THE LEGACY OF D. MARTYN LLOYD-JONES (1899-1981): SOME ANALYTICAL PERSPECTIVES[1]

Leigh B. Powell

In the preparation of this paper on the legacy of D.M. Lloyd-Jones, I have found myself oscillating between adopting the view of Cassius, one of the conspirators against Julius Caesar when he exclaims of Caesar:[2]

> Why, man, he doth bestride the narrow world like a Colossus; and we petty men walk under his huge legs, and peep about to find ourselves dishonourable graves.

And that of Oliver Cromwell: [3]

> Mr. Lely, I desire you would use all your skill to paint my picture truly like me, and not flatter me at all. But remark all these roughnesses, pimples, warts and everything as you see me. Otherwise I will never pay a farthing for it.

Knowing Lloyd-Jones' absolute abhorrence of adulation, and his fondness for Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658),[4] I am going to attempt, according to Cromwell's dictum, to paint as accurate a picture of certain aspects of his theology as is possible at this distance, both in time and space, from the scene in the United Kingdom. This paper assumes a knowledge of my two previous articles in *The Gospel Witness*, entitled "Dr. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899 - 1981): A Personal Appreciation."[5] Those articles were written out of a deep sense of personal indebtedness and gratitude to the Lord for the one who, under God, turned my feet into the narrow way. An avalanche of books, from the sermons of the Doctor himself to books and articles about him, have appeared since I wrote in 1981. Chief among these is Iain H. Murray's two-volume biography; *David Martyn Lloyd-Jones*.[6]

I have decided to focus primarily on Lloyd-Jones' doctrine of the Holy Spirit as it relates to preaching, for I believe this is the central aspect of his legacy to succeeding generations of Christians. In his lectures which I heard as a student at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, in the Spring of 1969,[7] he reserved his last lecture for what he considered "the greatest essential in connection with preaching, and that is the unction and the anointing of the Spirit."[8] Listen, as he speaks about this unction of the Spirit:[9]

> What is this? It is the Holy Spirit falling upon the preacher in a special manner. It is an access of power. It is God giving power, and enabling, through the Spirit, to the preacher in order that he may do this work in a manner that lifts it up beyond the efforts and endeavours of man to a position in which the preacher is being used by the Spirit and becomes the channel through whom the Spirit works.

Lloyd-Jones then moves into a discussion of his distinct view of the baptism with the Holy Spirit and preaching.

> There on the Day of Pentecost we have seen the apostles filled with this power, and seen also that the real object of the baptism with the Spirit is to enable men to witness to Christ and His salvation with power. The Baptism with the Holy Spirit is not regeneration - the apostles were already regenerate - and it is not given primarily to promote sanctification; it is a baptism of power, or a baptism of fire, a baptism to enable one to witness. The old preachers used to make a great deal of this. They would ask about a man, 'Has he received his baptism of fire?'[10]

Lloyd-Jones' whole life was a quest and fervent thirsting for the assurance of God's presence and power. His preaching struck you thus: "This is real! God is real! God is here!" Nothing distracted you from the awful reality that you were riveted and naked under the all-seeing eye of God.

In *Authority*, one of his first works to be published, we see from the very title why the Doctor was so preoccupied with assurance. In the Christian - in Lloyd-Jones' eyes, primarily in the preacher - there is the need for an intense experience of personal assurance. With Lloyd-Jones, this was not a self-consuming introspective concern, but a burning passion to be clothed with *divine* authority as he heralded the summons of the King of kings to rebellious sinners. In the introduction to this book, he states quite unequivocally:[11]

> There is no doubt that things are as they are in the Christian Church throughout the world today because we have lost our authority. We are faced by the fact that the masses of the people are outside the Church. They are there, I suggest, because the Church has in one way or another lost its authority. As a result, the people have ceased to listen or to pay any attention to its message.

This much-needed authority he found in what he called the baptism with the Holy Spirit. Moreover, it explains his interest in encouraging other Christian leaders and ministers (even though their theology might differ from his) to seek this baptism with fire. For example, David Watson (1933 - 1984), the Anglican Charismatic leader, along with three friends, sought out Lloyd-Jones for some advice after Watson had had a charismatic experience which he did not entirely understand. To their surprise, Lloyd-Jones "shared a very similar testimony of his own, when the Spirit had come upon him shortly after the Hebrides Revival in 1949. He said that it had given him a *new authority* in his preaching ministry."[12] At this point, Lloyd-Jones said to Watson and his friends: "Gentlemen, I believe that you have been baptized with the Holy Spirit."[13]

