

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

at Sandford, near Dublin, and many others came to the front as faithful and earnest men. The torch was kindled, the light spread, and there was no place where the great Evangelical movement of the first thirty years of this century took firmer hold than in Ireland.

The reader will draw his own conclusions from what has been set before him. We doubt not that one of them will be, that the Church of Ireland in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was labouring under a combination of extraordinary disadvantages without and within. But, truly, the good hand of her God has been upon her. The two great religious movements of the present century have told on her inner and her Church life. Earnestness in spiritual things, increasing love of order in her externals, now mark the Church of Ireland, and God's favour seems to have attended her earnest efforts to wipe off the traces of the shameful apathy and formality of the last century.

G. R. WYNNE.



#### ART. IV.—THE PENTECOSTAL GIFT OF TONGUES.

ON the nature of the Pentecostal gift of tongues, the Rev. H. C. Adams in the *CHURCHMAN* for November presents us with a view partly new, partly a revival of older opinions. That difficulties attend the question all will allow; nor will any be shocked or startled by Mr. Adams's treatment of it, which is reverent, and fully recognises the great miracle. But many, with myself, will not think that he has proved his case either negatively against the more general belief about the subject, or positively for his own.

The different opinions about the gift of tongues may be stated thus:

(a) At Pentecost the Apostles (and, it may be, others) were enabled to speak foreign languages, understanding them. (General opinion.)

(b) What the speakers spoke in their own tongue, each hearer was made to hear in his own tongue. (Cyprian, Gregory, Erasmus.)

(c) The speakers spoke sounds in a tongue not understood by themselves, but heard and understood by each hearer as his native tongue. (Mr. Adams and, I believe, the Irvingites and others, with perhaps some modifications.)

The meaning of "tongues" in 1 Cor. xii. and xiv. is part of the question, since most are agreed that their nature was the same as that of the Pentecostal tongues; but we may consider the Pentecostal tongues first.

In replying to Mr. Adams I shall follow his own order :

I. Philologically. Let us see what the Greek passages in Gospel, Acts, and Epistle can mean and do naturally mean.

St. Mark xvi. 17 : *γλώσσαις λαλήσουσι καιναῖς.*

Acts ii. 4 : *ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέραις γλώσσαις.*

1 Cor. xii. 10 : *γένη γλωσσῶν*; xiv. 5 : *λαλεῖν γλώσσαις.* Compare verses 2, 4, 10, 18, 21.

Objection is taken to *καινός*, "*καιναὶ γλώσσαις cannot mean foreign languages*;" for "*καινός means 'absolutely new.'*" What is "absolute" newness? Newness is a relative term. Bengel's "*quas nulla natio antea habuerat*" shows his opinion, but proves nothing.<sup>1</sup> *καινός* is, I allow, a strong word for "new," "strange;" but constantly used of things existing before. *Ἐα. gr.* from Euripides I take at random : *καινὸν ἔπος, φόνος καινός, αἷμα κ., ἡδὺς αἰεὶ καινός ὦν καινοῖσιν ἦν, παλαιὰ καινῶν λείπεται κηδευμάτων.* Things new and strange to those who have to do with them are *καινά*. French suddenly heard from an Englishman's mouth (who was known before not to speak it) would be reasonably termed *καινὴ γλῶσσα*. Therefore *καιναῖς γλώσσαις* in St. Mark *may* mean foreign tongues.

What of *ἑτέραις γλώσσαις*? "*It may,*" says Mr. Adams, "*mean foreign tongues.*" I can see no likelihood of its meaning anything else. St. Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 21 writes *ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις λαλήσω*, quoting the substance of Isa. xxviii. 11, 12, where in the LXX. is *διὰ γλώσσης ἑτέρας*, and certainly "foreign language" is meant. Aristotle, *Poet. c. 21*, is dismissed as irrelevant; but I, having learnt from a great Oxonian "to verify my references," turn to the place, and find this : "Every name (or noun) is either rightful (or "proper," or "current," the Greek is *κύριον*), or a foreign word (*γλῶττα*). And I mean by *κύριον* that which each people uses; by *γλῶττα* that which another people uses. So that the same word may be both *γλῶττα* and *κύριον*, but not to the same people. For example, *σίγνονον* (spear) is to the Cyprians *κύριον*, but to us Greeks it is *γλῶττα*." Beyond question here *κύριον* means "proper to the language native, current;" and *γλῶττα* "a foreign word" introduced in a passage. Such might be in English the French *ennui*, *rôle* etc. It is true Aristotle does not use *ἑτέρα γλῶσσα* at all; but he does use *ἕτεροι* for "foreigners," and *γλῶττα* even without

