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“People who are evangelical in their outlook,” says D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, “are agreed with one another about practically everything in connection with the doctrine of the person and the work of the Holy Spirit apart from this one matter.” The “one matter” he refers to is the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and Lloyd-Jones was one of those who most vividly highlighted the differences on that issue. His teachings concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit have caused both proponents and opponents of the Charismatic movement to label him at least a sympathizer to that movement. Others, including Lloyd-Jones himself, have insisted that he represents the traditional evangelical view, one that has been submerged by a newer teaching that allegedly emasculates the doctrine of the baptism of the Spirit.

Lloyd-Jones’s views of the Holy Spirit have been the subject of a full-length study by Michael Eaton, a major feature of Tony Sargent’s examination of Lloyd-Jones’s preaching, a small but significant part of Iain Murray’s biography of Lloyd-Jones, and the subject of several articles. This present study focuses on his views of the baptism and gifts of the Holy Spirit primarily as he expressed them in a series of sermons preached at Westminster Chapel, London, in 1964-65, sermons which Lloyd-Jones has been quoted as calling “my definitive teaching on the subject” of the baptism of the Spirit. It will address four main questions: (1) What did he teach concerning the baptism of the Holy Spirit? (2) What did he teach concerning the cessation of New Testament gifts? (3) What did he teach specifically concerning the practice of speaking in tongues? (4) What was his relationship to the Charismatic movement? These questions are not only closely related but also lie at the heart of the controversy concerning Lloyd-Jones’s views.

Baptism with the Holy Spirit

Lloyd-Jones says, “We are living, let us remind ourselves in an age hopelessly below the New Testament pattern—content with a neat little religion. We need the baptism with the Spirit.” But what, precisely, was this baptism that he believes is so urgently needed in the modern church? In a fashion that Lloyd-Jones himself might appreciate, it is best to begin with what this baptism is not in his thinking.

Baptism of the Spirit Not a “Regular” Work

Lloyd-Jones distinguishes between the Spirit’s “regular work” and His “exceptional work.” Baptism and revivals are examples of the Spirit’s exceptional work, and regeneration and sanctification are examples of His regular work. Therefore, baptism with the Spirit is not to be identified with regeneration. “It is possible for us to be believers in the Lord Jesus Christ without having received the baptism of the Holy Spirit,” he asserts. Indeed, this premise lies at the heart of much of his disagreement with certain segments of modern evangelicalism. He claims that to confuse the regular operation of the Spirit with the exceptional is dangerously close to quenching the Spirit.

Lloyd-Jones stresses the absolute importance of regeneration by the Spirit—“you cannot be a Christian without having the Holy Spirit in you”—but says, “I am asserting at the same time that you can be a believer, that you can have the Holy Spirit dwelling in you, and still not be baptized with the Holy Spirit.” One of his arguments is that regeneration is nonexperiential, that is, it is not an activity of which a Christian is necessarily aware by some experience. Baptism of the Spirit, however, is to Lloyd-Jones something that is experienced so unmistakably that one cannot help noticing it. It is not something subtle; “this is something essentially experimental, which involves a mystical experience, to use such a term.” He argues from the Corinthian situation, in which the effect of the spiritual gifts resulting from the Spirit’s baptism were so dramatic and unsettling that Paul had to deal with decorum and restraint in writing to that church. This distinction between regeneration and baptism is important in understanding his interpretation of I Corinthians 12:13, as will be seen later.

Likewise, the baptism of the Spirit is not to be identified with sanctification, for “you can be baptized with the Spirit and not show the fruit of
the Spirit, for you can be baptized with the Spirit immediately at the point of conversion. ... But that does not guarantee the fruits. Fruit means growth. That is development, that is sanctification.” He does allow that the baptism of the Spirit is an incentive to sanctification and even states that the presence of a desire for sanctification is a test of the genuineness of the baptism.

The baptism of the Spirit is also not to be identified precisely with the filling of the Holy Spirit. One must approach this point carefully, because Lloyd-Jones believes the references to being “filled with the Spirit” may refer to the baptism of the Spirit, as a description of the baptism of the Spirit. Central to his argument, however, is the identification of the filling of Ephesians 5:18 with sanctification, part of the Spirit’s regular work. “I want to say that a man can be filled with the Spirit in terms of Ephesians 5:18, and still not be baptized with the Spirit.” He compares the Spirit’s sanctifying work to a continuous drizzle and the baptism of the Spirit to a sudden downpour.

**Baptism of the Spirit and Its Synonyms**

What, then, is the baptism of the Spirit in Lloyd-Jones’s theology? Basically, it is a special endowment of power and blessing by a special work of the Holy Spirit “associated primarily and specifically with witness and testimony and service.” The “primary purpose and function of the baptism with the Spirit is beyond any question to enable us to be witnesses to the Lord Jesus Christ and to his great salvation.” Such baptism may or may not be accompanied with spiritual gifts such as tongues, and it plays a role in providing the believer with assurance of salvation. This baptism is not a one-time blessing but can be enjoyed repeatedly by the church as a whole or by an individual. “The blessing can be repeated if you truly seek it. ... Seek it, for it can be repeated many times.”