Ray B. Lanning, in seeking to answer the question as to whether Lloyd-Jones had ever personally experienced the baptism with the Spirit which he taught, says that in Murray's biography of the Doctor, he came across "several incidents which bear a striking resemblance to the experience the Doctor describes in *Joy Unspeakable*." Lanning quotes the following text from Murray: [14]

> [Lloyd-Jones] knew what it was to have experiences which rendered all questions of position and self-interest utterly insignificant. One such experience occurred at Easter 1925 in the small study which he shared with Vincent at their Regency Street home. Alone in that room on that occasion he came to see the love of God expressed in the death of Christ in a way which overwhelmed him. Everything which

> was happening to him in his new spiritual life was occurring because of what had first happened to Christ. It was solely to that death that he owed his new relationship to God. The truth amazed him and in the light of it he could only say with Isaac Watts:
>
> > Were the whole realm of nature mine,
> > That were a present far too small;
> > Love so amazing, so divine,
> > Demands my soul, my life, my all.

This incident took place in the context of Lloyd-Jones' struggle over whether to leave medicine for the ministry, and appears to have been a large factor in the process by which he came to certainty in the matter.

Murray suggests that this Easter 1925 incident was not an isolated occurrence. We are also given an important statement from the Doctor himself:[15]

> I must say that in that little study at our home in Regency Street, and in my research room at Bart's, I had some remarkable experiences. It was entirely God's doing. I have known what it is to be really filled with a joy unspeakable and full of glory.

Despite the speaker's characteristic reticence in relating matters concerning himself, we have here a remarkably detailed description. Do these early experiences fit the pattern of baptism with the Holy Spirit as given in *Joy Unspeakable?* On page 85 of that volume Dr. Lloyd-Jones proposes to give us "the marks, the signs and manifestations of baptism with the Spirit." Under the classifications of "the personal, subjective, experimental consciousness of the individual" we are given six signs or marks: a sense of God's glory and presence [p.87]; an assurance of God's love toward us in Christ [p.89]; the element of joy and gladness [p.98]; love toward God [p.108]; a desire to glorify the Father and the Son [p.109]; light and understanding of the truth [p.110]. Clearly these are the very elements which stand out so unmistakably in the accounts given above from *The First Forty Years.* In other words, according to the Doctor's own "symptomatology" he himself had the experience he called the baptism with the Holy Spirit very early in his Christian life, and that not once but on several occasions.

Unquestionably, Lloyd-Jones' passionate concern for the baptism with the Spirit derived from his lifelong desire that churches need to experience the electrifying spiritual enlivening that revival brings. It is the thesis of this paper that his ardour for revival is distilled in three indispensable elements: authority, assurance, authentication. This can be ascertained simply through a count of the frequency with which these words stud all his messages and writings. He constantly yearned for a signal, unmistakable conviction and illumination from the Holy Spirit to come into his hearers' hearts - like the afterglow of a nuclear explosion - so that they would all be irradiated with that burning-heart experience which the disciples on the Emmaus road experienced and thus exclaim: "Did not our heart burn within us, while He talked with us by the way, and while He opened the Scriptures?" [Luke 24:32]. This all-consuming interest in revival played a great part in the major emphases of his whole ministry. These emphases are to be seen against the dark curtain of unbelief that hung over Christendom in the mid-twentieth century. What was needed above all in this Egyptian darkness was an *authoritative* proclamation of God's Word, founded on the preacher's rock-like *assurance* in God and *authenticated* by the "demonstration of the Spirit and of power," so that men's faith "should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God" [1 Cor 2:4-5]. It should be noted that he was always at pains to distinguish Biblical revival from the Arminian concept popularized by the American Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875) in his popular volume of lectures, *Revivals of Religion.*

> Finney is the man of all men who is responsible for the current confusion with regard to this matter [of revival]. Our American brethren even get confused about the very terms. They talk about holding a revival meeting; they mean, of course, an evangelistic campaign. That is the result of Finney's influence, and it has really befogged the whole situation. The influence of Finney's teaching upon the outlook of the church has been quite extraordinary. People now, instead of thinking instinctively about turning to God and praying for revival when they see that the church is languishing, decide rather to call a committee, to organize an evangelistic campaign, and work out and plan an advertising programme to 'launch' it, as they say. The whole outlook and mentality has entirely changed.[16]

