Quote:

Quote:
-----As for the glossolalia, I got that thrown at me at my baptism, and the devil used it to scare me away from the church and draw me in to the occult. Consequently, I see little benefit in it for myself.

Quote:
-----I'm a bit puzzled by this. Glossolalia is the same as tongues, (= "tongues" in Greek) but you seem to be making a distinction :-?

I wish there was a term for it, but the type of tongues that was evidently given to the Apostles and Disciples, and even Mary, Jesus' mother at Pentecost (there were 120 of them waiting around for this event) seems to be the kind of tongues where the one speaking is heard and understood by everyone, regardless of their language. I would call that Pentecostal Tongues, and has nothing to do with any denomination.

Glossalalia, on the other hand, is what most people cannot understand themselves, nor are they meant to. I can't find a church that suits me anywhere nearby, although granted, there are at least 70 to explore, and I don't have the endurance to test them all these days. So, consequently, I have little experience of corporate tongues in worship.

I am blessed by the Holy Spirit to receive songs of all kind from Him, in English, and the ancient French I can only partly understand, although I never was fluent in the modern kind. But I know it isn't modern french, because the verb endings are different from all the Latin languages.

The songs I receive I sing immediately into a tape recorder I keep at hand for this purpose, because I don't have the memory to hold them for long. I figure that I get to use them when I need them, and they are saved up for when I find someone who needs songs and lyrics, and will do the orchestration, which is very difficult for me, never having been trained in it. The fact that I can do it at all is a tribute to the Holy Spirit, who makes me understand what I have never been taught.

Quote:

-----What did they do at your baptism? (You don't have to answer, but it sounds as if it wasn't a good experience!)

It wasn't. I only went to two churches briefly when growing up, Calvary Chapel at age 7 for about two months, and a different church at 15 for about three months, but long enough to understand what Baptism was about, and that I wanted it. The church I went to in my teens, was, I think, Foursquare Gospel, although I could be wrong.

Anyway, they expected me to come out of the pool in California that summer evening speaking in tongues. Unfortunately, they forgot to tell me about tongues of any kind, and in the evening light, at 15, I was scared to death. I babbled something to satisfy them, then cleared out completely. They looked evil in the reflected lights in the water, and Lucifer grabbed me and ran with me.

Fortunately, I did get baptised, and Jesus stayed with me (my testimony is on page two of Miracles that Follow the Plough).

Eventually, after I re-dedicated, I received a tape from a ministry that told how to receive tongues, and I was willing to experience anything. Anyway I called them, did what they asked me to do in getting rid of anything that might be Satanic in my house, which was a lot, since I had a fine collection of a nique Tarot Cards, and a superb occult library. I think I may even have cast out the house, then called them back, and prayed with them.

It took a few days for it to come out of my throat, like it was stuck, and then it flowed freely. However, I am not prompted of the Spirit to use tongues much, and then, well I can go from serious, to laughing, to crying in moments. And yes, I can speak in tongues without prompting, but I was taught to wait for the Spirit to prompt me. And frankly, if I am not prompted, it seems hard to me, as if I am trying to force something, and it is exhausting.

I have so much from God already, and spend most of my time with Him, or talking about Him, that tongues may be less necessary for me, but I can't tell for sure. Consequently, my very deep interest in this thread.

Quote:

-----I've heard people try to get someone to speak in tongues by telling them to "repeat after me", which is all wrong. I also had someone pray for me and put their hand on my head, (quivering the hand violently at the same time, in what they seemed to imagine was spiritual excitement!) and pushing hard to try and make me fall down. Being a stubborn cuss, and not feeling like collapsing on that occasion, I planted my feet and refused to fall down, so the chap gave up after a while!

I know, I can't let myself go either, and now, I don't like strangers touching me...I don't know their motives or their spiritual base, and with getting out of the house being a bit of a pain, I don't seek out Christians in Church. But I find them all over the place - I think that God sets this up, partly because my ministry is to the non-church going relatives of those that attend church. I find Christians everywhere I turn, even on the phone, and my disability makes it easy to bring up what Jesus has done for me. After all, there are not many people with walkers, or using the runabouts in stores that are smiling, happy, singing, or even downright playful and silly.

I daresay I'm a bit of a spectacle, but I don't mind if it will plant a seed or water one. I rarely meet a non-Christian unless I am supposed to evangelize. But God didn't call me to speak, He called me to write, so I meet mostly Christians everywhere, and have Church everywhere.