In the New Testament the Doctor sees several synonyms for “baptism of the Spirit,” notably “sealing with the Spirit” and “the earnest of the Spirit.” It is also essential in understanding his position to realize that baptism with the Spirit is a work of Jesus Christ. He argues that the Holy Spirit does things for the Christian—convicting, regenerating, and so on—but baptism by the Spirit is done by Christ Himself.

**Arguments from Scripture**

An expositor as careful as Lloyd-Jones would not advance such a position without what he believed was a solid scriptural basis. In the Gospels, he notes that Christ conducted His ministry only after baptized and empowered by the Spirit (see, e.g., Luke 4:14), arguing from John 6:25-27 that Christ was sealed at His baptism. Much of his argument comes not from the Gospels, however, but from Acts and the Epistles, particularly the Book of Acts. Lloyd-Jones sees no problem with basing doctrine upon the Book of Acts. “You should never pit one section of Scripture against another,” he says, referring to interpreters who contend that the incidents recorded historically in Acts do not necessarily provide any authoritative teaching for later believers.

A key element in his argument was the evidence he saw of believers who were regenerate but not baptized with the Spirit until later. Noting that the Holy Spirit was not “given” until Pentecost, he cites the apostles individuals who were regenerate but not immediately baptized with the Spirit (see John 15:3; John 20; Acts 1:4-8). But recognizing that many interpreters would agree with his assessment because they conceive of Pentecost as a special outpouring inaugurating the church, he points out further examples. The Samaritans in Acts 8 were regenerate Christians not yet baptized; Saul of Tarsus in Acts 9 was converted but Ananias came to him that he might be filled with the Holy Spirit; likewise Cornelius in Acts 10, the Doctor contends, was regenerate before the Holy Ghost was poured out upon him. He stresses in particular the incident with the disciples of John the Baptist in Acts 19, which he says “is an absolute proof that you can be a true believer in the Lord Jesus Christ and still not be baptized with the Holy Spirit; that incident proves it twice over. Twice over!”

Obviously the Doctor disagrees with those who think Jesus told the disciples to wait in Jerusalem until the Holy Spirit came only because they were awaiting a one-time outpouring. He agrees that there was a kind of dispensational element in Pentecost but maintains that all Christians even afterwards normally experienced
a separation between conversion and baptism with the Spirit. He is able to maintain this argument by denying that the church began on Pentecost and therefore sees no reason to see the baptism of the Spirit as a one-time inauguration. Instead, he believes the church was founded in John 20 when Jesus breathed the Spirit on the disciples. “Read again for yourselves the first two chapters of Acts and I just defy you to find any suggestion, any statement which says in any way that what was happening there was the formation or the constitution of the Christian church as a body and an organism.” The purpose of the “baptism with the Holy Spirit is one of power. It was never designed to constitute the church. Its object and purpose was to give power to the church that is already constituted.”

It should be noted that Lloyd-Jones does not resort partially to a straw man argument on this point. He goes to great lengths to contrast his view of John 20 with the interpretation that Christ’s breathing was just symbolic and not a real imparting of the Spirit. By demonstrating that such an idea is untenable, he leaves his own view victorious on the field by default. However, it is by no means clear that these two views offer the only alternatives. One could easily contend, for instance, that Christ’s action in John 20 was a real imparting of the Holy Spirit but that Pentecost marked a special outpouring of which the action in John 20 was only a foreshadowing.

Lloyd-Jones acknowledges the importance of the Book of Acts to his view of the baptism of the Spirit by noting that the teaching is less prominent in the Epistles. He believes that in the New Testament most Christians were already baptized with the Spirit so that the apostles could write with that assumption. Such an assumption cannot apply to the modern church, however, because the signs of widespread Spirit baptism are not present. It is in the Epistles, though, that Lloyd-Jones must wrestle with major texts advanced by those who disagree with his interpretation, particularly 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Ephesians 5:18. His explanation of the Ephesians passage (“be filled with the Spirit”) has been mentioned above, that there Paul refers to the sanctification of the believer and not to baptism of the Spirit as Luke does in Acts 2:4 (“filled with the Holy Ghost”; see also Acts 4:31).

First Corinthians 12:13 is even more critical: “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.” Paul’s language clearly seems to indicate a baptism that takes place at conversion for all believers—and with this interpretation the Doctor agrees. His position, however, is that the other references to baptism of the Spirit must not be interpreted through the filter of this verse, because a different baptism is being referred to. The Corinthians passage refers to regeneration. Here Lloyd-Jones’s distinction between baptism by the Spirit and with the Spirit comes into play. Christians are baptized by the Spirit into one body in I Corinthians 12:13, but Christ baptizes believers with the Holy Spirit for power and witness in the Book of Acts. The Holy Spirit is the main agent in the first case, and Christ is the main agent in the second. Michael Eaton, who agrees with Lloyd-Jones on this point, defends the concept that I Corinthians 12:13 must be interpreted separately from the verses in Acts, which he admits “may be linguistically untidy” but thinks is necessary from “contextual exegesis.”