As early as 1959, Lloyd-Jones anticipated some of the objections that are currently being levelled at his teaching on revival with its concomitant teaching on the baptism with the Spirit and the charismatic gifts. First, he argued, a change occurred around 1860, brought about by the influence of theological seminaries. Until around the 1830s, ministers who had experienced revival preached and in turn numbers of converted men began to preach. These men, says Lloyd-Jones, were:[17]

> Farmers, workers, manual workers and so on. They had not been to a theological seminary. They were men who had a living experience of God in their hearts, who read and studied their Bibles and books about the Bible. They were man of strong natural talent and were very largely self-taught...But then the idea came that as education had spread among the masses and the congregations were now more sophisticated and more learned, the ministry of these simple ordinary men was no longer adequate. (I am not criticizing that attitude; I am trying to put the actual facts before you). It was felt that there was a need for training and that you must have learned men in the ministry...Nor is there any *a priori* reason why spirituality and learning should be incompatible; but nevertheless it does seem to be the case in practice that as men become more and more learned, they tend to pay less and less attention to the spiritual side of things...I have known this very thing in my own life. Unconsciously one can become so interested in the purely intellectual aspect of Christianity and in learning and understanding and knowledge, as to forget the Spirit. I am therefore putting it simply as a possibility for consideration that perhaps the increase in theological seminaries may have been a factor in discouraging people from thinking about revival. The more learned we become, the more respectable we tend to become.

The second reason there is a lack of interest among Reformed men concerning revival, he argues, is "due to the fact that so much energy in the last century had to be given to the fight against Modernism." Orthodox men bent their energies toward developing rational apologetics and consequently failed to proclaim the gospel positively. Of the Church that depends exclusively on reasoned apologetics, he avers: [18]

> The devil has got her, and she tends to be negative only and to fail to recognize the positive activity of the Holy Spirit. History shows that what the Boyle lecturers and Bishop Butler and others failed to do, God did by pouring out His Spirit upon men like Whitefield and Wesley.

The third reason "is a natural dislike of too much emotion....In a most subtle manner such a man develops a dislike of emotion that becomes unhealthy and wrong; he loses his balance and becomes guilty of quenching the Spirit." Bearing immediately upon recent criticisms of his teaching is his remark "that there has been an excessive reaction against Pentecostalism and its phenomena. Many are so afraid of Pentecostalism and its excesses and aberrations that they are quenching the Spirit."[19] One needs to remember that this lecture was given in 1959 before the ground swell of the Charismatic Movement had really surged into the United Kingdom from the United States. "The Charismatic Renewal," Andrew Walker has written, "was...a major religious phenomenon in certain church circles in Great Britain in the late 1960's and 1970's."[20] A fourth major reason for Reformed antipathy to revival teaching, Lloyd-Jones argues, is that the latter can be linked to Arminianism.

> If men like Wesley and Finney and other Arminians can be involved in revival and used in it, well, we ought to be suspicious of revival'. The mistake here is that we all tend to think in terms of labels and parties, not realizing that God displays his sovereignty often in this way, that though a man may be muddled in his thinking, as John Wesley was at certain points, God may nevertheless bless him and use him. And if He cannot do this, then there is no such thing as the Sovereignty of God, and his omnipotence.[21]

Finally, he addresses what is "perhaps the most important and most serious matter....The Puritans themselves do not seem to teach us anything about revival."[22] He suggests several reasons for this neglect. They were so preoccupied with battling against Romanism, Laudian High Church teaching and internal struggles with more radical, mystically-inclined Puritans like Walter Cradock (*ca.*1610-1659) and Morgan Llwyd (1619-1659), that much of their teaching is by way of reaction and gives all too often a negative colouring to their approach. Perhaps, too, they suffered from too much decorum, being "anxious that everything should be done "decently and in order"?[23]

He closes this part of his significant lecture on revival with his analysis of more recent objections. We may briefly summarize them as follows:[24]

> 1. "The dislike of phenomena."
> 2. "The early [Plymouth] Brethren taught, and taught very strongly, that it was wrong to pray for revival because, they said, the Holy Ghost had been given once for all on the day of Pentecost....The argument is, "Why do you pray for the coming of the Spirit - for an outpouring of the Spirit? He was outpoured on the Day of Pentecost. How can He be poured out again?" "
> 3. "Nowhere in the New Testament are we taught to pray for revival." Here the Doctor gives his immediate response: "The New Testament Church was not exhorted to pray for revival because it was in the midst of a revival."

