Globethics Repository



Evidential Tongues

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see https://www.globethics.net. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy.

Item Type	Article
Authors	Menzies, Robert P.
Publisher	Asia Pacific Theological Seminary
Rights	With permission of the license/copyright holder
Download date	2026-11-13 05:36:05
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/237286

Evidential Tongues: An Essay on Theological Method

Robert P. Menzies

[HTTP://www.apts.edu/ajps/98-2/98-2-menzies.htm]

1. INTRODUCTION

The Pentecostal movement is facing an identity crisis. Any discussion of the doctrine of evidential tongues, if it is to be meaningful, must face this fact. This crisis is the product of an historical process which has been at work since the middle part of this century: the assimilation of the Pentecostal movement into mainstream Evangelicalism. This process of assimilation, although gradual and unobtrusive, has significantly impacted the theology and practice of both the Evangelical and Pentecostal movements. And, while it is the Pentecostal movement, which now finds itself at a strategic crossroads of self-definition, the direction it takes will inevitably impact the broader Evangelical world. The following essay will seek to describe the origin and nature of this self-identity crisis, outline the central questions which have emerged, particularly as they relate to evidential tongues, and suggest how Pentecostals might constructively face these challenges.

2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS

The theological roots of the Pentecostal movement are firmly planted in the nineteenth century Holiness movement and American revivalism. This fertile soil nurtured the fundamental affirmations that characterize Pentecostal theology and the approach to scripture upon which they stand. These theological affirmations were, for a variety of reasons, produced in isolation from other sectors of the Christian community. However, with the advent of the Second World War, this quickly changed. Pentecostals frequently found themselves in close proximity to their Evangelical brothers and sisters. New relationships developed, fostering an atmosphere of openness. The Pentecostal movement rapidly began to identify with the broader Evangelical world. Pentecostal Bible colleges featured textbooks produced by Evangelical scholars; their students flooded into Evangelical seminaries. Evangelical institutions and publications impacted the ethos of Pentecostal churches and significantly influenced the outlook of the laity. Now, almost a century after its genesis, the Pentecostal movement finds itself in a new environment: American revivalism has given way to modern Evangelicalism. The major tenets of Pentecostal theology remain the same; but the way we as Pentecostals approach scripture - the hermeneutic, which supports our theology - has been significantly altered. The hermeneutic of Evangelicalism has become our hermeneutic.

The newly adopted Evangelical hermeneutic supports most of the theological doctrines Pentecostals hold dear - those we share with our Evangelical brothers and sisters.[1] Yet this hermeneutical shift represents a very real challenge to those doctrines distinctive to Pentecostalism. Specifically, I refer to the Pentecostal belief that baptism in the Spirit is an experience subsequent to (or distinct from) conversion and that glossolalia represents its initial physical evidence. These cardinal doctrines, formulated prior to the assimilation of the Pentecostal movement into the larger Evangelical community, are based on an approach to scripture that is not entirely compatible with the new hermeneutic shaped by Evangelicalism. Thus, Pentecostal ministers frequently find themselves espousing a theology which is based on an approach to scripture that (if not they themselves) a significant portion of the members of their congregation no longer accept as valid. Now this does not mean that Pentecostal theology is wrong, but it does suggest that we cannot simply rely on the legacy of the past, if we hope to offer credible biblical support for our theological positions. The

context - and, indeed, the very character of the Pentecostal movement - has changed, and we must deal with the tensions this change has produced.

There is then a need to rearticulate our Pentecostal theology, and to do so in a manner, which addresses the pressing questions of our new context. What are these questions? Or to state the problem differently, Why are the old answers not adequate for the present? To this question we now turn.

3. LESSONS FROM THE PAST

3.1 The Inadequacy of Two-Stage Patterns

The doctrine of evidential tongues is inextricably linked to the Pentecostal understanding of baptism in the Spirit as an experience subsequent to (or logically distinct from) conversion. Before Pentecostals can speak of evidence, we must first establish the validity of the experience which it purports to validate. The foundational question then, is this: What is the nature of the Pentecostal gift (Acts 2:4)? For the Evangelical, the answer to this question has been shaped largely by James Dunn's influential book, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. Dunn asserts that the Pentecostal bestowal of the Spirit is the means by which the disciples enter into the new age and experience the blessings of the new covenant. Thus the Evangelical equates Spirit-baptism with conversion. By way of contrast, Pentecostals insist that the Spirit came upon the disciples at Pentecost, not as the source of new covenant existence, but rather as the source of power for effective witness. For this reason Pentecostals describe Spirit-baptism as an experience (at least logically if not chronologically) distinct from conversion which unleashes a new dimension of the Spirit's power: it is an endowment of power for service.