Quote:

-----I wonder if the Holy Spirit would honour such a performance with His presence. It might possibly even pass on an evil spirit if the person being prayed for is especially vulnerable for some reason. Although I think that the time it happened to me was merely the foolishness of man, trying earnestly to make me "get the power".

I think this is a real danger, and never attempt to touch anyone I don't know well. I've even come to dislike handshakes, because I don't trust strangers to be right with God, not even the most Christian seeming of them.

Thanks for your help, dear one.

Blessings,

Forrest

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/13 3:52

Quote:

-----Indeed, 1 Cor 14 does describe unintelligible gibberish

Am I alone in feeling uncomfortable with the word 'gibberish' or have we defined this term somewhere? Gibberish is usually unintelligible to the hearer and perhaps even to the speaker. The tongues of 1 Cor 14 may be unintelligible to the speaker and to the human hearers but he 'that speaks in an unknown tongue speaks to God' to whom it is not unintelligible... so I'm not sure that 'gibberish' is the right word.

Gibberish is a kind of failure in communication. He who speaks in an unknown tongue is not failing to communicate to the target of the communication, which (who) is God.

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/13 4:22

No, Ron,

You are not alone.

Tongues these days are mostly a personal thing, not a public one. And it is a gift you must request, or it doesn't happen for real.

I detest the public display of tongues, because I think it is a sign of spiritual pride...in other words, the devil is manipulating honest people who do speak in tongues. Paul did request people to not speak carelessly or frequently, unless they were prompted of the Spirit, and there was an interpreter to boot.

I rather think that prophesying in tongues is a larger gift than the regular one, and not often given.

Ron, it's perfectly scriptural, but there are some who simply don't go there, nor are you required to.

And Paul did say that prophecy was the better gift, and in plain language, not tongues.

All the cautions are about the misuse of tongues in public. The only point of tongues for those that are not being used to prophesy is to communicate about what the Holy Spirit wants you to talk to Abba about.

And yes, I find it taxing if the Spirit doesn't prompt me to use them. This is why I am asking questions.

I also have heard, that though Tongues is a fairly freely given gift of the Holy Spirit, that there are some who ask for it, but never receive it.

In my case, it seems to be something I can use, and occasionally the Holy Spirit does want me to use, alone, with Him. But with me, it is rare.

Now when I sing in the Spirit...I can understand a bit, and the melodies I am given are lovely. But the words are very repetitive praise songs.

But I suppose God likes them anyway. In a strange way, He is having me Praise Him.

But of late, Abba just wakes me up when he needs me or wants me to sing to him regular songs that I like.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

Don't worry about it. Just ask God if He want's you to have tongues, and obey if He says yes. And if you don't want them, I doubt you'll get them. It's called inhibition, and is perfectly natural.

Blessings, Bro!

Forrest

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/13 6:41

Quote:

Am I alone in feeling uncomfortable with the word 'gibberish' or have we defined this term somewhere?

I was using the term "gibberish" more-so for arguments sake. I don't really care for the term myself. Paul preferred to lik en it unto speaking like a Barbarian. Idiomatically speaking, I think gibberish would be a great dynamic equivalent.

I'm sure the thought of sounding like a Barbarian probably deflated the Corinthian ego a bit, especially since they seeme d to have a false estimation of the gift so as to think one had "arrived" by speaking in tongues. Without a charismatically gifted interpreter present to make sense of the message, the congregation will be at loss to the message, even though it was from God.

Thus, to them, it would be as if a Barbarian were speaking, or as if somebody were insane, or, as I have argued, "gibberish." No doubt, God understands the message. But to God the message would never be as a Barbarian tongue since H e is God :)

Re: the "g" word, on: 2007/5/13 18:12

Quote:

Corey_H wrote:

LittleGift said

Quote:

-----I'm a bit puzzled by this. Glossolalia is the same as tongues, (= "tongues" in Greek) but you seem to be making a distinction

There *is* a distinction. The "tongues" the apoststles spoke with in Acts allowed nearby witnesses to comprehend the scripture in their own language.

Contrast this to COR 14 where glossolalia's described - unintelligible gibberish.

God is not the author of confusion.

Dear Corey, and others...

You are making me cross, when you keep calling this gift gibberish. I don't *like* being cross! :-x

There need be no confusion if you really understand what the Bible is saying on this subject, and if you are in a meeting where the genuine gift is exercised with grace and restraint, according to the principles Paul outlined.