> 4. "You cannot have revival, it is said, without prior reformation. You must be right with respect to your doctrine before you have a right to pray for revival." At once, he gives his rebuttal: "If you say that God cannot give revival until first of all we have had a reformation, you are speaking like an Arminian, you are saying that God cannot do this until we ourselves have first done something. That is to put a limit upon God."

Lloyd-Jones' survey of revival was not wrought out of a purely academic interest. Powerful preaching demands powerful, Spirit-filled preachers. He stabs home this application: "Why should Reformed people above everybody else, be interested in the subject of revival?"[25] Again he summarizes his reasons for the necessity of an outpouring of the Holy Spirit in revival:[26]

> 1. "Nothing so proves that the church is the Church of God....It is solely due to the fact that she is His and that He has graciously intervened from time to time for her preservation that she is alive."
> 2. "This history above everything shows man's impotence when left to himself."
> 3. "What so proves that the work of salvation is the work of the Holy Spirit, and not a mere matter of moral suasion or argumentation, as a revival? How? Well, by the very suddenness of revival."
> 4. "Is there anything that so demonstrates the Sovereignty of God as revival? Think of it in terms of the timing of revival. When does revival come? The answer is not that it is when we have produced certain preliminary conditions, as Finney taught...It is Arminian thinking that teaches in some shape of form, "If only we do certain things, then..."."
> 5. "Lastly, nothing so shows the irresistible character of grace as revival."

In his conclusion, he defends his ministry-long exhortation to pray for revival:[27]

> God forbid that we should become a body of people who just denounce activism and do nothing! That is what is said about some of us. God forbid it should be true! Are we to be merely negative, merely to point at the faults of others, to point out the holes in their system and to be always denouncing negatively and ridiculing them? Of course not! What then are we called upon to do? We are called upon to go on with our regular work of preaching the gospel in all its fulness, in all its wholeness, after the manner of Puritan preaching. Let us do everything we can by every biblical legitimate means to propagate and to defend the faith. Let us use our apologetics in their right sphere. Let us do all that, and let us go on with the work of reformation in which we are engaged; but let us at the same time maintain the balance of which we were reminded by Buchanan. Let us pray for revival, because nothing else will avail us in the fight in which we are engaged. Thank God our efforts are producing results, and far be it from any of us to despise

> them or underestimate them; but it is not enough. The age in which we are living and the condition of the church, not to mention the world, call for a mighty conviction of the Sovereignty of God, the absolute necessity of the work of the Spirit, and these various other points I have been trying to emphasize. And that means nothing less than revival is needed.

In recent years, the overall evaluation of Lloyd-Jones' ministry has swung from one in which his exceptional spirituality, leadership, and spiritual and theological acumen were greatly valued to one in which some have called into question the blessing of his whole ministry. Among those voices strongly critical of the Doctor is that of the Free Presbyterian Church Synod (Scotland), which, in 1986, issued a warning statement that "it is quite impossible for adherents to the theology of the Westminster Standards to embrace the distinctive doctrines of Pentecostal theology."[28] As we have seen, Lloyd-Jones' view that the baptism with the Spirit is an experience subsequent to conversion was intrinsically linked with his concept of revival. It is his doctrine of Spirit-baptism in particular that has aroused the ire of critics, some of whom have called it a "Second Blessing" teaching. His rejection of the Warfieldian cessationist argument respecting the gifts of the Spirit has also evoked strong disagreement. Moreover, these severe strictures against his interpretation of Spirit-baptism and the charismatic gifts have been made by men who themselves derived great spiritual profit from his ministry.

My judgement, based almost exclusively on his published writings, is that it is quite incorrect to classify him as an exponent of classical Pentecostal or Neo-Pentecostal theology. Furthermore, while I would differ from the Doctor over his hermeneutical and exegetical base for his doctrine of the Spirit, I believe that through his instruction, he rightly urged men to expect, in faith and persevering prayer, mighty confirmations of the Spirit's active presence in Christ's Church. Before we can evaluate his doctrine of the baptism with the Spirit, we need to be aware of the very flexible way in which he uses terms. Although he recognizes that the following terms are not identical, he asserts that each one concentrates on different aspects of the same spiritual experience. Thus, he collocates the following terms: unction of the Spirit, earnest of the Spirit, sealing with the Spirit, baptism with the Spirit and receiving the Spirit. Michael A. Eaton points out that Lloyd-Jones occasionally relates the "baptism" to the "filling" of the Spirit. "He is insistent that Ephesians 5:18 has no connection with the baptism with the Spirit, yet the term 'filled' is used in Acts 2."[29]

The question we must now address is: Did Lloyd-Jones teach either classical Pentecostalism or Neo-Pentecostalism? Peter Hocken in a seminal work on the origins and development of the British Charismatic movement, states with regard to Neo-Pentecostalism:[30]

> The initial defining characteristic of the one emerging Charismatic movement is the presence of the Spiritual gifts--especially the most unusual and the most specific, namely speaking in tongues, prophecy and gifts of healing...The centrality of a changed relationship to God in the charismatic experience is evidenced by the regular association between receiving the spiritual gifts, and receiving the Holy Spirit. This finds its most common expression in the concept of baptism in the Spirit.