Although the foundational nature of this question can hardly be doubted, it is precisely here where we Pentecostals face our first hurdle. Simply put, traditional attempts to offer biblical support for our doctrine of subsequence are no longer viable in our new context. They fail to speak the language of modern Evangelicalism. Indeed, over twenty years ago James Dunn pointed out the methodological flaw characteristic of traditional Pentecostal arguments. Dunn's critique was specifically aimed at arguments for subsequence based on a conflation of John 20:22 with Luke's narrative in Acts, but it has wider implications:

> The common error...is to treat the NT (and even the Bible) as a homogeneous whole, from any part of which texts can be drawn on a chosen subject and fitted into a framework and system which is often basically extra-biblical.

In accordance with the prevailing scholarly consensus, Dunn suggested that there was a better approach. We should,

> take each author and book separately and...outline his or its particular theological emphases; only when he has set a text in the context of its author's thought and intention...only then can the biblical-theologian feel free to let that text interact with other texts from other books.[2]

Dunn went on to state that this method "is always liable to give the truer picture of the biblical thought than the former." And, I would agree. Dunn may be criticized for inconsistently applying his own method, but his method is sound and it has been widely embraced within our Evangelical context. The lesson to be learned is this: We must take seriously the theological perspective of each biblical author if we are to provide convincing answers. No other approach to biblical theology will do. The central question then is not simply whether we can find some two-stage pattern in the New Testament; but rather, what are the implications of the pneumatological perspectives of the various

New Testament authors (taken on their own terms and understood in their own context) for our understanding of the Pentecostal gift?[3]

3.2 The Problem of Historical Precedent

Once the foundational question concerning the nature of the Pentecostal gift has been addressed, the issue at hand comes into focus: What is the nature of the relationship between this gift and tongues? Of course the Pentecostal affirms that "speaking in tongues" is "the initial physical evidence" of Spirit-baptism. Yet, once again, traditional arguments offered in support of this position have not been convincing. These arguments generally focus on the five episodes in Acts (Acts 2, 8, 9, 10, 19) where it is maintained that glossolalia accompanied Spirit-baptism. Again, the Bible is treated as a homogeneous whole and texts are arranged together with little regard for the author's intent or overall theological scheme. The difficulties of this position have been highlighted by many, most notably Gordon Fee. Fee declares that this approach ultimately fails to convince because it is unable to demonstrate that Luke intended to present in the key narratives of Acts a normative model for Christian experience. The problem is actually twofold. First, the evidence is not uniform: If Luke intended to teach evidential tongues as normative, why does he not consistently present tongues as the immediate result of Spirit-baptism (e.g., Acts 8:17; 9:17-19)? Remember, the key question is not whether Paul or the Samaritans actually spoke in tongues; but rather, why did Luke not explicitly mention tongues if it was his intention to establish the pattern? Secondly, even when tongues is connected to Spirit-baptism, it is doubtful whether this connection is made in order to present evidential tongues as a normative doctrine. In other words, it is difficult to argue, simply on the basis of the repetition of events (historical precedent), that Luke intended to teach the doctrine. More is needed in order to establish normative theology.

Here again James Dunn's methodological observations are helpful. Rather than focusing on isolated passages in an attempt to establish a normative pattern (as we have seen, this approach is destined to fail), we should rather seek to reconstruct the theological (in this case, the pneumatological) perspective of the author and assess its relevance for the question at hand. This approach will necessarily draw from the full range of the biblical author's work (in Luke's case, the breadth of his two-volume work) in an attempt to elucidate his theological perspective. After the perspectives of the relevant biblical authors have been faithfully reconstructed, we can then bring them together to form a holistic biblical perspective.

It is worthwhile to note here that the value of a passage for assessing the theological perspective of a given author cannot be reduced to its "primary intent." A passage must be understood in terms of its original setting and intention, but the theological freight it carries may transcend its "primary intent." Each piece of evidence must be taken seriously as we seek to reconstruct the theological perspective of the biblical author.