In short, Martyn Lloyd-Jones does not believe that the baptism of the Holy Spirit is a one-time blessing that came at Pentecost nor does he think it occurs at regeneration. Instead, he sees it as a constant and repeated blessing, a blessing which the modern church is missing. In fact, when presented with the argument that there seems to be in the modern church no such Spirit baptism as he describes, he replies that the New Testament church was baptized with the Spirit and that the modern church is not but that it should be. He quotes Peter on Pentecost to argue his point, saying, “This is what God’s people are offered at all times in all places; there is no limit placed upon it at all.”

Baptism of the Spirit and Assurance

As mentioned previously, Lloyd-Jones equates the baptism of the Spirit with the sealing of the Spirit. He says that “sealing” can refer to ownership, to security (as in sealing a package), and to authentication. The first two ideas are present in the biblical concept of sealing, but the last predominates. One of the major results of baptism with the Spirit, or sealing, is this authentication to the believer that he is a child of God. At one point in his series the Doctor says that the reason he is dealing with this topic is that the
baptism of the Holy Spirit gives “an unusual assurance of ... salvation.”

Here Lloyd-Jones displays his view of a matter of controverted interpretation. The question of the assurance of salvation was a major difference between the reformers and the Roman Catholic Church. Protestants agreed on the fact of assurance, but they differed about its nature. Lloyd-Jones himself notes that the early reformers saw no difference between saving faith and assurance of faith but that later Protestants (as in the Westminster Confession) made a distinction between them. As for his own position, the Doctor argues that saving faith is different from the assurance of faith.

Lloyd-Jones reveals one of the Puritan influences on his thought at this point, although there is no suggestion that he followed the concept because it was Puritan but rather because he believed that some Puritans had advanced a scriptural teaching. Eaton notes that Calvin, like the other early reformers, saw no distinction between regeneration and sealing and believed saving faith included assurance by its nature. He points out that Lloyd-Jones differs from Calvin, preferring to follow the pattern of Puritans typified by Richard Sibbes who taught assurance through a direct testimony of the Spirit. Henry Lederle classes Lloyd-Jones with “The Reformed Sealers” who see the sealing of the Holy Spirit as a postconversion experience. In this classification he also includes Sibbes, Thomas Goodwin, John Owen, Charles Hodge, and Charles Simeon. Sargent says, “Though Lloyd-Jones’s personal views may be considered as a refinement or development of the thought of his predecessors, in no way can it be proven that he was adrift from the beliefs of many of the Puritans or eighteenth-century men.”

The Doctor sees three kinds of assurance. “The first type of assurance is the assurance that we get by deduction from the Scriptures,” that is, a Christian reasoning logically from the Bible’s promises concerning salvation that God has saved him. The second is that found in 1 John, “that there are various tests which you can apply to yourselves,” such as love for the brethren. The third kind, that resulting from sealing, is “an assurance that is given to us by the blessed Spirit himself.” He quotes Romans 8:15-16 and says, “Now this is what I mean by this highest form of assurance, the Spirit bearing witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. It is direct, immediate. Not our deduction but his absolute certainty, the Spirit telling us that we are the children of God.” Such assurance both gives comfort to the believer and lends power and fervor to the witness for which the baptism is granted. Among “the marks, the signs and manifestations of baptism with the Spirit,” Lloyd-Jones places “first and foremost ... a sense of the glory of God, an unusual sense of the presence of God.” Another pronounced characteristic that always accompanies it,” he adds, “is an assurance of the love of God to us in Jesus Christ.” Assurance and resulting power in testimony are the effects the Spirit’s sealing.

**Baptism of the Spirit and Revival**

In addition to linking assurance to the baptism of the Spirit, Lloyd-Jones also sees a link between revival and the baptism of the Spirit. At times this link seems to be a close connection: “The difference between the baptism of the Holy Spirit and a revival is simply one of the number of people affected. I would define a revival as a large number, a group of people, being baptized by the Holy Spirit at the same time.” At other times, this link sounds like an absolute equivalence of Spirit baptism with revival. Eaton observes about Lloyd-Jones’s views on revivals and baptism of the Spirit that “there can be no doubt that for him they are virtually the same thing. Revival views the matter corporately; the ‘baptism with the Spirit’ is his term for the experience viewed more individually.” In the Doctor’s thinking, the baptism of the Spirit feeds revival in a circular manner: the baptism poured out on individuals results in such powerful witness and testimony that revival arises from the results of that witness.

The matter of revival is a major issue in Lloyd-Jones’s theology and is worthy of a separate study in itself. The desire for revival was very keen in Lloyd-Jones. Revival “has been God’s way of keeping the church alive” throughout history he says, and he sees a sort of succession of revival through the Montanists, the Donatists, the Waldensians, the Brethren of the Common Life, and onward—but not into his own day. He blames this lack to a "seriously
defective” doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the modern church. “This, it seems to me, has been the trouble especially during this present century, indeed almost for a hundred years.”