Now, in a clearcut and very specific way Lloyd-Jones rejects this notion that baptism with the Spirit is attested by speaking in tongues or unusual gifts.

> There are people today [1965], as there have been now for a number of years, who say that the baptism with the Spirit is always accompanied by certain particular gifts. It seems to me that the answer of the Scripture is that that is not the case, that you may have a baptism with the Spirit, and a mighty baptism with the Spirit at that, with none of the gifts of tongues, miracles or various other gifts. No one can dispute the baptism with the Spirit in the case of men like the brothers Wesley, and Whitefield and many others, but none of these things happened in connection with them.[31]

Moreover, throughout his Scriptural expositions, Lloyd-Jones consciously differentiates his teaching from either classical Pentecostalism or Neo-Pentecostalism. What are the differences? In his exposition of Rom 8:15, Lloyd-Jones states that the Spirit of adoption that makes the Christian cry "Abba Father" is one of the manifestations of the baptism with the Holy Spirit.[32] He clearly distinguishes his position from that of classical Pentecostal doctrine with its Arminian approach by asserting these negatives. First, he insists that the "receiving" of the "Spirit of adoption" is passive and not active. It is not something which we are to "take", still less are we to "claim" it. Instead, we "receive" it.[33] Then he says that "we are not to agonize for it...Because this is 'received' passively you have no right to go to a 'tarrying meeting', and set a time limit, or postulate that it is going to happen at a given time. As it is the sovereign gift of God He determines the time as well as everything else."[34] Finally, he asserts:[35]

> You do not receive this by someone laying hands on you. There are many [Pentecostalists] who teach that all you have to do is to go to certain people who, by laying their hands on you, can give you this gift. Now it is quite clear that the Apostles had that gift, and that, in New Testament times, it was confined to them. It was a part of their calling, their authority, and their uniqueness.

It is important to note this last statement. Over against Pentecostalism and Neo-Pentecostalism he emphasizes the uniqueness of the apostolic office. He accepts the cessation of the apostolic gift and sees no scriptural evidence for the transmission of this blessing by the laying on of hands. We note this so as to remove any possible confusion that may have arisen due to the words of Lloyd-Jones' grandson, Christopher Catherwood, who has stated that Lloyd-Jones "believed that all the gifts existed today."[36] Then, in Lloyd-Jones' customary manner, after the negatives come the positives! We list the salient aspects:

1. Recognize the profound character of the experience. " 'Cry',...is the word used of our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane. With strong crying and tears he cried, 'Abba, Father'. This is a very profound experience; it moves one to the very depths."[37]
2. "Realize that it is something which is 'given'."[38]
3. "If you really desire the blessing, prove that you do so by living a life of obedience."[39] Note that there if no suggestion of an easy, instantaneous short-circuiting of the disciplined life of obedience.
4. "We must pray for the blessing and seek it, expressing a longing for it...Take Charles Wesley' way of expressing it:

> O Love Divine, how sweet Thou art!
> When shall I find my willing heart

All taken up by Thee?
I thirst, I faint, I die to prove
The greatness of redeeming love
The love of Christ to me.

Tell Him that is your heart's desire!"[40]

As Lloyd-Jones encountered different responses to his ministry, he moved towards crystallizing in his own mind the one, absolutely indispensable requirement for blessing on his preaching and on the Church. Eaton puts this well when he argues that the catalyst that precipitated his all-consuming desire for the authentication of the Spirit was his realization of the total inadequacy of apologetics.

