

views, was not a connected discourse, nor an address adapted to the wants and circumstances of others. He was wholly occupied with the relations of his own soul to God. The soul was absorbed in adoration and devotion. Hence to this condition are ascribed prayer, songs of praise to God, and the attestation of His mighty deeds. Such an one prayed in spirit; the higher life of the soul and spirit predominated in him. When, therefore, in the midst of his peculiar emotions and contemplations he formed for himself a peculiar language he was "wanting in the power so to express himself as to be understood by the greatest number."

With this view Meyer is in substantial agreement. He analyses the spiritual phenomena of the Apostolic Church, and in so doing both indicates his views of the nature of this particular gift, and assigns to it what he judges to be its relation to the other *charismata*. The following is, in substance, his analysis: (1) First, the gift of teaching, the most important of all, to which belong the apostolic, the prophetic, and the teaching *charismata*. (2) The gift of miracles, to which belong powers in the larger sense, and the more limited and specific gift of healing. (3) The gift of *practical administration*, to which belong the "service of help," and the gift of government; and (4) the *ecstatic charisma*, to which belongs the gift of tongues.

Mr. Beet holds, in the main, the same view. He describes it as a special and extraordinary gift of the Spirit, but denies that it was the faculty of speaking one or more foreign languages, or that it was a miraculous utterance in moments of special inspiration of prayer or praise in a human language unknown to the speaker, and affirms that words spoken "with a tongue" were evidently intelligible to others only when interpreted. He holds, indeed, that this gift was profitable to the speaker himself, as indicated by Paul's gratitude to God that he enjoyed it in an eminent degree, and that the words spoken in this preternatural state of spiritual exaltation, though unintelligible without interpretation, must have had a meaning, else they would not have been susceptible of interpretation. This, in meagre outline, and roughly expressed, is the substance of what this exceptionally able commentator says on this gift, as it existed in the Church at Corinth. The only point, in fact, in which he differs from Neander and Meyer is in respect to the complete identity of this with that bestowed upon the disciples on the day of Pentecost. While admitting, with these authorities, that the gift of tongues, as it existed in the Apostolic Church, was not generally the miraculous power of speaking languages which the speaker had never learned, he thinks that the gift bestowed upon the Church at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost was an exception to the rule, and that the apostles were actually enabled to address every one in the multitude drawn together on that occasion in his own mother-tongue. This, he thinks to be the only way in which the narrative, Acts ii., can be explained. Neander and Meyer feel the difficulty just as keenly as he does; but they cut the Gordian knot by assuming that St. Luke, following the prevailing tradition at the time that he wrote, was unconsciously led to attribute more to this phenomenon and the effect which it produced than really belonged to it.