<sup>1</sup> Surely *καινός*, from *καὶ νῦν*, is an improbable (*may*, an absurd) derivation. Schleusner, quoted as an authority, has it not in his lexicon. The *νός* is probably mere termination, as in *κλεινός*, *δεινός*. It might possibly be from stem of *καίω*; compare "brand new." Buttman connects it with *καθαρός*, linking that to *κεδνός*, and taking "some such idea as *blank* to be the ground idea." *Lex. sub voc. ἀήνοθεν.*

ἑτέρα, for a foreign word—important this when we come to the γλώσσαι of 1 Cor. xiv. Whether Aristotle “is not speaking of language at all;” whether he, called to ban ἕτερος from the sense of “foreign,” has done so, or the contrary, let others judge.

But ξένος, ἀλλότριος, or βάρβαρος ought to have been used, Mr. Adams argues. Granted that ξένη, ἀλλοτρία γλ. might have been used. Either may be discoverable; though no instance is quoted in Liddell and Scott’s lexicon, nor is there one in Euripides or Æschylus. Yet λαλεῖν ἀλλοτρίαις γλώσσαις sounds not to me very natural Greek; it has something ambiguous.

As to βάρβαρος, that is common, especially when Greeks speak of other nations, or of language as unmeaning to them and unintelligible. Mr. Adams aptly quotes 1 Cor. xiv. 11: “I shall be a *foreigner* to him that speaketh and he a *foreigner* to me.” Only—and this is curious—Mr. Adams maintains further on that St. Paul in this passage is *not* writing about *foreign* languages at all. But, to finish first with the tongues at Pentecost, I see no reason why, out of the five possible adjectives for the two passages, St. Mark xvi. 17 and Acts ii. 4, καινή and ἑτέρα were not as good as (and in some respects better than) the other three.

And, as far as the Greek goes, γλώσσαι may be “foreign languages” in 1 Cor. xiv. Aristotle, we have seen, uses γλώττα, “foreign word.” After all, what does “languages” in the plural naturally mean but “foreign languages”? A man strong “in languages” is one who knows “foreign languages.”

II. Historically, let us look at the question.

If the Apostles spoke foreign tongues, then, says Mr. Adams, around each separate speaker a separate audience gathered. This appears to him an amazing difficulty. But why? Antecedently to the miracle the foreign worshippers would be likely to group themselves by nationalities; and this they would do the more when they perceived that different languages were being spoken. We cannot say for certain how many languages were spoken; perhaps not so many as Mr. Adams supposes. One language may have served more than one of the nationalities in the list; the neighbouring provinces of Asia Minor, for instance. The words of verses 7, 8 are urged as showing that the miracle was in the hearing; but it is questionable if they do so. They are consistent with that view, but do not necessitate it. Suppose twelve speakers (or more or less) in different languages; each hearer might say, “I hear my own language spoken.” A German, on hearing a person speak German whom he had known to be ignorant of it, might ask, “How is it I hear you speak my language?” I deny that the Greek ἡκουον εἶς ἕκαστος τῆς ἰδίας διαλέκτου λαλούντων

αὐτῶν forces us, or even naturally leads us, to suppose that each *one* heard *several* speaking his own language. ἤκουον αὐτῶν λαλούντων, "they heard them speaking;" ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, "each one (hearing a speaker) in his own language." This use of a plural verb and its object with a singular distributive interposed is quite common. However, Mr. Adams does not hold that the miracle was entirely in the hearers (as some do). To myself it does not seem probable that it was in them at all. The Holy Spirit was poured on the *speakers*; *they* were "endued with power from on high."

