

THE
Free Presbyterian Magazine
and Monthly Record

Vol. 92

MAY 1987

No. 5

Unchanging Standards

As is well known our supreme standard is the inspired, infallible and inerrant Word of God; our subordinate, the Westminster Confession of Faith, every statement of which is substantiated by Scripture proof. Every minister of the Gospel and every office-bearer, on ordination subscribes to the solemn declaration: "I do sincerely own and believe THE WHOLE DOCTRINE contained in the Confession of Faith, approved by former General Assemblies of this Church, to be THE TRUTHS OF GOD; and I do own the same as the Confession of MY FAITH." To be in breach of that assertion or to undermine in any way the authority or veracity of these standards must clearly place the person guilty of such conduct in a most solemn position in the presence of that God before Whom vows are made and to Whom men are to give account.

Our separate existence as a church may be traced back to the movement in the Disruption Free Church to make subscription to these standards equivocal. Those responsible stopped short of openly discrediting Scripture or altering the terms of the Confession of Faith; their object was gained in a more subtle manner by the introduction and passing of the 1892 Declaratory Act. The significance of that event must be evident to any impartial student of Scottish church history and its far-reaching effects are only too sadly evident in our own day. Our separate identity will be emphasised anew this month when our Synod meets in Inverness at a distance, in more than the geographical sense, from other ecclesiastical Assemblies in Edinburgh. At the Disruption, it was said that "the Free Church originated nothing; it adopted no new article of faith; it organised no new ecclesiastical constitution; it prescribed no new forms of worship. The ecclesiastical laws — the Confession of Faith and Catechisms, the form of Church government, the ritual of worship — which had been received and observed in the National Church, were all

retained as they were, not by any specific appointment to that effect, but in virtue of the position the Free Church had been forced to assume." That was in 1843. In 1893 we were similarly forced to assume a separate position to preserve inviolate the constitution of the true, reformed Church of Scotland. That is what we humbly hold ourselves to be the custodians of, however insignificant we may be in the eyes of men.

It has been noted that the general body of the Disruption Free Church remained steadfast to her constitutional principles for about 20 years and then a spirit of change seemed to seize some of her prominent leading men. No change was made in the solemn engagements to abide by the original constitution. These were undertaken by all ministers and office-bearers but in defiance of solemn vows Free Church principles were quietly given up. The Establishment Principle became the subject of controversy. Innovations in worship were speciously introduced notwithstanding the confessional statement: "The acceptable way of worshipping the true God is INSTITUTED BY HIMSELF, and so limited by His own revealed will that He may not be worshipped according to the imaginations and devices of men or the suggestions of Satan, under any visible representation, or in any other way NOT PRESCRIBED IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES", or, as it is expressed in the vows of office-bearers, "Will you to the utmost of your power assert, maintain, and defend the same, and the PURITY OF WORSHIP, as presently practiced in this Church?" With the passing of the Declaratory Act she ceased to be the Disruption Free Church. Consideration of what happened within her pale when standards were disregarded provides food for thought and ought to move us to be on our guard. If we claim to be the Reformation Church of Scotland our position is a very onerous one and it is now more than ever necessary that we brook no change in doctrine, worship or discipline. Looking south to Edinburgh towards the other bodies who make a similar claim we feel constrained to ask: What sort of discipline not to ask morality is found in any body which binds men to uniformity of worship and then winks at their violation of them?

Notes of a Sermon

by REV. D. A. MACFARLANE M.A.

(Preached at Dingwall Communion on Saturday, 31st January 1970).

TEXT: Romans 7 verse 4

"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God."

Paul was instantaneously regenerated when he met Christ on the road to Damascus (of course, regeneration is instantaneous anyway). I notice that some think he was only awakened, and that he was not converted until afterwards. That is regrettable, because we find Paul saying then, "What wilt thou have me to do?". That means that his will had surrendered to Christ. Of course, he was not perfectly holy, for we have all this struggle recorded here — chapter 7.

Seeing we read here that they have become dead to the law, then we gather that at some time they were not dead, but alive to the law. There is a sense of the amenable that means biddable, but here it means that they were accountable to the law. This is not something which is popular in our day. Men do not like to hear about the law and that men cannot become dead to the law except by the body of Christ. I may say in passing that there is a great need that the Lord would raise up men who know the gospel, and would preach the gospel in our land, and that sinners in the visible church would come to kiss the Son.

The body of Christ is just the sacrifice of Christ. The Father told Him to assume the holy body into union with His divine Person so that He could come under the law. He suffered the double penalty of the law to which His people were exposed. By the double penalty of the law, I mean, first, the loss of divine favour and secondly the punishment of sense. He suffered, we may reverently say, until His Father sealed it on His spirit that it was all over. Then He said, "It is finished".

There are hundreds, I should probably say thousands of promises of Christ in the Old Testament. Perhaps you are shrugging your shoulders and wagging your heads, and saying, "What's that man talking of thousands of promises in the Old Testament for?" Well, will you tell me, by the way, how many grains of manna fell in a day, and how many grains of manna were in the golden pot? And how many drops of water were there in the water that gushed out of the smitten rock? Surely, every one was a promise of Christ. Christ was the Manna and Christ was that Rock. Of course, we need faith to receive Him, faith of the energising of God. Faith is god-given. It is God-given indebtedness of soul to Christ. I cannot give that to you. The ministers, nor the elders of the session cannot give it to you, but pray that you will get the Holy Spirit, and pray that thousands in our day will get the Holy Spirit. It is just an awful thing to think of multitudes in Britain, Europe, Africa and Australia, going to eternity, and they are not dead to the law nor the penalty of the law. Men may be divinity professors, and have a great deal of religiosity, but if they are not dead to the law, one look from the eye of God will be the

beginning of eternal woe for them in the place where there is no hope. We need faith to go unto and into Christ. We need to go out of ourselves. Then, goodbye to the law, and goodbye to the curse of the law forever.