I will repeat that genuine tongues (or glossolalia) is made up of WORDS! (unless someone happens to be speaking a la nguage like the "click" tongue of an obscure African tribe) It is very obviously a language, NOT gibberish!

If you think it's gibberish you either weren't listening or you heard something that wasn't the real thing. It's even possible to write down the words that are spoken, though they may not be understood, even by the speaker. Although I think that would spoil it in most cases.

I read of someone who only had one word at first, and thought it was a poor thing. He kept saying "Dorian" to the Lord, "

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

My Dorian". He hadn't a clue what it meant. But some of you Greek scholars could easily have told him (clue, my user name is a small version of it)! Afterwards he was given more words and the tongues began to flow more easily.

The main difference between what happened on the Day of Pentecost and what many Christians experience is that usually the language isn't understood by those present. But it's obvious from 1 Corinthians 12-14 that unknown tongues were also given in New Testament times, just as they are today. And, as in Corinth, being able to move in this gift says NOTHING about the righteousness or spiritual maturity of those who exercise it!

Therefore it would be ridiculous, as well as wrong, to boast of this gift. I'm just trying to convince you that I *do* know what I'm talking about when I say that tongues or glossolalia, (whatever you want to call this gift, for whatever purpose its used, or whether its a known or unknown language), it is NOT gibberish!

An example of speaking in a *known* language was an English person speaking fluent Welsh in a meeting. She had never heard the language and had no idea what she was saying. After the meeting some Welsh people came up and started talking Welsh to her, and were confused when she looked blank!

I forgive you Corey, but please don't use the "g" word any more.

Yours in Him

Jeannette

:-P

Re:, on: 2007/5/13 18:15

Quote:

KingJimmy wrote:

Quote:

Am I alone in feeling uncomfortable with the word 'gibberish' or have we defined this term somewhere?

I was using the term "gibberish" more-so for arguments sake. I don't really care for the term myself. Paul preferred to liken it unto speaking like a Barbarian. Idiomatically speaking, I think gibberish would be a great dynamic equivalent.

I'm sure the thought of sounding like a Barbarian probably deflated the Corinthian ego a bit, especially since they seemed to have a false estimation of the gift so as to think one had "arrived" by speaking in tongues. Without a charismatically gifted interpreter present to make sense of the message, the congregation will be at loss to the message, even though it was from God.

Thus, to them, it would be as if a Barbarian were speaking, or as if somebody were insane, or, as I have argued, "gibberish." No doubt, God understands the message. But to God the message would never be as a Barbarian tongue since He is God :)

Hi Jimmy

Read this after sending my reply to Corey. OK I can tolerate using the "g" word in this semi technical sense :-)

Jeannette

Re: Brother Jim - posted by dohzman (), on: 2007/5/13 18:45

You're a Church of God minister, student?? you have as part of your very training the tenets you are to embrace is that which you now speak against. Brother you need to re-think this and find out what it is exactly you really believe. If you don't embrace the doctrine of glossolalia;

than you should let thoughts over you know this and find out for yourself what it is exactly you do believe about the whole of our faiths doctrine in the Holy Spirit baptism with its outward signs. Presently world wide only 51% of all pentecostals believe in tongues and or profess the use of them in private or public.

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

There is a misuse of everything under the sun but that doesn't mean we throw the baby out with the bath water, if we do that than all preaching period must go too! So don't even go there.

Re:, on: 2007/5/13 18:55

Quote:
-----UniqueWebRev wrote:
...the type of tongues that was evidently given to the Apostles and Disciples, and even Mary, Jesus' mother at Pentecost (there were 120 of them waiting around for this event) seems to be the kind of tongues where the one speaking is heard and understood by everyone, regardless of their language. I would call that Pentecostal Tongues, and has nothing to do with any denomination.

Glossalalia, on the other hand, is what most people cannot understand themselves, nor are they meant to.

Oh, I see what distinction you are making. What confused me was that the word glossolalia *means* tongues, or language, so to me you were saying tongues are different from tongues! I tend to think of it as merely varieties of the same basic gift, as Paul said "diversities of gifts but the same Spirit".

You have a different variation of the same gift, whether we call it tongues or glossolalia. I think it's beautiful how you asked the Lord for a tongue you could at least partly understand, and He gave you your request.

The Lord's workings with us are all so individual - specially tailored to fit each one!

Quote:
-----It took a few days for it to come out of my throat, like it was stuck, and then it flowed freely.