An exclusive focus on an author's "primary intent" or "intention to teach" too often leads to a form of tunnel vision which ignores the implications of an individual text for the theological perspective of the author. This myopia is illustrated in Fee's treatment of the Samaritan episode in Acts 8:4-17.[4] He argues that this passage is ultimately irrelevant to discussions concerning the doctrine of subsequence for Luke's "primary intent" lies elsewhere. Now, the primary intent of the narrative, as Fee suggests, may be to stress that the expansion of the gospel beyond the bounds of Judaism had "divine and apostolic approval." And, I would agree, it is unlikely that Luke consciously sought to teach here that the gift of the Spirit is normally separate from saving faith. Yet this does not allow us to ignore the clear implications of the narrative for Luke's pneumatology. Indeed, the fact that Luke does separate the gift of the Spirit from saving faith clearly reveals his distinctive pneumatological perspective.[5] Furthermore, this separation refutes the commonly accepted interpretation of the Lukan gift as "the climax of conversion-initiation."

The lesson to be learned is this: In order to elucidate the theological perspective of a particular biblical author, we must deal with all of the relevant evidence. An examination of isolated passages or a survey of the "primary intent" of these passages will not do. Another key question then emerges: What does a careful analysis of the biblical author's text reveal about his theological perspective? Here, a variety of tools - if they help elucidate the historical meaning of the text [6] - can and should be employed. For years, Evangelical scholarship has been judiciously utilizing and benefiting from historical, redaction, and various forms of literary criticism.[7]

3.3 The "Intention to Teach" Fallacy

A focus on the theological perspectives of the various biblical authors inevitably raises an additional question, one that has rarely been voiced by Pentecostals: How do we put it all together? This takes us into the realm of systematic theology. The difference between the approaches of biblical and systematic theology has been artfully presented by G. B. Caird. Caird describes the task of biblical theology as one of listening to the dialogue of the biblical authors seated at a roundtable.[8] In biblical theology, we listen to their discussion. By way of contrast, in systematic theology we frequently begin with the agenda and questions of our contemporary setting. We bring the pressing questions of our day to the biblical text and, as we wrestle with the implications that emerge from the text for our questions, we seek to answer them in a manner consistent with the biblical witness. We do not simply sit passively, listening to the discussion at the roundtable. Rather, we bring our questions to the dialogue and listen for the various responses uttered. Ultimately, we seek to integrate these responses into a coherent answer.

I would suggest that the question concerning the relationship between tongues and Spirit-baptism is a question of systematic theology. This point has been largely missed by Pentecostals and Evangelicals alike. This omission has resulted, on the one hand, in our inability to present a convincing case; and on the other, in a cavalier dismissal of our position by Evangelicals. We have needlessly hammered away at attempting to demonstrate that Luke intended to teach evidential tongues. Yet "the question of what constitutes 'the initial evidence' of a person having received the 'baptism in the Spirit' simply is not raised in the New Testament."[9] That is to say, neither Luke nor any other biblical author deliberately sets out to demonstrate that "tongues" is the initial physical evidence of that empowering experience (and dimension of the Spirit's activity), which Pentecostals appropriately call, "baptism in the Holy Spirit." This conclusion, however, does not necessarily "render the doctrine invalid" nor indicate that the questions associated with the doctrine are inappropriate.[10] It is not only legitimate, but often necessary, to bring our questions to the text or (as Caird might put it) to the dialogue at the roundtable. Here we must also carefully listen to the voice of scripture. The lesson to be learned is this: Although the biblical authors may not directly address our questions, our goal is to identify the implications for our questions, which emerge from the various theological perspectives they represent. A rigid attempt to argue that Luke (or any other biblical author) intended to teach evidential tongues will not do. Thus, another key question has been identified: What implications emerge from the perspectives of the various biblical authors for our question pertaining to the relationship between tongues and Spirit-baptism?

I have identified three crucial questions, which Pentecostals must address if we are to communicate effectively in our context, shaped as it is by modern Evangelicalism. Each question highlights a weakness in past Pentecostal approaches and clarifies our task for the future. They may be summarized in the form of imperatives:[11]

1. Rather than seeking to find a two-stage pattern in the NT by conflating texts from various authors, we must seek to elucidate Luke's distinctive pneumatology and demonstrate how this necessarily impacts our understanding of the Pentecostal gift.

2. Rather than seeking to find a pattern of evidential tongues from isolated texts in Acts,[12] we must carefully analyze all of the relevant information from the biblical author's text (utilizing all of the tools available to us) in an attempt to uncover his distinctive theological perspective?
3. Rather than seeking to demonstrate that the biblical authors intended to teach evidential tongues, we must wrestle with the implications which emerge from the perspectives of the various biblical authors for our question pertaining to the relationship between tongues and Spirit-baptism?