We need to be married to Him. If we are married to Him we are married to this Epistle, and if we are married to this Epistle we are married to Him. And if we get the tip of the tongue of our souls dipped in the ocean of the merit of Christ there will be a well of living water springing up in our souls to Everlasting Life that will sweep away all the slime and filth in our hearts.

If you have regeneration, you will have two things — First, RIGHT, and secondly DELIGHT in virtue of which you will have a relish for the divine way of salvation. Ask that God will deal with you, I was going to say one-sidedly. That is that God would deal with you savingly Himself.

AIDS

by Rev. Dr Donald M. Boyd

AIDS, *Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome*, has been described as “the greatest threat to public health in Britain since the Middle Ages” (Sir Donald Acheson, the Government’s Chief Medical Officer, who is spearheading the Government’s fight against AIDS). This article is not intended to be an exhaustive source of information respecting this disease but it is hoped that it will be helpful to our people that they may assess its danger. While I believe that the majority of our people follow the teaching of the Word of God sufficiently closely, as to their outward conduct, so that they are not at a great risk of contracting AIDS, yet it is folly to assume that they all do. The Scripture reminds us of the deceitfulness of the human heart because of man’s fallen and corrupt nature, and one expression of this is to have a fair show of religion while living a double life in which immorality and other wickedness features.

The Disease

The virus responsible for this disease is called *Human Immunodeficiency Virus*, HIV. The virus attacks the body’s immune defence system so that the body can no longer fight diseases, such as infections and cancers and the person eventually dies from overwhelming infection or cancer. At present, there is no cure for AIDS and, once the person catches it, it is fatal in quite a short time.

The commonest way of catching the virus is by intimate sexual behaviour with someone who is infected. An unknown, but possibly

quite large, proportion of people who catch the virus go on to develop the disease. The disease was first reported among the sodomites in America, who spread the disease rapidly among the homosexual communities with their particular forms of vile homosexual practices. In the UK, the vast majority of cases of AIDS are among homosexuals. An infected person can then transmit the disease to a person of the opposite sex by normal sexual behaviour. The Government is trying to combat the disease by telling people to keep to as few partners as possible, to be "sure" of one's partner, and to take certain precautions that are being advertised all over Britain. This is a counsel of despair, the reaping of what has been sown for many years in this country. There is only one message that *must* be given to safeguard the safety of the population, as well as being the message of the Word of God, namely fidelity within marriage and chastity outwith marriage. It is reprehensible that the Government will not firmly declare this message just because it is too "moralistic." The real reason may be that it is too near what the Bible says, and it retrospectively condemns the permissive standards of the past and present. The Government prefers to shift the responsibility for "moralising" to the churches, and to lean on the charity of the churches to provide finance for hospices for the terminal care of the AIDS victim. It may be that the Government is not taking a firm line on the moral aspect because it knows that this disease is largely confined to the homosexual population at present and so, if a cure can be discovered before AIDS affects the large promiscuous heterosexual population, then that large promiscuous heterosexual population need not change its lifestyle. In other words, there is simply an element of popularity involved in not being firm; the Government does not want to tell the large promiscuous heterosexual population to be faithful to their spouses.

The Government tries to defend itself by saying that its approach is to try to accommodate the people who will ignore its advice on curtailing their promiscuity. The danger with such an approach is that if the Government will give an alternative course to these people, they will assume that it is safe (which it is not). The Religion and Morals Committee has written a strong letter to the Government telling it of its responsibility to give a clear moral lead to the nation.

Leaving aside homosexuals and the sexually promiscuous, drug addicts constitute the other main group of people at risk of catching AIDS. Drug users who inject drugs into their veins (intravenous injections) often share needles. The virus can therefore be passed by the nee-

dle from someone who has it to someone who does not have it. This is why the Government is issuing free needles to intravenous drug users to try to stop them sharing needles and spreading the disease. In Scotland, Edinburgh and Dundee have the most drug addicts so that this problem is worst there. These drug users are not only destroying their own bodies by drug abuse, but are now in danger of destroying themselves and others with AIDS. The sin of self-destruction is abominable in God's eyes — "no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him."

It is also possible to transmit the AIDS virus by a blood transfusion if the person giving blood (the blood donor) is infected with AIDS. Symptoms of the disease may not become apparent for many months after the infection begins and so the donor may unwittingly donate infected blood. The Blood Transfusion Service checks all donated blood for HIV. However, at present, the tests can only show HIV infection about six months after the person has become infected. Naturally, anyone who may have caught the AIDS virus is discouraged from donating blood, and scientists are trying to find a test which will pick up HIV infection in the months before symptoms develop, so that all blood available for transfusion may be declared safe.

Apart from infected pregnant women transmitting the virus to their unborn children, the AIDS virus is not easily transmitted any other way. For example, although the virus has been detected in human saliva, there are no cases of anyone catching the virus from saliva.

Scriptural Assessment

Romans 1: 18-32 teaches us that those people who suppress their knowledge of God are already under the wrath of God. Part of the manifestation of that wrath is that God gives them over to the expression of their unnatural lusts. It is no kindness to hide this solemn fact from them. The Church is to teach them that they are under this wrath and to call them to repentance and to faith in Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of their sins. The message of the Lord Jesus Christ is, "I am not come to call the righteous but sinners to *repentance*."