> In the early years of his ministry he was countering anti-intellectualism. But in the 1960s and the 1970s he was countering 'dead orthodoxy'. His *major* emphasis on the Spirit's baptism seemed to commence in the 1950s (although he held his view from the earliest days of his theological thinking). He moved from an interest in apologetics to an interest in the work of the Spirit. In 1952 he could report: 'For very many years now, although I would not for a moment have chosen such a course myself, a great deal of my time has been taken up with the task of maintaining and defending the evangelical faith.'[41]

His realization of the limited efficacy of apologetics is confirmed many times in his sermons and lectures. In a message given at the dedication service of a new Inter-Varsity Fellowship building on September 29, 1961, he warned:[42]

> I trust what I am saying will not be taken as criticism of scholarship. I have just thanked God for it. We must go on to encourage it. But if we begin to rely on our scholarship we are finished. We must rely on nothing else than the Spirit of the living God. If we put our confidence in anything else, or in anybody else, we shall begin to walk down the road that leads to disaster.

In response to an Australian pastor's request for help, "he concluded his helpful reply with a scintillating flourish that has lingered on my mind: 'Orthodoxy is essential, but that is not enough; we need the authentication that only the Holy Spirit can give'."[43]

From an examination of the abundant contexts in which the baptism with the Spirit is mentioned, one can see that the Doctor shapes his "doctrine" to meet the need of preachers who require the authenticating *imprimatur* of the Spirit in their ministries. Eaton writes:[44]

> It is interesting to note that the vast majority of illustrations that come in his sermons on the baptism with the Spirit are stories taken from the lives of preachers. He constantly makes the point that the baptism with the Spirit is not only for special Christians or for preachers but is for every Christian. Yet when he comes to illustrate his teaching concerning the baptism with the Holy Spirit he is almost

> invariably drawn to tell of incidents from the lives of great preachers.

A survey of his book *Joy Unspeakable* reveals that only the following individuals were not preachers by calling: Blaise Pascal (1633-1662), a Roman Catholic, a "brilliant thinker and philosopher"[45]; Thomas Aquinas (*ca.*1225-1274), "the theologian and teacher of the Roman Church"[46]; a "member of the congregation"[47]; "a woman...[who] became a Christian, in a revival...in the Isle of Lewis"[48]; Johann Tauler (*ca.*1300-1361)...a Roman Catholic priest[49]; "a very ordinary man"[50]; "a simple labourer...James McQuilkin."[51] The other thirty-seven men whom Lloyd-Jones cites to confirm his doctrine of the baptism of the Holy Spirit are all preachers!

We turn now to consider the Doctor's views on the charismatic gifts. He admits:[52]

> I confess freely that it is beyond any question the most difficult aspect of the whole subject, and yet we must deal honestly with it because it is in the Scriptures. It is the question of the gifts of the Holy Spirit which result from the baptism with the Spirit.

Again, he can say with regard to the gifts: [53]

> We need authority and we need authentication. It is not enough merely that we state these things and demonstrate them and put them logically. All that is essential but it is not enough. Is it not clear that we are living in an age when we need some special authentication - in other words, we need revival.

In *The Sovereign Spirit* Lloyd-Jones develops quite a different view of the gifts than is found in either Pentecostalism or the Charismatic Movement. He is not a cessationist in the Warfieldian camp, nor is he a restorationist like John Wimber. He basically asserts that God can sovereignly give these spiritual gifts whenever he chooses, and that history attests that he has done this. Though he goes into detail about their use and control today, he supplies so many tests to distinguish genuine from false claims, one is left wondering whether he believed the claims made for their existence in his day. Typical of his treatment is this reference to the apostles in Acts.

> They had the gift of miracles, but what is so interesting to observe is that the apostles never made experiments, or tried to heal somebody, wondering whether it would happen or not. No, there were no trials, no experiments and no failures. What is still more interesting is that the apostles never made an announcement that they would work miracles on such and such a day. They never put up a poster saying, 'Come on Thursday, there will be miracles performed'. Never! Why not? There is only one answer - they never knew when it was going to happen. What clearly happened was that they were suddenly confronted by a situation and the commission was given to them.[54]

However, we may not turn to these pages for help in identifying the false exercise of prophecy today, especially the trivializing "prophecies" that are often given. In reality, I do not think that the position

enunciated by Lloyd-Jones here in 1965 would be adequate to deal with an existential encounter with a contemporary "prophet" in any of our churches on a Sunday morning! Lloyd-Jones uses very heavy artillery to pound the cessationist argument,[55] and at the peak of the bombardment he makes the unfair charge that cessationists are "really guilty of the error known as 'higher criticism'."[56] In this sweeping criticism even his Reformed mentors, Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) and B.B. Warfield (1851-1921), both eminent cessationists, must be included. Edwards is Lloyd-Jones' beloved theologian of revival par excellence, yet curiously he does not mention him in connection with the cessationist position.