The Lord actually asked me if I was willing to receive this gift! I said no because of not wanting anything supernatural! Then realised that it's wrong to refuse a gift from someone you love - especially if he's God!

As mentioned in another thread, it was all very matter of fact. Strange words started coming into my mind. For a long time I wouldn't speak them aloud, even when alone. But with the Lord's reassurance that this really was of Him, not just my imagining words, I gradually grew braver! Singing came later, and usually the tunes aren't that special. Sometimes I find myself singing a favourite hymn and can't remember the words, or the words don't seem enough, so use tongues instead, to the same tune.

Quote:
-----However, I am not prompted of the Spirit to use tongues much, and then, well I can go from serious, to laughing, to crying in moments. And yes, I can speak in tongues without prompting, but I was taught to wait for the Spirit to prompt me. And frankly, if I am not prompted, it seems hard to me, as if I am trying to force something, and it is exhausting.

I know what you mean, it seems that the USE of the gift as well as the gift itself has to be in the Spirit. Makes sense when you think of those in the Bible who used a genuine gift "in the flesh", or with wrong motives. Jonah was a genuine prophet with a bad attitude, for example. I can "decide" to speak in tongues, kind of from habit, but it doesn't feel right. Another time it just flows so naturally. Like prophecy it has to be used in the right way, directed by the Lord, not just as we please.

Quote:
-----...I find Christians everywhere I turn, even on the phone, and my disability makes it easy to bring up what Jesus has done for me. After all, there are not many people with walkers, or using the runabouts in stores that are smiling, happy, singing, or even downright playful and silly.

I daresay I'm a bit of a spectacle, but I don't mind if it will plant a seed or water one. I rarely meet a non-Christian unless I am supposed to evangelize. But God didn't call me to speak, He called me to write, so I meet mostly Christians everywhere, and have Church everywhere.

That's lovely! Maybe one reason you aren't healed - yet - is that you are such a witness as you are!

But you are allowed a few moans if necessary, it's obviously not your usual outlook on life, as it is with some people, in spite of your disability.

Love in Him

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

Jeannette

Re: - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/13 19:22

Quote:

LittleGift wrote:

Quote:

.....I find Christians everywhere I turn, even on the phone, and my disability makes it easy to bring up what Jesus has done for me. After all, there are not many people with walkers, or using the runabouts in stores that are smiling, happy, singing, or even downright playful and silly.

I daresay I'm a bit of a spectacle, but I don't mind if it will plant a seed or water one. I rarely meet a non-Christian unless I am supposed to evangelize. But God didn't call me to speak, He called me to write, so I meet mostly Christians everywhere, and have Church everywhere.

That's lovely! Maybe one reason you aren't healed - yet - is that you are such a witness as you are!

But you are allowed a few moans if necessary, its obviously not your usual outlook on life, as it is with some people, in spite of your disability.

Love in Him

Jeannette

I never thought of that. I always assumed it was for teaching me something, and also the result of just what happens in the flesh.

And no, it is not so bad that I can't live with it. I don't like it...who would? And I complain too much, in my opinion, but I was brought up to be a 'guy' and never show I'm suffering.

But I am glad I work at not complaining, because frankly, it makes me unhappy. And I don't like to go to unhappy places.

Mostly I see that I was given too much by God at the beginning, couldn't handle it, misused it, couldn't undo my circumstances, and asked Him to give me peace of mind and comfort of spirit. So God broke all my circumstances off me, and freed me up, but it was a lot to get over!

I'm mostly gotten there, but the 12 year journey was a !@#%^&*()_+)(*&#%\$#@!!!! And there is still a lot left to go through.

Thanks for the new idea about God using my disability as a source of witness. I use it that way, come to think of it, but I didn't think that God might have planned that too.

Is He sneaky, or what?!

Blessings,

Forrest

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/13 22:51

Quote:

.....
You're a Church of God minister, student?? you have as part of your very training the tenets you are to embrace is that which you now speak against. Brother you need to re-think this and find out what it is exactly you really believe. If you don't embrace the doctrine of glōssa than you should let thoughts over you know this and find out for yourself what it is exactly you do believe about the whole of our faiths doctrine in the Holy Spirit baptism with its outward signs.

Where in my statements have I ever called into doubt the doctrine of tongues? I fully believe in them and their modern d

ay usage. I think you have misunderstood my posts.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/14 5:13

Quote:
-----What Paul is against is that such gibberish happens in the context of a public assembly without an accompanying interpretation to make sense of what was said, so as to bring about the edification of the saints.