It is the duty of the Government to clearly warn these people to change their lifestyles to conform to the scriptural standards of morality. If the Government will not do so, it can only expect the displeasure of God. "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people" (Proverbs 14: 34). The present crisis calls for radical action. The Lord Jesus Christ, in speaking on immorality, said, "If thy right eye offend

thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." (Matthew 5: 29). This implies the repeal of the 1967 Sexual Offences Act in order to make homosexual acts criminal offences.

Many church leaders have been careful to avoid saying that AIDS is the judgment of God on a promiscuous society, citing the innocent who are caught up in the disease. However the Scripture teaches us that Nebuchadnezzar was God's instrument of judgment against apostate Judah, although faithful men were caught up in it. The Scripture also asks the rhetorical question, "Shall there be evil in a city and the Lord hath not done it?" (Amos 3: 6). "I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things" (Isaiah 45: 7). The truth is that many of these church leaders do not believe that God is a God of judgment at all, and therefore they speak in this way.

The present situation reminds us of Isaiah 26: 9, 10, "... when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness. Let favour be shewed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness: in the land of uprightness will he deal unjustly, and will not behold the majesty of the Lord." The Lord's judgments are the only language that some people will obey; the church leaders might not believe in God's judgments, but most people will learn from them nevertheless.

Advice to our People

In practice, people who are faithful to their spouses are in little danger of catching AIDS. For such people, the most likely source of infection is from a blood transfusion although this risk is extremely small. There are two situations in which one may receive a blood transfusion. Firstly, for a routine major operation, the surgeon will have made sure that there is some blood available for you if you should need it. It is possible for you to arrange with the hospital to receive *your own* blood by donating it some months in advance. This is called autotransfusion. The risk of getting AIDS is eliminated because one receives one's own blood. Autotransfusion has not been deemed necessary before now because blood was always considered to be safe. Moreover, some have suggested that it is selfish simply to donate blood for yourself and so this has not been encouraged. However, it would not be difficult to donate the blood for others if in the event one did not need it during or after one's own operation. Secondly, a blood transfusion may be given in an emergency, e.g. after a road traffic accident. It is clear that any blood transfusion one will receive in an emergency situation will almost certainly be

someone else's blood. However, as previously mentioned, the risk of being given infected blood is extremely small.

It would be nice to assume that the majority of our people follow the teaching of the Word of God sufficiently closely, as to their outward conduct, so that they are not at a great risk of contracting AIDS, yet it is folly to assume that they all do. Those people who have sexual relationships outside marriage are at risk of contracting the AIDS virus and then passing it on to their innocent spouse. Such people are debarred from the Lord's Table because of their sin against the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." They cannot receive this privilege until it is evident that God has given them repentance. The *communion (common) cup*. No-one has been known to catch the virus by the transfer of saliva. Therefore the medical advice is that the common cup is safe as far as the AIDS virus is concerned.

The Future

Medical research is going ahead to try to detect the infection at its earliest stages in order to make blood transfusions completely safe. While we should pray that a cure may be speedily found and that the virus will become less virulent, the most likely hope of preventing AIDS in the future is the development of a vaccine, but this may take up to 10 years to be available to the general public.

We should also pray that society will learn its lesson and repent, else the Lord may not answer the former prayer. It would be good if the shame of being discovered to have the AIDS virus would be carried over into shame and repentance for the promiscuous lifestyle which has so often been the cause of contracting it.

The health authorities are speaking in terms of an epidemic. The reason for this is the promiscuous lifestyle led by many in our country. If the people of this land were to return to the Biblical standards of morality there would be no epidemic. Although they are slow to learn the lesson, we hope that this will be the outcome of this scourge that the Lord has brought upon us. It is certainly the case that people are already having to rethink their attitudes towards a promiscuous lifestyle and some are suggesting that this disease has killed off the "swinging 1960s" way of thinking. However, it is only once a cure is found and prevention is effective that we will be able to see if there is any lasting impact upon society's standards. It would be good if this voice in God's providence would bring the nation to "search and try its ways and turn again to the Lord" in repentance.

If the epidemic scale of this disease is borne out, then there will be a great need for increasing our resources for terminal care of these patients. The Government is calling on the churches to support such charitable ventures as Hospices for the terminally ill. The Hospice movement is in its infancy in this country, and this disease will give it a large impetus to develop. It will result in more attention being given to the terminally ill. The present Hospice movement tends to recognise the spiritual element in the treatment of the terminally ill and tends to encourage the role of the ministers in the "whole person" approach to the dying patient. It is however sad that, as far as this disease is concerned, in which unnatural vice often features so strongly, that little is heard in the mass media about the importance of pointing these people to Christ, that by repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ they may find the forgiveness of their sins, reconciliation with God and peace of conscience which they so much need to face the "king of terrors" which shall prove to be the *last* enemy in the case of those who believe in Christ for the salvation of their immortal souls.

Life in a Christian Church

by Rev. Malcolm MacInnes, Toronto.