Let us now turn to a discussion of these tasks.

4. FACING THE FUTURE

4.1 Luke's Distinctive Pneumatology

We have noted that for the issue of subsequence (the foundation for any Pentecostal understanding of tongues), the key question is: What is the nature of the Pentecostal gift (Acts 2)? It is abundantly clear that Luke intended his readers to understand that this gift (whatever its nature) was available to - and indeed, should be experienced by - every believer. Virtually all Evangelicals accept this fact. However, Evangelicals, while acknowledging that divine enabling is prominent in the narrative, affirm that this aspect of Luke's account is simply a reflection of his special emphasis. Luke and Paul, it is assumed, shared essentially the same pneumatological perspective, and thus broader, soteriological dimensions of the Spirit's work are also understood to be present. The universal character of the Pentecostal gift is then easily explained: all should experience the gift because it is the means by which the blessings of the new covenant are mediated. Some may (or again, they may not) receive additional gifts of power for witness.

Yet, if it can be demonstrated that Luke views the work of the Spirit exclusively in Charismatic or prophetic terms (that is, unrelated to soteriological themes such as justification, cleansing, sanctification),[13] then it is not possible to associate the Pentecostal gift with conversion or salvation. Indeed, by placing the Pentecost account within the framework of Luke's distinctive theology of the Spirit, Pentecostals are able to argue with considerable force that the Spirit came upon the disciples at Pentecost, not as the source of new covenant existence, but rather as the source of power for effective witness. And since the Pentecostal gift is Charismatic rather than soteriological in character, it must be distinguished from the gift of the Spirit which Paul associates with conversion-initiation. Here then, is a strong argument for a doctrine of subsequence - that is, that Spirit-baptism (in the Pentecostal or Lukan sense) is logically distinct from conversion. The logical distinction between conversion and Spirit-baptism is a reflection of Luke's distinctive theology of the Spirit.

Note that this argument is not based on biblical analogy or historical precedent. It does not seek to demonstrate that the disciples had received the Spirit, at least from Luke's perspective, prior to Pentecost. Nor is it dependent on isolated passages from the Books of Acts. Rather, drawing from the full scope of Luke's two-volume work, it focuses on the nature of Luke's pneumatology and, from this framework, seeks to understand the character of the Pentecostal gift. The judgment that the gift is distinct from conversion is rooted in the gift's function: It provides power for witness, not justification or cleansing. The universal character of the gift, established in Luke's narrative rather than historical precedent, is the basis for its normative character. I would suggest this sort of approach, which actually follows Dunn's methodology (and that of modern Evangelicalism) in a consistent manner, enables us to articulate in a convincing way a fully Pentecostal theology.

4.2 The Synthetic Task

As we move more specifically to the question of evidential tongues, we face the systematic challenge (see imperatives 2 and 3) outlined above. We are called to identify the implications, which emerge from the various theological perspectives of the biblical authors for our question concerning the relationship between tongues and Spirit-baptism. Elsewhere I have outlined what this sort of enterprise might look like.14

I have argued that the Pentecostal doctrine of evidential tongues is an appropriate inference drawn from the prophetic character of Luke's pneumatology (and more specifically, the Pentecostal gift) and Paul's affirmation of the edifying and potentially universal character of the private manifestation of tongues. My argument may be summarized as follows:

1. Paul affirms that the private manifestation of tongues is edifying, desirable, and universally available. In short, all should speak in tongues.
2. Luke affirms that the Pentecostal gift is intimately connected to inspired speech, of which tongues-speech is a prominent form, possessing a uniquely evidential character.
3. Therefore, when one receives the Pentecostal gift, one should expect to manifest tongues, and this manifestation of tongues is a demonstrative sign (evidence) that one has received the gift.

Furthermore, we might add that although the doctrine of evidential tongues is formulated in modern language and addresses contemporary concerns, it is linked to a process of doctrinal development which extends back into the apostolic age. The question it addresses undoubtedly accompanied the expansion of the church among the Gentiles and it appears to be unavoidable for those who would try to reconcile Paul's gift-language with Luke's Pentecostal gift. The doctrine calls us to retain a biblical sense of expectancy, for it reminds us that the manifestation of tongues is an integral part of the Pentecostal gift, edifying, and universally available. Above all, the manifestation of tongues is a powerful reminder that the church is, by virtue of the Pentecostal gift, a prophetic community empowered for a missionary task.