Do you think this means an absolute ban on un-interpreted tongues in a public gathering or is this 'silence' comparative? "If any man speak in an unknown tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course; and let one interpret. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the church; and let him speak to himself, and to God." (1Corinthians 14:27-28 KJVS) Do you talk to yourself? I do and so did David and many another. I sometimes 'talk to my self' in a meeting too. Not raising my voice but adding a private 'amen' to someones preaching. I do it because I need to react or respond to what I am hearing and because, even if uttered quietly, the expressed word is more lasting than the thought word.

How about tongues in meetings then? Would Paul absolutely prohibit me from a quiet expression in tongues when I hear a prayer need or want to respond and don't quite know what to say? Perhaps 'speaking to yourself' and 'to God' has to do with volume in the context of the gathered assembly.

There are, after all, degrees of silence. "And when he had given him licence, Paul stood on the stairs, and beckoned with the hand unto the people. And when there was made a **great silence**, he spake unto them in the Hebrew tongue, saying, Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defence which I make now unto you. (And when they heard that he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them, **they kept the more silence**: and he saith,)" (Acts 21:40-22:2 KJVS) The first word for silence here is the word used by Paul in 1 Cor 14 in relation to uninterpreted tongues. However in Acts 21:40 it adds the adjective 'great'. So we have 'silence' and 'great silence'. Moving into Acts 22:2 we now have a 'greater silence'. So we have 3 levels of silence!!

1. silence (the word used by Paul in 1 cor 14)
2. great silence, as in Acts 20:44
3. even greater silence as in Acts 21:2 Apparently there are at least two higher levels of silence than that enjoined upon the uninterpreted tongue utterances. ;-)

...and just to raise the temperature a little... 1Tim. 2:12 (KJVS) But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. This is the word used in Acts 21:2 but WITHOUT the adjective 'great'. So apparently there is at least one degree of silence beyond this too. ;-)

Re: Tongues in Public - posted by UniqueWebRev (), on: 2007/5/14 6:40

Ron,

I have often been in a meeting with a Pastor teaching, and found myself both singing under my breath, or speaking in tongues, barely moving my lips, yet still seemingly able to hear the teaching, and praise God at the same time.

What I object to is what I see on TV - crowds of peoples speaking in tongues, emotionalizing all over the place, the Pastor peppering his speeches with the same great, round, holy sounds...disgusting!

Oddly, what I think is so interesting is what happens in a synagogue - they are relatively noisy places, with the men praying quietly to themselves, and rocking back and forth...davening, I believe it is called, while the women are talking and laughing together, and paying no attention whatsoever except during the ritual bits the Rabbi or anyone else for that matter, is speaking, and those in the synagogue making the appropriate response. And then it goes back to generalized chaos again, at least in comparison to our polite, church services.

I heard a description once of the women being held to silence in the synagogues by Paul, because, being separated in the orthodox manner, women on one side, men on the other, women were getting up, and asking questions of the men, while the teaching was going on. And this was what Paul objected to. Women, so far as I know, have never been silent in even the most orthodox synagogues.

This amused me, since services at synagogues are not quiet affairs, and then you start talking about three different kind

s of silence?

In our churches, if you speak quietly under your breath in response to the Spirit, in tongues or out, I doubt anyone would notice, or if they did, be bothered. I know that sometimes I would have to move a few chairs away from people when singing under my breath, since the melody was a bit more discernable than almost breathless speech.

The oddest thing to me about tongues is that you can listen to another speak, and speak in tongues at the same time, for the two don't seem to affect the other. Total disassociation of the mind from tongues.

Anyone else ever notice this?

Blessings,

Forrest

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/14 6:49

Quote:

Do you think this means an absolute ban on un-interpreted tongues in a public gathering or is this 'silence' comparative?

No, I don't think the silence is absolute. After all, Paul says if no interpreter is present, the individual is still free to express his tongue unto God, just in a "silent" manner. And this silent manner would be loud enough so as to not dominate the meeting.

At my church, we often have times during worship where people pray "in concert." For those uninitiated in such a practice, praying in concert is simply everybody praying audibly at the same time. For some this is in English (well Ron would probably say we are praying in American), for others this is in an unknown tongue. However, I don't believe this to be confusing, because it is obvious the people doing this aren't doing it in such a way as to dominate or give a message to the rest of the congregation. They are simply doing it in a private manner. Their aim is not to be heard by others.