There is considerable confusion as to what is the nature and function of the Christian Church. Some look on it as a social agency for the performance of certain "religious duties" such as baptism, marriage, or funeral services. Some view it as the place for formal worship confined to set-hours on the Lord's Day or even mid-week. There are others, born-again Christians, who look on the church merely as the place of worship where their own spiritual temperature will be adjusted for a short period. Are all, or any, of these right? I do not think so! There is a sense in which aspects of the church's work touches on all of these, but not one of them defines adequately the Biblical truths regarding the church. Even evangelicals of this decade have suffered from a shift in emphasis from propositional religion to an experience-oriented one. It is true that saving religion is to be experienced, but it must be experience related to and governed by Scripture revelation. Religion can be plentiful but not powerful. That is the situation prevailing in Canada and the United States. Present-day evangelicals have been likened to "a lion on the loose, but no one fears the lion"! Surely the situation is very different from that which existed with the early Christian church. Then both civil and ecclesiastical authorities felt that they had a power to reckon with.

If the Christian church is to follow the teaching and example of Christ, it must understand the spiritual, the moral, and the social condition of the times. Jesus charged the religious and secular worlds with their imperfections. His approach covered the wide spectrum of human and divine relationships. His answers demonstrate principles of truth which are adequate for the present crisis in both church and civil life. Jesus corrected the distortions and perversions of the religious world by applying these principles. The same task confronts the church today. The principles are revealed in Scripture, or "by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture", and it is the duty of the church to discover and apply them.

"The Word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy Him" (Shorter Catechism 2).

There is danger of limiting evangelicalism to adherence to an orthodox creed, without regard for the practical outworking of the Gospel message. This is to deny the relevance of Scripture to the present situation. It fails to demonstrate "Scripture-truth-in-action". On the other hand, the Epistle of James challenges the Christian to demonstrate faith by a life of "works". The primary duty of the church, and of those who are part of it, is to discover afresh the Biblical basis of faith, and to apply its principles to the situations in life. The spotlight of the Word of God must be turned on the hearts and lives of men and women, and they must be called to repentance. The life must show that the soul is alive to God. The spiritual mind cannot be hid. It ought not to be considered an optional-extra for Christians, or something of less importance than adherence to a creed or a profession of faith. The works will show that the faith is real. Justification and sanctification may be distinguished, but they ought not to be divorced. Justification is an act; sanctification is an on-going work based on that act. Christian living must not only be based upon union to Christ, it must constantly follow the union. The experiential dimensions of the Christian life must parallel the norms of Scripture. For example, love to the Lord Jesus and trust in Him for salvation must characterise every true Christian. Persistence in a course of conduct which is clearly condemned in Scripture is blatant contradiction of any claim to Christian discipleship. The large influx of sinners to the kingdom of Christ through the "decisions" and "conversion experiences" of mass evangelism has produced a superficial Christianity. Walter Chantry has discerningly observed that "the products of modern evangelism are often sad examples of Christianity. They make a profes-

sion of faith, and then continue to live as the world. Decisions for Christ mean very little". The "Invitation System", characteristic of many evangelistic campaigns, has contributed largely to the present defective life and witness of the church. The practice of inviting people who wish to receive Christ to come forward to the front cannot be shown to have warrant from Scripture. Too often the impression is given that "coming forward" is tantamount to receiving Christ. Leighton Ford, one of the exponents of the Invitation System, advocates such appeals as "God is willing, Come now; Come here". The most popular description of "the Invitation" is an "act of commitment to Christ". The Billy Graham Evangelistic Campaign practices this method, and although it is asserted that little knowledge and no emotion is needed to respond, packed appeals are repeated, equating the distance to the front as the distance the sinner is from Christ. Iain Murray has asserted that "In all this there is no pressure beyond the solemn insistence on the one fact that those who want to receive Christ must come to the front". Most often, if not always, those who come forward are spoken to as those who have committed their lives to God. The emotional impact on the observer is compounded as he sees others proceed to the front. Psychologists rightly contend that such a response can be obtained on issues which are not related to Christianity. The outcome is that when the various elements which have contributed to the emotional impact are removed, the person is back where he was initially. This explains the "falling away" of so many who "decided for Christ". Charles Finney was the first to adopt this method in evangelism, and with him there was the loss of some of the theological depth which had been characteristic of earlier periods. Finney narrowed down his message to one point, the point of accepting Christ. Asahel Nettleton, whose ministry was greatly blessed in revivals, was critical of Finney's message and methods, and of the adverse effects these had on the churches in the area. Nettleton hoped that the writings of Jonathan Edwards would "supply the deficiency in Finney's sermons". Too often the concern seems to have been "strength in names and numbers". Heads are counted, and the statistics become the great encouragement and challenge for the next crusade. What is needed rather is conviction based on the Truth of God. Only then will a strong theology emerge. The observation has been made that much of the church's literature is experience-oriented. Christians must become more objective in their thinking, having God and revealed truth in heart and mind. Only in this way will the literature become theological. The present subjectivism resembles too strongly the self-centredness of those who are not