A difficulty is made about St. Peter's address (Acts ii. 14-35). Whether in the vernacular or in Greek I presume not to determine; but doubt not it was in one of the two. Either would serve for a large audience, and (as Wordsworth supposes) the eleven might be addressing others. Its being addressed to οἱ κατοικοῦντες as well as native Judæans proves nothing; certainly not that it was at once heard as many languages. Plenty of the foreign Jews must have been bilingual; some probably trilingual. On such occasions as these gatherings are we to suppose the sojourners unable to communicate with any but just their own provincials? "But," it is asked, "what need was there of many tongues, if one could have been understood?" The whole need was not, as I think, for that one day; but at such a meeting of different nationalities the miracle would be most striking and best attested, and the immediate effect of the preaching in many tongues very great. Further need and use for the gift would be afterwards.

And so we come to the question, Was it a permanent gift? This we cannot answer perfectly; but surely it was so with some, and to some extent. We cannot determine whether each Apostle could speak *all* languages, or how many. Possibly to one was given some languages (or a language), to another others (or another). And the subsequent fields of their labour may have been chosen accordingly. Study and learning may not have been entirely superseded; of some local dialects preachers may have been ignorant, as was St. Paul apparently of Lycaonian. But it is plain that somewhat of his preaching was understood by the men of Lystra even before the miracle; the Lycaonian dialect was neither needed nor given. In fact, I agree with Mr. Adams on one point, that the Apostles probably could not speak *all* foreign languages "at will," but I doubt whether there ever has been any universal belief that they could. Certainly no one now would formulate his belief in these words: "The Apostles possessed the power of speaking *all* foreign languages at will." Rather we should say: "The gift of tongues was a power to speak foreign languages." More than this we cannot presume to assert.

And surely it was meant as a help to the first preaching of the Gospel abroad.

Against this common-sense view I see no valid objection either from the Greek of the Scripture or from the facts of the case. But against Mr. Adams's view I see many objections. "The Apostles spoke in a language they did not understand; to the hearers the strange language sounded as if it had been their own." Now surely they meant something; they thought in their own language, whatever the sounds appeared like to themselves; but (according to Mr. Adams) they were uttering sounds that were no human language, their vocal organs were playing them false, as were the hearing organs of their audience. Nay, from what Mr. Adams says about St. Mark xiii. 11, the preacher may have been understood to say something different from what he meant to say. Better (he may argue) was this inspired utterance, but in sound it was a jargon and no language.

Now I fail to see any need or likelihood of such a miracle. Nothing seems gained, much lost, by the preachers not understanding their own voices. The only shadow of countenance for it is in the statement that some, mocking, said the men were stuttering under the influence of wine. Plainly these were the careless and inattentive; to such a foreign language might seem so; but the general sense of the hearers was quite different. What need for the declaring of "the wonderful works of God" to have been in this no-language? What good was it that the sounds should be unintelligible to the speakers, and not heard as uttered? No good even then; and for general profit in future preaching what did it give, this needless double deception of speaker and hearer? If the preacher did not understand what he had said, how could he and his hearer go on with instruction? There would be endless confusion and misunderstanding.

Yet such were (Mr. Adams appears to think) not only the *γλώσσαι* at Pentecost, but also those afterwards at Corinth. It requires courage to face such a censure as this: "It is impossible that anyone who studies the subject, however cursorily, can think that the *γλώσσαι* of 1 Cor. xiv. were foreign languages." Well, I do think so; many learned editors of the Greek Testament and divinity professors have thought so; like Teucer behind the Telamonian shield, behind them I must cower and shoot; we are all "cursory" together.

St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xiv., appears to me to say in substance this: "Prophecy, spiritual insight, power of explaining Scripture, etc., is better for home use in a church than speaking foreign languages. He who speaks to Greeks a tongue non-Greek profits them little, if at all. The speaker who prays in

a foreign tongue may do good to himself in private devotion (he thankfully appreciates the God-given power, and probably increases his own carefulness and attention); but in public, if you speak a foreign tongue, you or someone must translate it. An interpreter there must be, then your hearer will get instruction and counsel, and own the wonder too. But the chief use of foreign tongues is not in your own home-gatherings, but abroad among unbelievers; to them they are both 'a sign' and instructive. Use them not thus for mere display of power."