And I don't think Paul would have a problem with this. What Paul seems to take issue with is everybody attempting to give an utterance at one time, so as to communicate something. The problem in Corinth is that in many ways, they seemed to simply lack good manners. Thus, if somebody started to give a message in tongues or to prophesy, somebody else who felt prompted by the Spirit wouldn't wait their turn, and instead would simply jump in on the other person.

... more to come later (time to go to work).

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2007/5/14 7:07

I have a great deal of reverence or respect for the things of God, for His ways, His gifts, etc... to read giberish as a discriptive is disrespectful of that which was meant to aid us pilgrams in our journey. BTW here's websters definition on the word giberish:- rapid and inarticulate talk ; unmeaning words.

Thats to me doesn't at all sound like something that might come from an All knowing intelligent Holy God, given to the children whom He loves as evidence of something as important as the Ressuection of Jesus Christ. I don't know , maybe you don't fully understand the reality of being called into the ministry and the tools (Words are the tools we employee) with which we expedite this calling. A minister is responsible for eternal souls of men and women and will someday stand before God and give account of the effect of ---words--and how they effected individuals for good or evil. I recommend a book by Spurgeon called "Lectures to my Students".

Quote:
----- Where in my statements have I ever called into doubt the doctrine of tongues? I fully believe in them and their modern day usage. I think you have misunderstood my posts.

I love God and His written Word. Therefore I am careful about what I write, say, in regards to the things of God. You as a minister/student of the God of the Word need also to exercise some wisdom and remember that more than just a handful of Christians are reading these posts. Now I don't seek to be hurtful to you Brother, however if this one incident serves to create in you some carefulness now, it will turn to bless you for the rest of your life and service for the Lord and if you'll allow it to, it will make you a workman fit for God's service in the public forum. Things like respect, honor, love, can be felt by people who hear/read what it is we are saying.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/14 12:32

Quote:
-----I heard a description once of the women being held to silence in the synagogues by Paul, because, being separated in the orthodox manner, women on one side, men on the other, women were getting up, and asking questions of the men, while the teaching was going on. And this was what Paul objected to. Women, so far as I know, have never been silent in even the most orthodox synagogues.

This is frequently given as an explanation for Paul's comments but there is no indication that the assembly in Corinth met in a synagogue or that they adopted this style of worship. His statements about women praying and prophesying would indicate that we are in a 'house church meeting'.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2007/5/14 12:35

Quote:

to read gibberish as a descriptive is disrespectful of that which was meant to aid us pilgrims in our journey.

I by no means mean any disrespect to the word of God. However, Paul's argument in 1 Cor 14 is clear. An uninterpreted message in tongues sounds like a Barbarian speaking. And in Greek/Roman culture where the Greek language was highly praised, to speak anything else would be our equivalent of "gibberish." That is, it is a language that we hear that doesn't make sense. It is unintelligible and of no profit to the hearers.

Now, in the eyes of God a message in tongues is not Barbarian or gibberish, for He understands them all. However, to people here on earth, unless God brings sense to the message, it will forever be lost to those who hear it. Which is why we need somebody with the spiritual gift of interpretation to tell us what the message means in our vernacular. Otherwise, to us, it will be gibberish.

Now, if this word gibberish offends you, stick to using the phrase Paul uses to describe it, "barbarian." However, "gibberish" in my opinion would be a justifiable idiomatic translation as today which gives a good sense of the word. That is my only aim here, so as to bring out understanding.

And I say all this as one who has been a Pentecostal for nearly 7 years, a graduate of Lee University's school of ministry, and present member of the Church of God (Cleveland, TN). This view is entirely in keeping with classic Pentecostalism.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/5/14 12:36

Quote:
-----I love God and His written Word. Therefore I am careful about what I write, say, in regards to the things of God. You as a minister/student of the God of the Word need also to exercise some wisdom and remember that more than just a handful of Christians are reading these posts.

Fairly frequently in these forums I get on the wrong end of someone's agitation so please forgive me if I interfere...

Scriptures and Doctrine :: 1 Corinthians 14:1 - Gifts??

I am not sure what Jimmy has said which has caused you to think he is behaving inappropriately. Can you be a bit more explicit? or talk in over with him by PM?

Re: - posted by HomeFree89 (), on: 2007/5/21 20:21

My mom just found this article I had bookmarked after someone on here give it to me.

<http://www.cfcindia.com/web/mainpages/articles.php?display=article07>

Mr. Poonen does speak in tongues, so he's not anti-tongues and he handles this topic well.

Jordan