the disciples of Christ. Too often the church's message has failed to communicate a "sense of the sacred". There is a spiritual vacuum in society and often also in the preached message. In its worship the church needs to become concerned for the presence of God. Then will those who worship begin to truly experience that "This is the house of God, and the gate of heaven". People need to have restored a sense of that sacred order by which they ought to live. Expository preaching through the Bible will ensure that a variety of subjects are raised which might not otherwise be explicitly dealt with. The Christian and the Christian Church are intended, for the present, to be in the world. This is where Christ walked and talked, and this is where the individual Christian and the Church collectively is to live out the truths and principles of the Scripture. Jesus did not isolate Himself from the immediate interests and concerns of people. He knew that there was evil in the world, but He did also use its legitimate resources to advance the interests of His kingdom. It is not possible, nor is it Biblical to totally divorce the Christian life from society. The Saviour's example and teaching require that the Christian be in the world as salt and as light (Matthew 5: 13-16). Salt is to preserve and to prevent deterioration; light is to disseminate knowledge. Society is not the source of sin — it only reflects the sin from the human heart. A blanket rejection of all society will not ensure a holy life; nor will an undiscerning conformity to society automatically win souls to Christ. Our concern must reach out to others. There is the second great commandment which requires that we love our neighbour. The Lord Jesus made the point very clear when He told about the Good Samaritan. A priest and a Levite passed by the man whose need was obvious. The following quotation makes practical application of the principles in the commandment and in the story — "love demands that I use what is mine . . . my neighbour cannot demand it by civil right, but by divine command I cannot withhold it if my neighbour's need cannot be met with otherwise". The concern for others must be more than for their physical needs. According to the Epistle of James, we must attempt to meet these physical needs. If we do not even try, we sin; but if we do only that which is addressed to the body we have a social Gospel, and souls are left to perish. The Christian needs to be "missionary-minded". Churches can have missions in foreign lands and be indifferent to the "Christless community" in which their own people live. The interest in "missions" is then limited to "prayers and offerings". Both of these are important, but more is involved in the "mission" of the church in the world. We may find it easier to give money than to say "Here am I, send me". If the

Christian finds it easier to give his money than to give himself, his time, his talents, he has not yet resembled his Master, Who gave Himself.

There is no area of human experience here on earth to which the principles of Scripture do not apply, and therefore the Christian church and its individual members should seek to understand the basic principles involved. In family life the need for Biblical instruction is staggering. Broken homes, "single parents", and common-law relationships have become the norm. God is dishonoured, individuals are hurt, the church suffers, and society is fragmented. The only remedy is the application of the teaching of the Scripture. The morals and standards of the Bible must once more be implanted so that the family members will conform to what is right. The Christian influence in education is being eroded, not because Christianity has nothing to offer, but because the Christian community has lost hold of its former place. Christianity and true knowledge are mutually supportive. There is no conflict between the Bible and science properly defined. It becomes part of the Christian obligation to seek that, by God's grace, society will discover that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom".

The Christian is a disciple of the Lord Jesus, and his whole life-style is to be according to the teaching and example of the Master. "Cheap grace is the preaching of forgiveness without requiring repentance, baptism without church discipline; cheap grace is grace without discipleship". Christ's demands for discipleship are high, with the end in view that God will be glorified (John 15: 8). The Christian life is a life of freedom, but it is defined freedom. It is the freedom of being in the yoke with Christ; the freedom of self-denial. For the restoration of the former glory of the Church the work of the Holy Spirit is needed in rich measure. Those who occupy the pulpits must discover in the Gospel the power of God unto salvation, and proclaim its whole message. The people who hear the word preached, must discover what it is to walk in close fellowship with God, what it is to "put off the old man, with his deeds, and to put on the new man". The teaching of Jesus, and the proven experience of God's saints in all ages, indicates that this can be achieved only by the constant and humble use of the "secret place" for prayer to, and fellowship with God.

"But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly". (Matthew 6: 6)

Towards 1988

by Rev. Dr. Donald M. Boyd

(The first half of this lecture dealt with the attempts of the Church of Scotland to remove the Westminster Confession of Faith from being its principal subordinate standard and to alter "the 1926 Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in Matters Spiritual")

Ecumenical documents

I now come to consider another cord of this threefold ecumenical cord which is entangling the Church of Scotland. So far we have looked at the ecumenical assaults on the Westminster Confession of Faith. Now I wish to draw attention to the ecumenical documents that the Church of Scotland is committed to noting and discussing. Due to their involvement in many interdenominational discussions and alliances, it falls to them to notice the results of these discussions and alliances. I am not going to review past history but simply to mention briefly three such matters, and to expand the third one as an ecumenical cord of its own.

Firstly, the LIMA Report is the Report of the World Council of Churches held at Lima in 1982. This Report deals with Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, a trio that have become very common in recent discussions. This Report concedes the episcopal argument respecting ministry. Due to the Church of Scotland's involvement in the World Council of Churches, this Report was presented to the General Assembly for discussion, so that the Church of Scotland spent 1984 contemplating its deliberations.

Secondly, there is a 1984 Report "God's Reign and Our Unity". This Report was produced by the Working Commission of the Anglican-Reformed International Commission. This body is jointly appointed by the Anglican Consultative Council and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches. This Report was hailed as another "Bishops Report" for it recommended an adapted form of the three-fold episcopal ministry, for the sake of unity, because "the large majority of Churches" have it. Its ideas followed the LIMA document on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. So the Church of Scotland spent another year studying another document that spoke basically the same message.

This softening up of the grassroots opposition to episcopacy was not left to chance. In 1983 a new standing committee was created, The Board of World Mission and Unity. Its remit very likely includes the study of the multiple ecumenical projects going ahead in our time and, likely, it is

to serve as a suitable vehicle to bring these repeatedly to the notice of the General Assembly. It was this Board which reported on "God's Reign and Our Unity".

Multilateral Church Conversation

Thirdly, there is the last report of the Multilateral Church Conversation, on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, called "Christian Unity — Now is the Time." These conversations were mentioned earlier in the lecture. They have been held during the last 18 years (since 1967) between six Scottish Churches — the Church of Scotland, the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Methodist Synod in Scotland, the Congregational Union of Scotland, the United Free Church of Scotland and the United Reformed Church within Scotland (formerly the Churches of Christ). They have issued three reports, the first on Faith, the second on worship and sacraments generally, the third on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. This last one, which proposed a united church in Scotland, was welcomed by the 1985 General Assembly of the Church of Scotland and is currently being discussed by Presbyteries and Kirk Sessions.* The Board of World Mission and Unity will report the Presbytery responses to the 1986 General Assembly.