Understanding the centrality of revival to Lloyd-Jones’s thought, and his close identification of revival with the baptism of the Spirit, explains his almost harsh attitude toward those who view that baptism as a one-time event at Pentecost. “If your doctrine of the Holy Spirit does not leave any room for revival, then you cannot expect this kind of thing. If you say the baptism with the Spirit was once and for all on Pentecost and all who are regenerated are just made partakers of that, there is no room left for this objective coming, this repetition, the falling of the Holy Spirit in power and authority upon a church.” The result, he claims, is a turn to man-centered evangelism. “You see it [the teaching of a one-time baptism at Pentecost] excludes ... the whole doctrine concerning revivals; and that is why we have heard so little about revivals of religion in this present century. We have heard a great deal about campaigns, but very little about revival, and that is where this great departure has taken place from what had been the rule amongst evangelical people in the Christian church ever since the Protestant Reformation.”

He charges that “when things are not going too well, the church does not exhort people to pray for revival, but decides to have an evangelistic campaign.”

**Arguments from Church History**

Lloyd-Jones’s linking of revival to the baptism of the Spirit also leads to another aspect of his teaching, his arguments from church history. Throughout the series of sermons on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, he appeals to examples from history to support his thesis. He offers what is almost a philosophy of history to explain the connection of history to the teaching of Scripture:

The church is the church of God, and essentially the same throughout the ages. There is an amazing continuity, and the principles taught in Scripture are worked out in the history of the church. And because we are in the flesh, we are helped by examples and illustrations, hence the great value of history. I know of nothing next to the reading of the Scriptures themselves that has been of greater value to me in my own personal life and ministry than constant reading of the history of the church. I thank God for it more than ever, for the way in which, by illustrating these things, it has saved me from pitfalls and has shown me the right way to assess these matters.

One sermon in the series, “Test the Spirits,” is an example of these principles in action, as he relies heavily on church history as a means of testing the spirits to discern the true from the false in connection with the Spirit’s work.

Tony Sargent counts twenty-six figures in church history that Lloyd-Jones identifies in his series as having received the baptism of the Spirit. The Doctor cites, among others, John Knox, Hugh Latimer, John Flavel, Blaise Pascal, John Wesley, Howell Harris, Jonathan Edwards, D. L. Moody, R. A. Torrey, A. B. Simpson, and even Charles Finney. Their testimonies, he argues, refute the charge of novelty against his position. At the same time, he uses history to defend his belief that the baptism of the Spirit was not always necessarily accompanied by the gifts. He mentions Whitefield, the Wesleys, and Moody as men baptized by the Spirit but who did not work miracles.

The Doctor also offers historical arguments to help explain why the spiritual gifts and the baptism of the Spirit have apparently vanished from church history at various periods. He sees one cause as the decision of the early apologists to rely on spiritually deadening philosophy rather than the Word of God and the enlivening Spirit. In the fourth century the Constantianian settlement brought to the church smothering regulation and rigid institutionalism that quenched the Spirit.

He points to the tendency of Christians to stress academic learning from the 1850s as a reason for the loss of the power of the Spirit in more recent days, blaming respectable “Victorianism” for infecting the church. “Dignity! Formality! Learning! Culture!” he says disdainfully, created a situation in which “a man was judged in terms of his degrees and his diplomas, not his anointing with the Holy Spirit.”

**The Cessation of Spiritual Gifts**

Martyn Lloyd-Jones identifies the granting of spiritual gifts in the baptism of the Holy Spirit as
one of the signs that often (but not always) accompanies that baptism. Therefore, he pointedly rejects cessationism, the teaching that certain sign gifts such as tongues, healing, and prophecy ceased at the close of the New Testament era with the completion of the canon and the passing of the apostles. He refutes the classic argument from I Corinthians 13:10 (“when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part is done away”) and proceeds to answer the main arguments for cessationist position. The Doctor concludes that “there is nothing in the Scripture itself which says that these things are to end.”

For example, he denies that these were only sign gifts designed to convince the Jews, because they were also performed among the Gentiles. The fact that these gifts were not mentioned elsewhere, such as the pastoral epistles, he calls an unconvincing argument from silence. He likewise maintains that it is no argument against the gift of healing that Timothy and Epaphroditus were not healed of illness, because the sign gifts were not permanently and universally given; rather, they were present as God sovereignly decided. The Doctor becomes quite pointed in his criticism of cessationism. To say that the gifts do not apply to post–New Testament believers is to “pick and choose” what one will believe, he says, likening such a position to higher criticism. To say that to say the miraculous gifts are temporary, Lloyd-Jones declares, “is simply to quench the Spirit.” Masters rightly protests that the Doctor’s “most withering and intolerant passages [are] reserved for the most unreasonable of people—the cessationists.” Masters further charges that the argument for the cessationist position is “greatly overstated” and distorted in these sermons.

Yet Sargent points out that despite his pointed rejection of cessationism, Lloyd-Jones was in effect not far from the cessationist position. As will be seen, his acceptance of the idea of continuing spiritual gifts did not necessarily translate into acceptance of the modern practice of those gifts. Furthermore, as Sargent notes, “He did assert that certain aspects of the Acts record were foundational and would not be repeated.” The apostleship he calls the “obvious example,” but he particularly notes the Doctor’s belief that the office of the prophet, in the sense of advancing new revelation from God, ceased with the writing of the New Testament when this office was no longer necessary.