Lloyd-Jones was markedly influenced by the Puritans in his exegesis of Scripture.[57] This raises a fundamental question in regard to the legacy he leaves contemporary ministers in the Reformed tradition: Is the Puritan hermeneutic appropriate for twentieth century-preachers? Lloyd-Jones certainly pulls us into the vortex of all the major hermeneutical problems the Reformed movement has inherited from the Puritans. All too often, Puritan exegesis has been adopted quite uncritically without any discerning analysis of the presuppositions and historical milieu of the Puritans. Little, if any, encouragement has been given to students in the Reformed tradition to work out a consistent Scriptural hermeneutic for contemporary preaching. Thus, men of lesser capabilities than Lloyd-Jones have found themselves embroiled in, and repeating, the harsh and divisive battles over law and grace, Church and state, sabbatarianism, and preparationism that plagued the Puritan era. It is also due to this lack of a well worked-out biblico-theological hermeneutic that we find ourselves with regard to Lloyd-Jones' outstanding stimulus to Reformed ministry on a world-wide scale having to say that his individualistic interpretation of Scripture has contributed to the current confusion regarding the interpretation of the meaning of Pentecost. At this point, in view of these criticisms, I can almost heart the nasal Welsh tones of Lloyd-Jones coming over my shoulder: "Well, then, come along now, Mr. Powell, what solution do you *propose*?"

Well, I would reply, our exegesis must be derived from accurate hermeneutical principles. We shall attempt to briefly state some of those that have a bearing on Lloyd-Jones' doctrine of the Spirit. First, Scripture presents the progresssive coming of God to man from Genesis to Revelation. The focus is not on man and his needs, it is upon God. Second, the Bible is history, but it is also a *unique* redemptive history. All preachers are quite legitmately seeking to have a heaven-sent, arresting effect on their hearers. One should not attempt to achieve this, however, by short-circuiting the hard study of the text in order to get a quick application of the text. Thus, one must first discover the author's intention in the text. Once discovered, the preacher's application will be that much more electric, and inescapably convicting since the hearer cannot quibble; he or she will see what is the truth of *that* text! Third, Neo-Pentecostal exegesis insists that redemptive historical events are recorded in Scripture with the express purpose to provide *examples* or *patterns* for our conduct today. Pentecost is presented in Scripture as the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy [Joel 2:28-32]. If it is simply a *model experience* for post-Apostolic Christians and not primarily a *fulfilment* of God's divine plan of salvation, then Pentecost is not a unique event. We are immediately plunged into an existentialist interpretation of Scripture where the historicity does not matter at all. Fourth, the Bible is not a *timeless* record of spiritual or moral truths, but a history of events in a particular time and place. Lloyd-Jones tends to present an idealized "Golden Age" view of the early Church. If we do not take account of the differences, as well as the similarities, between that culture and ours, we may very well repeat the errors and limitations of the Church at that time. Fifth, when we seize upon some moral or spiritual qualities exhibited in a text, we may miss the broader textual concerns of the covenant, the theocracy and the various covenant offices. Thus, in his *Spiritual Depressions: Its Causes and Cure*, Lloyd-Jones focuses our whole attention on Elijah's spiritual depression under the juniper tree, and thereby misses the whole point of the text![58] The chief concern here in 1 Kings 19 is that Elijah, God's covenant prophet, is the unique bearer of God's Word, and he, the sole light-bearer in the world, has abandoned his post and left Israel in darkness! That is the point of God's re-iterated question: "What are you doing here, Elijah?" Finally, a consequence of this focus on

individual experience, apart from the fact that it leads one to miss the redemptive point of the Scriptural context, is that it tends to reduce the Church's sense of corporate or family responsibility for God's cause, and work in the world and in history. This is strikingly evident in Lloyd-Jones' focus on preachers, rather than on the Church in the sermons we have examined.

In closing this paper, one must emphasize that however we may differ over the hermeneutics and the theological expression of the Christian life, this man *lived* an authentic and powerful spiritual life. All of us may not endorse all of his exegetical conclusions, but we do affirm that he saw the absolute necessity of the Church being revived and sensitive to the work of the Holy Spirit within her. Do we know the authenticating power of God's Holy Spirit in our midst? Do our churches experience what Paul prayed for the Ephesian Christians in Eph 3:14-17? From his own intense level of spirituality, David Martyn Lloyd-Jones raised men's expectations to seek a living face-to-face communion with the Lord of Glory. Whatever else one may say of his ministry, he did lift his congregation up to glory; he left us rejoicing and praising God, and "lost in wonder, love and praise!"