In this proposal, we see once again the old familiar faces. The proposals embrace changes to the 1926 Articles Declaratory and to the form of government of the Church.

First, the phrase "the Church of Scotland adheres to the Scottish Reformation" in Article 1 should be interpreted in the sense that the Scottish Reformation of the Church is not complete, but is a continuing process. This is obviously an attempt to explain away the Scottish Reformation. It is the sort of explanation that one would give who is envisaging eventual union with the Church of Rome itself, and is therefore very far-sighted. It evidently cuts the Church of Scotland away from the actual attainments of and adherence to the Scottish Reformation.

Secondly, some of the conferring Churches have suggested that the historic creeds might be included along with the Westminster Confession of Faith in Article II, "the principal subordinate standard of the Church of Scotland is the Westminster Confession of Faith." We have already seen that this procedure is one of the ploys being used to minimise the influence and standing of the Westminster Confession of Faith as the principal subordinate standard and it is a method approved by those

* At the time of the lecture, 4th Dec. 1985. The majority of Presbyteries subsequently rejected it in the form it was presented to them.

openly opposed to the teaching of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

Thirdly, there should be an addition to the last line of Article III to make it read, "to bring the ordinances of religion to the people in every parish of Scotland through a territorial *and other ministries*." This change has been described as "very small," yet it may prove to be very large. Does this loophole act as the small needle's eye to draw in the episcopal thread? I believe it does.

Already the Church of Scotland is being asked to consider appointing its Presbytery moderators for seven years. Several prominent people in the Church of Scotland doubt that this will satisfy the Scottish Episcopal Church. There is reason for thinking that the Church of Scotland itself will go further. Rev. Dr. George Balls of the Church of Scotland is the Convener of the Multilateral Church Conversation. He does not only argue from expediency (which is the only argument left for episcopacy, since all shadow of scriptural warrant has been long ago overthrown and is now acknowledged by some Episcopalians to be so), but he talks of the congregational form of government being repeated at Presbytery level, so that he can then talk of "a pastor of pastors — Presbyterianism with a more human face". The "pastor pastorum" is an unfortunate, though probably a deliberate, term in the context, especially when he himself laments the cry of "Bishops Report" which, he says, has inevitably gone up. However, this manner of speaking is a veiled, if not an open, way of saying that "ministry must be exercised at all levels in a personal, collegial and communal way". That is a quotation from the LIMA Report, which concept reappears in God's Reign and Our Unity. Prof James Whyte of the Church of Scotland calls this a "new cliché in ecumenical newspeak . . . for (which) no empirical evidence or scriptural authority is offered to support it . . . The logic . . . would be that we need, not only bishops, but, at the universal level, a Pope."

Reaction

There is a reaction to these movements both inside and outside the Church of Scotland.

INSIDE

1. *The ecumenists* have been encouraged to carry on their way. In 1984 the Very Rev. Dr. W. B. Johnston was sent by the General Assembly as their first representative to the General Synod of the Church of England to initiate a regular exchange of visits. In Feb./Mar. 1985 the first meeting of its kind was held between the Church of Scotland and the

Church of England to discuss the different forms of establishment in the two churches and the implications for the mission of the two churches. For "mission", read "ecumenism" or "union", which are now the same thing. It hardly needs to be said that the Very Rev. Dr. W. B. Johnston and Rev. Dr. George Balls were representing the Church of Scotland.

2. *A conservative reaction.* There are many different groups of conservatives and traditionalists in the Church of Scotland, and all whom I include in this section may not be happy with the designation. However, for the sake of convenience I am putting them together because they have one thing in common — they oppose with varying degrees of vigour the Multilateral Church Conversation's proposals.

The Very Rev. Dr. Andrew Herron warns that the union with the Episcopal Church is a breach of the 1926 Articles Declaratory and that protesters would undoubtedly sue for the property, which he is confident they would win. He has elaborated his fears in the last of the Baird Lectures delivered by him in Strathclyde University in Oct.-Nov. 1985. He seems to have taken the lead in the opposition to these proposals, arguing about the identity of the Church, its Presbyterian principles of equality of the ministry and ordination of elders, the force of the Accession Oath by the Sovereign, and the current Episcopal opinions of Presbyterian ordination. He complains about the "ominous silence" respecting the proposed changes to the 1926 Articles Declaratory, to which Rev. Dr. Balls replies that they are only discussing the *principle* of change after which the details will be discussed!

Prof. James Whyte, who is ecumenically minded and was involved in setting up the Multilateral Church Conversation, complains about the end result — for whereas they began on the mutual acceptance of each other's ministries, now the tune has changed — mutual acceptance now has a condition, the condition of unspecified changes in these ministries. This may explain the *Rev. Jim Salmond's* statement that the ecumenical dialogue began with the concept of "unity in diversity", but is now requiring us to go further.

The Very Rev. Prof. John McIntyre at an earlier stage joined the criticisms by objecting to the Panel on Doctrine's proposals (which have a similarity to the Multilateral Church Conversation) following on Dr. Herron's warning of possible conflict between the four proposed principal subordinate standards. Prof. McIntyre asks whether doctrine is to be ascertained by what is common to these standards, or by complementing them; he considers Article I to be inadequate as a definition of the substance of the faith; and he thinks that to assert liberty of opinion is no

longer enough because we need to consider the liberty of interpretation of the Articles and the status and authority of the Confession as a subordinate standard.