In addition, Lloyd-Jones’s strong belief in God’s sovereign distribution of these gifts results in his staking out a position somewhere between cessationism and modern Pentecostal/Charismatic ideas. He does not believe anyone can do anything to secure the baptism of the Spirit and hence likewise cannot secure the gifts; they are given in a sovereign manner by God. The Doctor, for instance, calls the idea that the gifts are always present to be claimed by faith “unscriptural,” saying that “we must never use the word ‘claim.’ It is incompatible with sovereignty.”

Lloyd-Jones bases this sovereign distribution on what he sees as clear scriptural precepts. Of tongues he says, “If—and it is indeed the teaching of I Corinthians 12 that this is the case—if the gift of speaking in tongues is something that is given by the Holy Spirit himself in his sovereignty and in his Lordship, if he is the giver, then he can give it whenever he likes, and he can withhold it whenever he likes.” Likewise, other gifts and miracles cannot be worked whenever a person wants, and he offers several examples to prove that the gifts are not at the discretion of the recipient. He notes, for example, that the demon-possessed girl in Acts 16 followed Paul for several days before he cast out the demon, implying that the apostle could not cast out the demon whenever he wished. The confusion between baptism of the Spirit and the gifts arises, he contends, because the sovereign Spirit sometimes gives these gifts when He baptizes and sometimes He does not. In fact, at one point he identifies his “main purpose in this whole series of sermons” by saying, “It seems to me that the teaching of the Scripture itself, plus the evidence of the history of the church, establishes the fact that the baptism with the Spirit is not always accompanied by particular gifts.”

The Gift of Tongues

Perhaps there would be little (or at least less) controversy concerning Lloyd-Jones’s view of the baptism of the Spirit if it were not for his acceptance of the possibility of the gift of tongues. Earlier evangelical leaders such as D. L. Moody and R. A. Torrey taught a form of Spirit
baptism similar to the Doctor’s without arousing particular controversy. But the rise of Pentecostalism in the early 1900s and even more the Charismatic movement in the 1960s made the gift of tongues a symbol of larger movements.

One must first note that Lloyd-Jones is more open to the gift of tongues than most Reformed evangelicals have been historically. Referring to I Corinthians 14, for example, he says the practice of tongues “is not merely permissible” but is in fact “desirable.” He not only thinks tongues in Corinthians were an “ecstatic utterance” and not a known language but even goes so far as to say, “I am very ready to agree with those who say that he [a man who speaks in tongues] is probably speaking in the language of paradise, the language of the glory itself.”

Rather than condemning tongues speaking outright, he is willing to consider their possible validity. “When a man comes to me and tells me of some great occasion in his life when, while praying, the Holy Spirit suddenly came upon him and he was lifted up out of himself and found himself speaking in a strange tongue, I am ready to believe him and to accept him, especially if he tells me either that it has never happened to him again or that it has only happened very infrequently. I will accept it as being an authentic experience.” He may have been referring in this sermon to an encounter he describes in a later one: “I know a man, a missionary for years in China, who tells me that on one occasion when alone in his room, he was baptized with the Holy Spirit and found himself speaking in tongues. He has never done so since. … I said, ‘My dear friend, the fact that you tell me that it has only happened to you once makes me say that it was genuine and authentic. If you told me that you could do it whenever you liked I would be really troubled.’”

Yet, as these last quotations indicate, his approval of speaking in tongues is by no means unqualified. He says that the practice of the spiritual gifts must be marked by control and understanding, and he strongly opposes the idea of letting oneself go mentally in order to open oneself to spiritual influence. He calls it “so wrong and so dangerous … to try to induce or produce in ourselves the gifts of the Spirit,” and he therefore criticizes relaxation and breathing exercises that supposedly bring about the baptism of the Spirit, denounces uttering nonsense sounds until one begins to speak in tongues, or clapping hands and singing choruses to initiate a spiritual experience.

The Doctor also warns against the power of suggestion and hypnotism. Citing the book This is That about revivals in the Congo, he considers it significant that tongues speaking occurred only in those areas of the Congo in which tongues had previously appeared or been discussed; where there was no prior exposure to tongues, no tongues appeared in connection with the revival. He observes that “if the suggestion is made that all who have the baptism of the Spirit must speak in tongues and this is repeated and repeated, it is not surprising that people begin to speak in tongues. … I am concerned … we should never forget the power of suggestion.” Beyond this, Lloyd-Jones warns of dangerous sources of tongues speaking. Spiritism, psychology, and hysteria can produce tongues or even healings, he notes, and he records the example of a lay pastor he knew who was dealing with a girl who was “devil-possessed” but could speak in tongues.

In short, as Eaton observes, in contrast to most Reformed theologians and ministers, “Lloyd-Jones firmly believed in the possible continuation in the church of the gifts of the Spirit. He was, however, exceedingly cautious about accepting the validity of particular claims.” After summarizing the Doctor’s position, he concludes that for Lloyd-Jones the gifts “could be given with the baptism with the Spirit but were not indispensable [sic] to it. Other agencies, psychological and demonic, could produce phenomena and so phenomena in themselves were non-significant.”

