by various difficulties. (1) Was  
this speaking in various languages a *gift*  
*bestowed* on the disciples *for their use  
afterwards*, or was it a *mere sign*, their  
utterance being only us they were mouth-pieces   
of the Holy Spirit? *The latter  
seems certainly to have been the case*. It  
appears on our narrative, **even as the  
Spirit gave them utterance**. But, it may  
be objected, in that case they would not  
themselves understand what they said.  
I answer, that we infer *this very fact* from  
1 Cor. xiv.; that the speaking with tongues  
was often found, *where none could interpret   
what was said*. And besides, it would  
appear from Peter’s speech, that such, or  
something approaching to it, was the case  
in this instance. He makes no allusion to  
the *things said* by those who spoke with  
tongues; the *hearers alone* speak of their  
declaring *the wonderful works of God*.  
So that it would seem that here, as on  
other occasions (1 Cor. xiv. 22), tongues  
were for a sign, not to those that believe,  
but to those that believe not. If the first  
supposition be made, that the gift of speaking   
in various languages was bestowed on  
the disciples *for their after-use in preaching   
the Gospel*, we are, I think, running  
counter to the whole course of Scripture  
and the evidence of the early fathers on  
the subject. There is *no trace whatever*  
of such a power being po cd or exercised  
by the Apostles (see ch. xiv. 11, 14) or by  
those who followed them. I believe, therefore,   
the event related in our text to have  
been a *sudden and powerful inspiration of  
the Holy Spirit, by which the disciples  
uttered, not of their own minds, but as  
mouth-pieces of the Spirit, the praises of  
God in various languages, hitherto, and  
possibly at the time itself, unknown to them.*  
(2) How is this “*speaking with other  
tongues*” related to the “*speaking with  
tongues*” (or, “*with a tongue*”) afterwards  
spoken of by St. Paul? I answer, that  
they are *one and the same thing*. See this  
further proved in notes on 1 Cor. xiv.  
Meantime I may remark, that the two are  
inseparably connected by the following  
links, —ch. x. 46, xi. 15,—xix. 6,—in which  
last we have the same juxta-position of  
*speaking with tongues* and *prophesying* as  
afterwards in 1 Cor. xiv. 1—5 ff. (3)  
*Who were those that partook of this gift?*  
I answer, the *whole assembly* of believers,  
from Peter’s application of the prophecy,  
vv. 16 ff. It was precisely the case supposed   
in 1 Cor. xiv. 23. The unlearned and  
unbelievers of that passage were represented  
by the **others** of our ver. 13, who pronounced  
them to be drunken, (4) I would not conceal  
the difficulty which our minds find in conceiving   
a person supernaturally endowed  
with the power of speaking, *ordinarily and  
consciously*, a language which he has never  
learned. But there is to my mind *no such  
difficulty*, in conceiving a man to be moved  
to utterance of sounds *dictated by the Holy  
Spirit*. And the fact is clearly laid down  
by St. Paul, that the gift of *speaking* in  
tongues, and that of *interpreting*, were  
*wholly distinct*. So that the above difficulty   
finds no place here, nor even in the  
case of a person *both speaking and interpreting*:   
see 1 Cor. xiv. 13.—On the  
question whether the speaking was necessarily   
*always* in a foreign tongue, we have  
no data to guide us: it would seem that  
it *was*; but the conditions would not  
*absolutely* exclude rhapsodical and unintelligible   
utterance. Only there is this  
objection to it: clearly, languages *were  
spoken* on *this* occasion,—and we have no  
reason to believe that there were two distinct   
kinds of the gift. (5) It would be  
quite beyond the limits of a note to give  
any adequate history of the explanations of  
the passage. A very short summary must  
suffice. (*a*) The idea of a gift of *speaking  
in various languages* having been conferred  
*for the dissemination of the Gospel*, appears   
not to have originated, until the *gift  
of tongues* itself had some time disappeared  
from the Church. Chrysostom adopts it,  
and the great majority of the Fathers and  
expositors. (*b*) Some, both in ancient and  
in modern times, have supposed that the  
miracle consisted in the multitude *hearing*  
*in various languages* that which the believers   
spoke in their native tongue: that  
*one language was spoken, but many were  
heard*. To this it may be replied, as is  
done by Gregory Nazianzen, that “thus  
the miracle would be wrought, not on  
the speakers, but on the hearers.” ‘This  
view, besides, would make a distinction  
between this instance of the gift and those  
subsequently related, which we have seen  
does not exist. On the courses taken by  
the modern German expositors, see note in  
my Greek Test.   
  
**even as** (i.e. ‘*in such  
measure and manner in each case as*’) **the  
Spirit granted to them to speak** (bestowed  
on them utterance)] The words rendered  
**gave them utterance** have been supposed  
here to imply that they uttered short  
ejaculatory sentences of praise. But this  
seems to be unfounded: and our word to  
*utter*, to *speak out*, seems exactly to render  
it. Their utterance was none of their own,  
but the simple gift and inspiration of the