The Editor of Life and Work while coming down strongly on the nature of the Church of Scotland as Reformed in doctrine, adhering to the Scottish Reformation, and Presbyterian, nevertheless says there are two formidable arguments in favour of these proposals, one of which is that it is expedient to go ahead because "no more practical plan is . . . likely to emerge in the near future."

I hurry through all these matters to show that there is a considerable volume of reservation and opposition to these proposals, though Dr. Herron does speak of "a *minority* (who) would protest and separate" (my italics). Dr. Balls' reply to these objections is alarming. I have not had the time to work it into this paper but it may be dealt with in the subsequent discussion.

OUTSIDE

Rutherford House is an evangelical study centre with interdenominational links, but it is principally supported by Church of Scotland people. The Trustees, committee members and supporters are mainly Church of Scotland members (the original Trustees were all Church of Scotland), and it has a special interest in the discussions within the Church of Scotland. In September 1984, Rutherford House produced its own reply to the Westminster Confession of Faith debate in publishing *The Rutherford Forum Papers* "Church and Confession: A Response to the Panel's Study Guide", and it is shortly to publish "Rutherford Forum Paper 5" on the Multilateral Church Conversation.

Rutherford House seems to be trying to establish a forum for evangelical debate, resolution and action. The lack of such a forum has been a patent and inexcusable vacuum in Scotland for many years, which explains the rush of enthusiasm among some evangelicals in Scotland. It is noticeable that the Free Church has been trying to come into this vacuum for several years through the activities particularly of Prof. Donald MacLeod as editor of the *Monthly Record*. The relative (administrative) success of Rutherford House may explain the Free Church's recent sponsoring of an International Conference as an attempt to hold on to and gain back some ground for itself.

Rutherford House brings us to the reaction in the *Free Church*, at least as that is epitomised in Prof. Donald MacLeod. There is no need to review past events there, but simply to notice that Prof. MacLeod is now

openly arguing for an evangelical Reformed ecumenism. He clearly viewed the first international Conference of Reformed Churches in Edinburgh, hosted by the Free Church of Scotland, as an ecumenical tool, advocating that the next one "should end with a Communion Service". At the recent British Evangelical Council Conference on Union and Separation, he clearly seeks to replace the Westminster Confession of Faith with a new doctrinal formulation as a basis of union among evangelical Reformed Churches, or if that is not possible (for he gives up the Baptists as irreconcilable) at least they should stand together.

Assesment

It is hard to deny the ecumenical forces at work in the foregoing. The "adjustments" to the 1926 Articles Declaratory required by the Multilateral Church Conversation strongly suggests that the prior attempts to do so were similarly motivated.

The Panel on Doctrine was prominent in trying to change the position of the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Convener is Rev. Prof. James B. Torrance, an outspoken critic of covenant theology and election in the Westminster Confession of Faith. In a letter to the Life and Work, the Panel on Doctrine showed that, in its view, the superiority of the Creeds to the Westminster Confession of Faith resided in their belonging to the undivided Church. They therefore see the Westminster Confession of Faith as a dividing Confession if it is the primary subordinate standard.

It is significant that Prof. J. B. Torrance is a member of the Commission which produced "God's Reign and Our Unity", as also is Rev. Prof. George Yule, Professor of Church History, Aberdeen. The latter, as far as I am able to ascertain, was Professor of Church History in Ormond College, Melbourne, during the time of the uniting of the Australian Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists in 1976. The Rev. Dr. Malcolm Mackay, a former secretary of the Australian Council of Churches and a Minister of State for the Navy in the Australian Parliament, describes that Australian union as "far from happy". He goes on to say, "Looking back over the years which have passed since union, it is quite apparent that the so-called "uniting" movement was nothing of the kind . . . Considering the cost of the uniting movement in both human and spiritual terms, one must surely question whether it was worthwhile."

It is evident that the Scottish Episcopal Church will not rest content with seven year Moderators. The Editor of Life and Work says he does

not know how the present proposal will satisfy them. The truth is, it probably will not.

Will the Church of Scotland go ahead with these proposals? There are indicators that it will try to, even although it may involve division and legal action. I make this assessment from the words of the past secretary of the Panel on Doctrine. I observed earlier that he did not deal with the loss of identity of the Church in departing from the Westminster Confession of Faith as its principal subordinate standard. He does however refer to the untested legal arguments against removing the Westminster Confession of Faith and says, "This . . . raises issues which may best be argued by constitutional lawyers and which, if they are ever pressed to the ultimate, may have to be settled outside the Church." I take this to mean that he thinks the Church is prepared to take on this challenge, i.e. to relegate the Westminster Confession of Faith to a historical document, because of his confidence that they would win any ensuing law case.

On the other hand, Presbyteries have recently indicated a widespread desire to preserve the unity of the Church, which may check the ecumenists' zeal. However the ecumenists may interpret this desire for unity (re-interpreting is their fort ) as a mandate to go on to the *wider* unity!

Rutherford House is a latitudinarian body who profess to hold to Reformed principles. Many of its sponsors are already compromised in the mainline denominations. What Rutherford House will achieve is yet to be seen, but many of these evangelicals in the main heterogeneous denominations do not seem to realise that the evangelicals are kept down by the powers that be by giving them some leeway to express their opinions, and thereby lulling them into thinking that they are achieving something and so kept happy. (One may recall the evangelical experience in the Church of England.)