The Charismatic Movement

The question of speaking in tongues leads to the larger and even more controversial question: What was Martyn Lloyd-Jones’s relationship to the Charismatic movement? Both advocates and opponents of that movement identify Lloyd-Jones as sympathizer. Herman Hanko, a staunch Calvinist traditionalist, claims that the series on the baptism of the Spirit “leaves no doubt about it that elements of the charismatic movement were indeed characteristic of his thought.” He sees
Lloyd-Jones’s “fundamental concession to the charismatic movement” in his acceptance of “the very heart of the charismatic heresy,” which is the “second baptism of the Spirit.” Michael Eaton, a Pentecostal, asserts, “Lloyd-Jones was sympathetic to Pentecostalism, as indeed he was sympathetic to any evangelical group which emphasized the need of the working of the Holy Spirit.”

Of course, a necessary part of answering this question is determining what it means to be “Charismatic.” Sargent says Lloyd-Jones was “a charismatic preacher” in the sense of his stress on “the empowering of the Spirit both in the preparation and delivery of sermons” and in his idea of “unction” or “sacred anointing,” that is, preaching under the blessing and power of the Holy Spirit. But this is not what is commonly meant when Lloyd-Jones is called a sympathizer to the Charismatic movement.

One should note first that Lloyd-Jones never favored movements that stressed any single aspect of Christian teaching, such as holiness, prophecy, or the spiritual gifts. “You do not find a movement on gifts, because if you do you will find that you are saying very little about the Lord. And any teaching or preaching which does not keep the Lord central and vital and overruling everything is already wrong teaching. That kind of teaching always leads to trouble and eventually to disaster.”

Furthermore, the roots of his beliefs were far removed from the Charismatic ethos. As mentioned before, Lloyd-Jones owed much more to Puritanism than to Pentecostalism as the source of his teaching of the baptism and gifts of the Spirit. Michael Eaton, who has done the most thorough work on the sources of Lloyd-Jones’s pneumatology, sees three major influences on his thought, all Puritans: Richard Sibbes (1577-1635), Thomas Goodwin (1600-1679), and John Owen (1616-1683). Chronologically, even the 1964-65 series of sermons do not fit into a Charismatic framework. Iain Murray argues that the sermons on Spirit baptism could not be taken as any kind of expression of the Charismatic movement for the simple reason that there was no Charismatic movement in Britain when the series began in 1964; it was still basically an American phenomenon at that time. Sargent maintains that Lloyd-Jones cannot be accused of accepting or furthering the Charismatic movement, although he likewise did not oppose it. Instead, he argues that Lloyd-Jones stood in a line of interpreters tracing back to the Puritans and that his views did not derive from nor seek to serve the Charismatics.

As the previous section on tongues indicated, Lloyd-Jones rejects several tenets of both Pentecostalism and the Charismatic movement. He says on one occasion, “It is possible for a man to be baptized with the Holy Spirit without ever speaking in tongues, and, indeed, without having some of these other gifts which the Apostle lists in this great passage that we are examining.” Again, he contends that “speaking in tongues is not the invariable accompaniment of the baptism of the Spirit. I put it like that because there is teaching which has been current for a number of years and still is today, which says that speaking in tongues is always the initial evidence of the baptism with the Spirit. It therefore goes on to say that unless you have spoken in tongues you have not been baptized with the Holy spirit. Now that, I suggest, is entirely wrong.”

He is no more sympathetic to the idea of the laying on of hands: “This whole idea of giving the gift by the laying on of hands has been restored by the Pentecostal movement in this present century, but until then you do not find it. You find rather what seems to have been the norm in the New Testament itself—namely, that the Spirit has ‘fallen upon’ people in the various ways I have tried to describe to you.” Even when Lloyd-Jones allows for tongues, healings, and the like, the strictures he places on their practice—particularly the sovereign distribution by the Spirit—do not leave room for Pentecostal and Charismatic practices.

Lloyd-Jones’s correspondence offers other examples of his dissent from Pentecostal and Charismatic teaching. In the 1969 he was asked to offer an opinion on a dispute between John A. Schep, a founder of the Reformed Churches of Australia who had Pentecostal leanings, and non-Pentecostal Dutch professor Klaas Runia. He wrote to Schep, “I find myself in between both of you. I feel that you perhaps do not ‘prove and try the spirits’ sufficiently, and that you stress Tongues in the Pentecostal sense and as those who are guilty of the Corinthians error do, where as I feel that Prof. Runia is guilty of ‘quenching
He wrote to Runia, “I certainly feel that Prof. Schep has crossed the line into a form of Pentecostalism. He shows this in his emphasis on Tongues and also in his urging people to seek this particular gift and, indeed, to claim it.”

Perhaps the best summary of his position comes from a letter to a third party later that year: “I think it is quite without scriptural warrant to say that all these gifts ended with the apostles or the apostolic era. I believe there have been undoubted miracles since then. At the same time most of the claimed miracles by the Pentecostalists and others certainly do not belong to that category and can be explained psychologically or in other ways. I am also of the opinion that most, if not all, of the people claiming to speak in tongues at the present time are certainly under a psychological rather than a spiritual influence. But again I would not dare to say that ‘tongues’ are impossible at the present time.”