My own attempt to apply this methodology to the issue of evidential tongues is clearly just a beginning. I do hope, however, that it will serve to encourage others to pursue what I believe to be a fruitful course.

4.3 Central Affirmations

I have attempted to pinpoint several (largely hermeneutical) issues which will be important for Pentecostals as we face the future and attempt to rearticulate our theology. Our goal is, of course, to do so in a way that is faithful to the biblical text and relevant to our contemporary setting. As we reflect on how we can best rearticulate our theology, we will inevitably be confronted with the fact that the text imposes limits on what we can say. With this in mind, it might be helpful, as a way of concluding this section, to outline the various affirmations often found in the Pentecostal movement. The affirmations listed below move from those which (in my opinion) are most fundamental and clearly supported in the scriptures to those which are less so. Which of these affirmations are consistent with the biblical witness and important elements of our Pentecostal heritage?

1. Baptism in the Spirit (i.e., the Pentecostal gift) is an empowering experience logically distinct from conversion.
2. Tongues is a gift available to every Christian.
3. Tongues is a gift which is desirable for every Christian.
4. Tongues is evidence or proof that one has been baptized in the Spirit.

5. Tongues always occurs at the moment one is baptized in the Spirit, thus without tongues one cannot be baptized in the Spirit.

I have argued elsewhere that points one through four are all valid and defensible.15 Point five, as it is worded above, appears to be more difficult to support from the text. There are those who, with some justification, would maintain that while tongues is the biblical accompaniment of baptism in the Spirit, speaking in tongues may not always transpire at the moment one reports Spirit-baptism. For example, Joseph Roswell Flower, an early and influential Assemblies of God leader, testified on several occasions that he first spoke in tongues some two months after he was baptized in the Spirit.16 In any event, we need to reflect on what we can and should say, and how to say it effectively. It is hoped that the affirmations listed here might serve to stimulate discussion concerning where the methodology outlined above might take us.

5. Conclusion: A Strategy for the Future

By way of conclusion, I would like to outline a strategy for addressing "the tongues" question. This strategy moves beyond the methodological considerations highlighted above and suggests concrete steps which Pentecostals might take in order to deal with the issue in a meaningful way.

First, we should emphasize that Spirit-baptism (in the Lukan sense) is a missiological enabling (power for witness) distinct from conversion. We cannot and should not allow our contribution to the broader Evangelical world to be reduced simply to the question of tongues. Pentecostals are raising two crucial questions ("What is the nature of the Pentecostal gift?" and "What is the relationship between this gift and speaking in tongues?"), and both need to be heard. The question concerning the nature of Spirit-baptism is logically prior to the question of its relationship to tongues, more significant for the life of the church, and (I would suggest) more clearly supported in the scriptures.

Secondly, we must recognize the limitations, as well as the strengths, of "initial physical evidence" language. All theological formulations are the product of human beings and thus, for better or for worse, are human attempts to come to terms with the significance of the word of God. All such formulations stand under the judgment of the word of God. The phrase, "initial physical evidence," as all theological formulations, has its limitations. The focus on "evidence" can easily lead to a confusion of the gift with the sign. The Pentecostal gift is not tongues. It is rather an empowering which enables its recipient to effectively participate in the mission of God. The manifestation of tongues is an evidence of the Pentecostal dimension of the Spirit's work, but not the gift itself. An inordinate focus on "evidence" may result in Christians who, looking back into the distant past, can remember the moment they "got it," but for whom the Pentecostal dimension of power for witness is presently unknown.17

Thirdly, we need to stress the relevance of our doctrine of evidential tongues. To many of our pastors and people, the doctrine seems to be simply irrelevant. Yet I do believe that the doctrine holds much promise. "Initial evidence" may indeed be a human formulation, but it does capture well the sense of expectation called for by Luke and Paul: Tongues-speech is an integral part of the Pentecostal gift, edifying, and universally available; thus, when one receives the gift, one would expect to manifest tongues. Furthermore, the manifestation of tongues is a powerful reminder that the church is, by virtue of the Pentecostal gift, a prophetic community empowered for a missionary task. This, of course, does not exhaust the theological significance of glossolalia. Frank Macchia has given helpful direction here and hopefully others will help him blaze this trail.18

Fourthly, we need to stress the fact that tongues-speech is not a badge of holiness nor does it signify that one has entered into a higher degree of spiritual maturity. At a popular level, we are frequently guilty of falling into this Corinthian trap. If we can be clearer on this point, many barriers of resistance might come down.

