

other recognized, genuine New Testament passages (Acts 10, 19, and I Cor. 12-14), it is only in Acts 2:1-11 that the meaning is made explicit. Here it is manifestly a divinely given vehicle of linguistic communication for the evangelization of the multitudes in a situation that demanded and justified it, and as a token of the universal message and mission of the Christian gospel.

Ninth, While I Corinthians was probably written somewhat earlier than Acts (I Cor. between A.D. 54-57 -- Acts c. A.D. 63), the question of tongues did not arise at Corinth until nearly a quarter of a century after its occurrence at Pentecost. Luke, the author of Acts, was the companion and fellow worker of Paul during most of his second and third missionary journeys, as also during his two-year Caesarean imprisonment, and on his voyage to Rome and imprisonment there. Consequently it is most certain that Paul would have supplied him information for the Acts record covering those periods when Luke was not with him (especially on Acts 10 and 19). Thus Paul would naturally have approved the interpretation of the events that Luke recorded, though Luke may have gotten his information concerning Pentecost and other events up to the appearance of Paul at Troas from other sources, unless indirectly through Paul (see Acts 8:1-4; 9). In any event his thorough acquaintance with Paul's view on the subject of "tongues", as also other theological issues, seems almost certain. This is absolutely no Biblical evidence of any difference of opinion between Luke and Paul on this "tongues" question, or any other issue in fact. Therefore, on the basis of these facts we would concur with Blackwelder when he says,

We may assume that the viewpoint of Acts is decisive for what Paul writes in 1 Corinthians (on "tongues").

Some expositors begin by attempting to reconstruct the situation at Corinth and then either try to make Luke's account fit what they surmise occurred at Corinth or suggest that there were two different categories of the gift of tongues. Such an approach is unsatisfactory, for it is Luke who describes what the gift was. Paul writes (to the Corinthians) to correct false ideas regarding it. Therefore, if we are to avoid speculation about speaking in tongues, we must get our bearings from the basic treatment which is given in Acts 2:1-11 . . . If the true gift of glossolalia is manifested, it will be according to the pattern of Acts 2:4-11.

Blackwelder is on solid ground when he denies that there is any Scriptural evidence that anyone under the influence of the Holy Spirit ever spoke in an "unknown tongue". Since *glossais* means "languages," and languages are means of person-to-person communication, they will necessarily be known to some people.

Tenth, that the gift of languages, as recorded in Acts 2, was for evangelization purposes, rather than for the personal edification of the believer, as is claimed by advocates of the "unknown tongues" doctrine, is further evident from the absence of any mention of tongues in Acts 2 beyond its initial employment in