As an interesting sidelight, three years later an Australian, John Knight, wrote to Lloyd-Jones after hearing an evangelist say that Lloyd-Jones privately spoke in tongues but would not admit it. The Doctor replied, “I am very happy to answer your questions; and it is simply this, that I have never spoken in Tongues either in private or in public.”

In light of this evidence, the most one can say is that Martyn Lloyd-Jones left openings for Charismatic teaching but cannot be classified as Charismatic himself in doctrine. Peter Masters, who is very critical of Lloyd-Jones’s view of the baptism of the Spirit, nonetheless notes, “It is clear … that Dr. Lloyd-Jones was by no means a 100% card-carrying charismatic.” Likewise Charismatic Michael Eaton writes, “Lloyd-Jones cannot be interpreted simplistically as ‘for’ or ‘against’ the charismatic movement.”

One issue that is not often raised in discussions of Lloyd-Jones’s alleged pro-Charismatic sympathies is the inconsistency of such sympathy with his separatist stand. In the 1960s the Doctor caused a major disruption in British evangelicalism by urging evangelicals to leave their compromised denominations. The Charismatic movement is not simply an extension of Pentecostal teaching to larger boundaries. It is a theologically inclusive movement with strong tendencies toward doctrinal indifferentism as a result of its stress on “unity in the Spirit.” It would be difficult to reconcile Lloyd-Jones’s separatist position with acceptance of such a movement.

And in fact Lloyd-Jones did not ignore this aspect of the discussion. In 1971 he characterized the Charismatic movement as one of the influences that undercuts the careful definition of evangelical truth because of its insistence on unity based on Charismatic experience. Murray notes some of the Doctor’s criticisms of the Charismatic movement, such as his opposition to the idea of Catholics, even cardinals, being accepted in Charismatic circles because they had a “charismatic experience” while still holding to Catholic teachings that makes doctrinal agreement impossible. He also rejects the idea of prophesying as it related to receiving infallible revelation. The reason that such disagreements with the movement did not get wider notice was that Lloyd-Jones’s policy was to win men through persuasion rather than polemics, and he therefore refused to criticize the movement as much as some others did.

In brief, it is a distortion to assert that Lloyd-Jones favored or really in any way promoted the Charismatic movement. At most, one can allow only Masters’ legitimate warning that Lloyd-Jones’s teachings on the baptism of the Holy Spirit “have persuaded many admirers of Dr. Lloyd-Jones to take a much more open view of charismatic teaching, with resultant damage.”

Evaluation

Such was Martyn Lloyd-Jones’s fame and influence that few would deny that his teaching had an impact on the large segments of evangelical Christianity. Michael Eaton not only approves of Lloyd-Jones’s teaching but also sees an original contribution in his thought. Eaton suggests that the Doctor formulated a doctrine of Spirit baptism that avoids the problem of splitting Christians into spiritual “haves” and “have-nots,” a charge often made against systems that divide believers between those who have a special measure of the Holy Spirit and those who lack it. Eaton explains, “The baptism of the Spirit is conceived as sealing what is already present objectively. The Christian who is ‘assured’ of salvation is not more Christian, or more forgiven,
or more justified, or more regenerated. He is not necessarily more sanctified either before or after such an experience. ... It is not objectively a ‘second work of grace.’ It is a ‘release of the Spirit.’”  

Some have questioned why Lloyd-Jones ever advanced this teaching. Peter Masters, a former associate of the Doctor’s, suggests somewhat harshly that the motive was desperation and frustration. He says of Lloyd-Jones’s view of the baptism of the Spirit, “I feel that it arose from a sense of great disappointment because of the apparent lack of success of the work of so many reformed churches.” Masters goes on to argue that Lloyd-Jones did not see “his own philosophy of Christian service as a possible cause,” namely, “a wrong definition of the primacy of preaching—a definition which set no value upon the service and instrumentality of ‘ordinary’ Christian people.” Masters concludes that the Doctor “had come to feel that people were stressing doctrine and not experiencing enough of the Spirit. But if the reformed folk with whom he was familiar had been trained and encouraged to engage in practical Christian service, this tendency would never have come about.”  

Admittedly, some of the Doctor’s supporters lend support to the idea that this teaching was a kind of revision forced upon him by circumstances in later years. Christopher Catherwood, Lloyd-Jones’s grandson, says that his grandfather aroused interest in Reformed theology and expository preaching after World War II, before which time he found Christians “rather flabby, and afraid of both doctrine and intellect.” By the 1950s, however, he thought that “many reformed people had become dry and arid” and “lacked the fire and sense of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit.” J. I. Packer likewise thinks that Lloyd-Jones, having spent his early career challenging anti-intellectual evangelicals to think and to think theologically, found himself in the 1960s teaching two different groups. On the one hand were very rational, orthodox Christians with little fervor, “Calvinistic pietists ... who lacked assurance and joy.” On the other hand were “experience-oriented Christians” who were “going overboard on charismatic concerns.” The series of sermons addressed both groups.  