Fifthly, we need to encourage the production of literature at a variety of levels, especially the scholarly, on this and other related topics. There is no substitute for sound scholarship and it needs to come from a variety of sources (individuals and institutions) and be made available through a wide range of publications and forums. The challenge before us is clear: We must influence the larger Evangelical world or they will influence us! In short, if we are to have an impact on this and especially the next generation, we must produce articles and books which speak the idiom of our day and which provide a strong theological basis for our doctrines. It will take time, effort, and encouragement from institutions, but our voice can be heard.

Footnotes

1. Although Pentecostals represent a diverse sub-group within Evangelicalism, for the purpose of this paper we shall distinguish between Pentecostals (assuming their identification with traditional Evangelical values) as those who affirm a baptism in the Spirit subsequent to conversion which is associated with tongues and Evangelicals as those who do not subscribe to this view.
2. James D. G. Dunn, *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* (London: SCM, 1970), p. 39.
3. When I refer to "the NT authors" or "their perspectives," I am not in any way minimizing or lessening the role of the Holy Spirit as the One who has inspired these authors to write God's word. With this terminology, I simply acknowledge the beauty and the richness of the Bible, and more specifically, the New Testament. In the Bible, God has chosen to reveal himself to us by inspiring real people, who lived in a specific historical and cultural context and who faced and dealt with real issues, to write His word. Thus, when I refer to the theology or perspective of Luke or Paul, I understand this to be entirely consistent with a high view of scripture. I wholeheartedly affirm that the Bible is the divinely inspired, infallible, and authoritative word of God.
4. Gordon Fee, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), pp. 94-96; see also Fee, *Gospel and Spirit: Issues in New Testament Hermeneutics* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), p. 97.
5. In other words, the way in which Luke narrates these events reveals that his pneumatology is different from - although (I would add) complementary to - that of Paul. A high view of scripture does not rule out theological differences between various biblical authors. Rather, it suggests that the differences which do exist are "differences in harmonious development rather than irreconcilable contradictions." (I. H. Marshall, "An Evangelical Approach to 'Theological Criticism'," *Themelios* 13 [1988], p. 83). I would suggest therefore that a high view of scripture demands, not that Luke and Paul have the same pneumatological perspective; but rather that Luke's distinctive pneumatology is ultimately reconcilable with that of Paul, and that both perspectives can be seen as contributing to a process of harmonious development.
6. Note the concern for historical meaning expressed in the excellent hermeneutics textbook penned by William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Dallas: Word, 1993), p. 133: they define textual meaning as "that which the words and grammatical structures of that text disclose about the probable intention of its author/editor and the probable understanding of that text by its intended readers."
7. See for example Donald John's fine article, "Some New Directions in the Hermeneutics of Classical Pentecostalism's Doctrine of Initial Evidence," in *Initial Evidence: Historical and Biblical Perspectives on the Pentecostal Doctrine of Spirit Baptism*, ed. G. McGee (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), pp. 145-67.

8. Caird's approach is summarized by L. D. Hurst, "New Testament Theological Analysis," in *Introducing New Testament Study*, ed. Scott McKnight (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989), p. 145.
9. Larry W. Hurtado, "Normal, but not a Norm: Initial Evidence and the New Testament," in *Initial Evidence*, p. 191.
10. Hurtado, "Normal," p. 191.
11. This is not intended in any way to denigrate our forefathers and mothers. Rather, it is simply an acknowledgment that each generation must address the new and pressing questions of its context.
12. Note the appeal often made to 1 Corinthians in discussions of Acts 9: Paul spoke in tongues didn't he?
13. Roger Stronstad (*The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984]) and I (*Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994]) have maintained this position.
14. See chapter 13, "Evidential Tongues," in R. Menzies, *Empowered for Witness*.
15. See my *Empowered for Witness*.
16. One of J. R. Flower's former students, the Rev. Jim Allen, personally heard Flower testify in this manner and alerted me to this fact. Note also the written sources documented by F. Macchia in his article which appears in this volume.
17. The phrase "accompanying sign" is a possible useful alternative.
18. Frank D. Macchia, "The Question of Tongues as Initial Evidence: A Review of *Initial Evidence*, edited by Gary B. McGee," *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 2 (1993), pp. 117-27.