---

1 This is a corrected version of a paper given to the Fellowship for Reformation and Pastoral Studies, Toronto on November 13, 1989.

2 William Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar* Act I, Scene II, lines 134-137 [in W.J. Craig, ed., *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* (New York: Oxford University Press, n.d.), p.950].

3 Cited Antonia Fraser, *Cromwell. Our Chief of Men* (1973 ed.; repr. London: Mandarin, 1989), p.472.

4 In Lloyd-Jones' words: "Surely one of the greatest Englishmen that has ever lived" [*The Sovereign Spirit: Discerning His Gifts* (Wheaton, Illinois: Harold Shaw, 1985), p.92].

5 *The Gospel Witness*, 60, No.2 (April 9, 1981), 8-11; 60, No.3 (April 21, 1981), 7-11.

6 *David Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The First Forty Years 1899-1939* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1982; *David Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The Fight of Faith 1939-1981* (Edinburgh: The Banner of Trust Trust, 1990).

7 Later printed as *Preaching and Preachers* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1971).

8 *Ibid.*, p.304.

9 *Ibid.*, p.305.

10 *Ibid.*, p.308.

11 *Authority* (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1958), p.7.

12 Cited Michael A. Eaton, *Baptism with the Spirit. The teaching of Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989), p.31. Italics added.

13 Cited *ibid.*, p.31.

14 "Dr. Lloyd-Jones and the Baptism with the Holy Spirit", *The Banner of Truth*, 271 (April 1986), 2-3.

15 *First Forty Years*, p.101.

16 "Revival: An Historical and Theological Survey" in his *The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors: Addresses Delivered at the Puritan and Westminster Conferences* 1959-1978 (Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1987), p.5

17 *Ibid.*, p.6.

18 *Ibid.*, p.9.

19 *Ibid.*, p.9.

20 *Restoring the Kingdom. The Radical Christianity of the House Church Movement* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985), p.48.

[21] *Ibid.*, p.10.
[22] *Ibid.*, p.10.
[23] *Ibid.*, p.11.
[24] *Ibid.*, p.12-15, *passim.*
[25] *Ibid.*, p.18.
[26] *Ibid.*, p.18-20, *passim.*
[27] *Ibid.*, p.20.
[28] *The Free Presbyterian Magazine*, 91, No.7 (July 1986), 201-202.
[29] *Baptism with the Spirit*, p.162.
[30] *Streams of Renewal. The Origins and Early Development of the Charismatic Movement in Great Britain* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1986), p.153-154.
[31] *Sovereign Spirit*, p.53.
[32] *Romans: An Exposition of Chapter 8:5-17: The Sons of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1975), p.272.
[33] *Ibid.*, p.261.
[34] *Ibid.*, p.281. Italics added.
[35] *Ibid.*, p.281-282.
[36] "Introduction" to Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Joy Unspeakable. Power & Renewal in the Holy Spirit*, ed. Christopher Catherwood (Wheaton: Harold Shaw Publishers, 1984), p.13.
[37] *Sons of God*, p.279.
[38] *Ibid.*, p.280.
[39] *Ibid.*, p.282.
[40] *Ibid.*, p.282-283.
[41] *Baptism with the Spirit*, p.130. Eaton is quoting D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Maintaining the Evangelical Faith Today* (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1968), p.3.
[42] "Beware That Thou Forget Not", *The Christian Graduate*, 15, No.1 (March 1962), 5.
[43] Cited John W. Campbell, "Our Gracious God" in *Worship in the Church.* Papers Given at the Second International Baptist Conference, October 15-19, 1984 (Toronto: Jarvis Street Baptist Church, 1984), p.218.
[44] *Baptism with the Spirit*, p.218.
[45] *Joy Unspeakable*, p.106.
[46] *Ibid.*, p.112.
[47] *Ibid.*, p.85.
[48] *Ibid.*, p.118.
[49] *Ibid.*, p.125.
[50] *Ibid.*, p.131.
[51] *Ibid.*, p.279.
[52] *Sovereign Spirit*, p.24.
[53] *Ibid.*, p.25.
[54] *Ibid.*, p.153-154.
[55] *Ibid.*, p.28-33.
[56] *Ibid.*, p.43.
[57] See my brief comments in "Dr. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981): A Personal Appreciation", *The Gospel Witness*, 60, No.3 (April 21, 1981), 10.
[58] *Spiritual Depression: Its Causes and Cure* (London: Pickering and Inglis, 1965), p.19.