Such is my view of the substance of 1 Cor. xiv. Doubtless the Corinthians had used the tongues wrongly for display; had used "foreign languages" in prayers and preachings to Greek Christians without being careful to have them warranted by an interpreter. But suppose a *γλῶσσα* no human language, would the Corinthians have listened at all? Or, having listened, and had the sound interpreted, how could they test the genuineness of the interpretation? No one could do so, not even the speaker, if he did not understand himself. Whereas of the interpretation of a real foreign language there were many checks: some other person present, though not a preacher, might know both the languages; imposture could be easily detected.

I cannot imagine what Mr. Adams thinks about *γένη φωνῶν* in 1 Cor. xiv. 12. Compare *γένη γλωσσῶν* in xii. 10. It is impossible that they can be anything but the different languages of the world; and if they are not also the *γλῶσσαί* of the rest of the chapter, all coherence and argument is gone; xiv. 5 seems to me to mean "the speaker in a foreign language must translate into Greek, else he will not edify his hearers." Some, however, think *τις* should be supplied with *διερμηνεύη*. And v. 12, "let him pray in a foreign tongue, with intent to translate, that he may (or 'one may') translate it afterwards." In chap. xii. a distinction seems to be drawn between power to speak and power to translate, but in point of fact they are not absolutely identical. Besides, a second translator would always be an assurance and a safeguard; e.g., I might quote a Greek sentence and translate it, and my audience say, "Yes, that is your translation; we should like to hear somebody else's."

Mr. Adams says there is "very little in early Church history to throw any light on the matter." As to throwing light on the meaning of the Greek, that is (in my judgment) because no Greeks would doubt about it. And as to the (to some degree) permanent power in the Apostles to speak foreign languages, we need not expect what had been promised by Christ, and plainly described as fulfilled, to be constantly re-asserted. What everyone knew was taken for granted.

Lastly, and briefly: "Why did the Apostles not write in many foreign languages, if they could speak them?" Speaking a language and writing it do not always go together. And the Apostles' age was a non-writing age. Few writers were there in those times and places. Very few wrote even Palestinian vernacular or Greek. Was it because they could not speak them? Again, most of what we have received written was written then in Greek, because that language was, through all the East, far more universally understood and spoken than some will allow.

W. C. GREEN.

---

ART. V.—THE FIRST VISCOUNTESS MORDAUNT.

THERE are few more conspicuous characters in the reigns of William III. and Queen Anne than Charles, the third Earl of Peterborough, the hero of the siege of Barcelona, and of many other thrilling incidents in the Spanish war. This distinguished general was not only known for his extraordinary skill and energy in the art of war, but for his singular vivacity and love of adventure, and throughout his life for his sparkling wit and humour. Like most great men, he had a remarkable mother. His mother was Elizabeth, the first Viscountess Mordaunt, and it was chiefly from her that he inherited the talents which distinguished him. This lady deserves to be remembered for her own sake, as well as for the sake of her illustrious son.

The father of Charles, the third Earl, was—like his brother, the second Earl—an ardent supporter of the Royal cause in the struggle between Charles I. and his Parliament; and, after the death of the King, he was one of the chief promoters of the efforts which followed, to place Charles II. upon the throne. He was known at this time as the Hon. John Mordaunt, and, as such, was married to the future Viscountess, Elizabeth, daughter and heiress of Thomas Carey, second son of Robert, Earl of Monmouth. This lady was remarkable for her wit, her beauty, and her loyalty in the subsequent court of the "merrie monarch;" but she was far more remarkable still for the beauty of her personal piety and for her devotion to God, and to the duties of religion, in the midst of a court where all thoughts of God were far too often forgotten. Of her it is that Lord Clarendon says, "She concurred with her husband in all honourable dedications of himself," and that she was "a young and beautiful lady, of a very loyal spirit, and notable vivacity of wit and humour." Of her it was that these lines were written,