

Anastasija Cumika

Donald Maldari

THE 184-01

9 December 2016

Critique Response on the Article #2

The article that is being examined has a title “Rethinking Tongues” and was written by Stanley Toussaint. This article can be found in *Bibliotheca Scara* journal in volume 172. The article consists of two parts. In the first part the author argues what definition for the word “tongue” would be the most appropriate **in terms of how it** was used in the bible. The author states that the most accurate definition would be that “tongue” means just language that others did not understand. The second part is dedicated to discussion of what was the purpose of the tongues where author ends up with the statement that the gift of tongues was the sign of judgement on Israel. The Author uses many examples from the bible where the word “tongue” was met and shows a very good and deep analysis to support his ideas. Overall the article is very clear and pretty persuasive but I think that more accurate definition of the word “tongue” would be ecstatic utterances because it is unrealistic how people can immediately start speaking some language they have never heard before.

The main point of the article was to persuade the reader that the purpose of the tongues was to show a sign of coming judgment to Jews in Israel. Although, giving the proper definition for the word is an important base to build the main argument on it. The author introduces two possible definitions for the word “tongue” in what it might have been used in the bible besides that this is an organ: ecstatic utterances and language. The main idea behind the definition is that tongues were “strange words, spoken in spiritual ecstasy” or in other words under the Holy Spirit influence. By defining the tongues as a language, the author leaves out important point that people were inspired by the Holy Spirit, they were in ecstasy.

Another counter argument against defining “tongues” as a language is that it sounds very unrealistic that people immediately started talking some foreign language they have never heard before. Even more, as they spoke different languages they were able to understand each other. I do not think our brain is capable to produce the knowledge of different languages even under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Although, I find it possible that in ecstasy people can express some Ecstatic utterances or jargon that would impossible to understand for other people around who are not under the Holy Spirit inspiration. So I find that the most accurate definition for the word “tongue” is ecstatic utterances.

By having a more proper definition the author’s statement that the gift of tongues was the sign of the judgement on Israel makes more sense as there is more connection with God. The second part itself is very clear and persuasive. The author gives great support for his idea by a deep analysis of the parts of the bible where tongues were mentioned. Also there is a great flow of thought and how the author builds on his argument like the wall with small bricks. So by the end of the paper author’s statement looks clear and meaningful for the reader.

The paper is very clear and persuasive. The only point that I think would strengthen the article is if the author would define the word “tongue” as an ecstatic utterance, not the language, as it gives a better understanding that people who spoke tongues were inspired by the Holy spirit.

I’m not very familiar with “tongues.” Studying it from a purely linguistic perspective may yield interesting data.

A