Sargent, however, rejects Masters’ idea that Lloyd-Jones’s preaching on the baptism of the Spirit was a desperation measure. He points out that his teaching predates the 1960s and contends that circumstances did not give rise the teaching but merely caused the Doctor to bring it to the forefront. Sargent’s view is apparently borne out by Lloyd-Jones’s own words. He says in one place, “I am doing this for one reason only. To me the most urgent question of the hour, is the need of this power for witness, the need of this power in our lives. The early church turned the world upside-down as the result of this baptism, and without it we shall avail nothing. So it is important for the church as a whole and for the individual Christian.”  

Even apart from the controversy over how to interpret the baptism and gifts of the Holy Spirit, Lloyd-Jones can be faulted in some of his reasoning. His discussion of revivals is somewhat circular. Because he closely identifies revival with the baptism of the Spirit, then those who identify the baptism of the Spirit with Pentecost and the believer’s conversion cannot look for revival. “Such a teaching rarely, if ever at all, speaks about revival,” Lloyd-Jones contends. “It is not interested in revival and, of course, cannot be.” But this argument is valid only if one accepts the identification of revivals with Spirit baptism. An interesting comparison is found in the views of American minister A. J. Gordon (1836-95). His views of the Holy Spirit’s presence, baptism, and gifts are remarkably similar to those of Lloyd-Jones. Gordon stressed the need for a Spirit-empowered ministry, held to a postconversion baptism of the Spirit for power, and allowed great latitude for the existence of spiritual gifts. Gordon was also a strong proponent of the need for revival. But he believed, against Lloyd-Jones, that Pentecost was a one-time blessing of the Spirit for the inauguration of the church and saw no difficulty in reconciling such a view with a desire for revival.  

One must also question Lloyd-Jones’s reliance on arguments from history. He certainly does not place history on a par with Scripture, and he can appeal to the example of theologians such as Charles Hodge who use historical theology as a subsidiary proof. But history is not an authoritative source. The Scriptures are directly
inspired by God and carry the promise of illumination by the Holy Spirit in their study, but even then humans sometimes misinterpret the Bible. How much more difficult it is to rely on the discipline of history, an area of study researched, written, and interpreted by errant humans. Unlike the Bible, history has no promise of the divine superintendence of an omniscient God to guide interpretation. History can prove a painfully elastic resource as different interpreters use it for different ends. History may be a guide, but it cannot be an authority.

With these criticisms, one should also note the virtues of Lloyd-Jones’s presentation. His stress on the centrality of Christ in all discussions of spiritual gifts and Spirit baptism is both a rebuke to Pentecostal/Charismatic teaching and a challenge to those who reject such teaching. “It is not the gifts that are central to the New Testament,” the Doctor says; “it is the Lord.” He says elsewhere,

He [the Holy Spirit] gives experiences, he gives power, he has gifts that he can give. But the point I am making is that we should not seek primarily what he gives.

What should we be seeking? We should always be seeking the Lord Jesus Christ himself, to know him, and know his love and to be witnesses for him and to minister to his glory.

Whatever else he does, Lloyd-Jones challenges complacency in his preaching on the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Sargent observes correctly that “one does not have wholeheartedly to embrace his pneumatology to benefit from DML-J’s corrective about unction as the supreme necessity for preaching powerfully.” The same may be said of other aspects of his teaching. Sargent cites the “often quoted” words of Lloyd-Jones concerning the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Christian’s life: “Got it all? Well, if you have ‘got it all,’ I simply ask in the Name of God, why are you as you are? If you have ‘got it all’ why are you so unlike the Apostles, why are you so unlike the New Testament Christians?” Those who are correct in their pneumatology but lacking in spiritual power and fervor might well ponder that question. They might likewise weigh this challenge: “We have become so formal, with everything so set, so organized, all in the control of man—and have forgotten this other evidence, the power and the glory of the Spirit and the sanctity and the holiness. I am convinced that the greatest need of the church is to realize again the activity of the Holy Spirit.”

Finally, what of the question asked in the title of this study? Is D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones a “Pentecostal Puritan”? Actually even the second label, which is more apt, is not exactly accurate. The Puritans profoundly influenced Lloyd-Jones and he gladly promoted their writings. But he was a twentieth-century man facing twentieth-century problems. He might borrow from the Puritans, might engage profitably with their thought, but they were not his standard of belief nor his authority in religion.

As for “Pentecostal,” the previous pages have indicated that despite advancing some teachings that are amenable to Pentecostalism and the Charismatic movement, Lloyd-Jones cannot be realistically portrayed as an advocate of either system or even influenced by either. The Doctor’s own words are the best reply. Iain Murray says that in 1979 Lloyd-Jones, on hearing of an article calling him a “theoretical Pentecostal,” said, “I was against Pentecostalism and still am. My doctrine of the baptism of the Spirit is that it gives full assurance. I have never been satisfied with any speaking in tongues that I have heard. ... It is very unfair to put the label pentecostal on me.”
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