It is evident that in the near future, because of the forced ecumenical policy in the Church of Scotland, there is going to be a realignment of Reformed Christianity in Scotland — this has been sensed in many quarters and it seems that Prof. MacLeod is preparing the ground with the help or connivance of Rutherford House.

Dr. Nigel Cameron, Warden of Rutherford House, recently wrote "the great disagreements within Christendom are now largely within and not between denominations . . . it has all become very confusing, and made increasing nonsense of the notion that Church representatives can meet together and 'negotiate' an agreed version of the faith on behalf of their Churches." Another correspondent in Life and Work envisaged

a splitting and realigning of the denominations in Scotland. This is the ecclesiastical ferment we are living among and which ecumenism is forcing upon us.

The Synod Resolution on the Pentecostal-Charismatic Movement & the Teaching of Dr D. M. Lloyd-Jones

by Roy Middleton, Barnoldswick

On the initiative of the Religion and Morals Committee, the 1986 Synod approved a timely and important Resolution warning about the alarming spread of Pentecostal Theology even amongst those who claim to be exponents of the Reformed Faith. The Synod Resolution stated "that it is quite impossible for adherents to the Theology of the Westminster Standards to embrace the distinctive doctrines of Pentecostal Theology." (See F.P. Magazine, July 1986, Vol. 91 p201-202)

The Resolution further warned about one of these distinctive doctrines of Pentecostalism, namely the concept of a "second work of Grace" distinct from, and subsequent to, Effectual Calling. The Synod stated that such a concept is contrary to the Word of God. This latter warning was especially relevant as such views are now being widely disseminated in Reformed circles due to the fact that a "Second Blessing" concept, the "Baptism with the Holy Spirit," is taught in many of the books of the late Dr David Martyn Lloyd-Jones, and that these volumes circulate widely among adherents of the Reformed Faith.

The warning contained in the Synod Resolution, with reference to the teaching of Dr Lloyd-Jones, has recently been criticised by the editor of "The Banner of Truth" the Rev. Iain Murray in the February 1987 issue of the magazine (p12). Under the caption of "A 'warning' about Dr Lloyd-Jones," Mr Murray says that when he first read the Synod Resolution "censuring the teaching of Dr Lloyd-Jones on the Holy Spirit as though it were akin to Pentecostalism" he was "too incredulous to consider a reply." He goes on to call the Resolution "a sensational criticism." He also stricures the editors of the "English Churchman" and the "Australian Anglican Church Record" for reprinting the words of the Free Presbyterian Magazine.

Mr Murray's strictures, and his interpretation of Dr Lloyd-Jones' teaching as being little more than the Westminster Doctrine of Assurance, call for several observations.

(a) Dr D. M. Lloyd-Jones' Teaching

In 1984 a volume of Dr Lloyd-Jones' sermons called "Joy Unspeakable", edited by his grandson Christopher Catherwood, and containing a foreword by the Rev. P. Lewis of Nottingham, was published by the Charismatic Publisher "Kingsway Publications." The sub-title of the book is "The Baptism with the Holy Spirit."

The significance of this volume is highlighted by the words of the Rev. Graham Harrison, a Welsh minister in full sympathy with Dr Lloyd-Jones' position. Mr Harrison writes, "On more than one occasion the present writer urged the late Dr Martyn Lloyd-Jones to publish something explicitly on his view of the doctrine of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit. The answer given each time was, "Yes, someday I must do so. And when I do I know what it will be. I have about two dozen sermons on John 1: 26, 33 which I preached at Westminster in the 60s. They represent my definitive teaching on the subject." (The Evangelical Magazine of Wales Vol. 24: 3, June-July 1985, p10).

That Mr Harrison's assertion is correct is put beyond doubt by a letter from Mrs Lloyd-Jones, and her two daughters Ann and Elizabeth, to the Editor of "Reformation Today", who had queried the motivation in publishing "Joy Unspeakable".

They write, "soon after Dr Lloyd-Jones' death many people, yourself included, gave, in articles and books what they considered to be his true position with regard to the baptism of the spirit. We felt it was right, therefore, that the doctor should be allowed to speak for himself on the subject. We were helped in this by the fact that he himself had said that these sermons on John 1 were his definitive statement on the subject (though of course he had preached and published in similar vein in both his Romans and Ephesians series) so those were our motives in publishing them." (Reformation Today No. 94 — Nov.-Dec. 1986 pii).

This definitive teaching is contained in "Joy Unspeakable", and its companion volume "Prove all things" (Kingsway Publications 1985). With regard to these volumes, Catherwood informs us that in many chapters the bulk of the editorial work had been carried out by his grandfather, who fully intended that these sermons be published ("Prove all things" p6).

Dr Lloyd-Jones' grandson summarises the content of the volumes in his introduction to "Joy Unspeakable". "My grandfather . . . believed passionately in the baptism with the Holy Spirit as a second post conversion experience. But he equally realised that it has a filling with power that made those who had received it into better witnesses for Christ. His

indeed was a Christ centred message, emphasizing that a deeper knowledge of and relationship with Jesus Christ was at the heart of baptism with the Spirit. Similarly as will be made clear from the forthcoming volume of his sermons on the gifts of the Spirit, while he believed that all the gifts existed today, he refused to hold, on the basis of scripture, that any one gift was necessary as proof of baptism with the Spirit." (p13)

In "Joy Unspeakable" Dr Lloyd-Jones defends his second blessing teaching by appeal to the same texts that pentecostalists use to defend their doctrine. (i.e. Acts or the Apostles 8: 14-17, 9: 17, 10: 44-46, and 19: 6). The Reformed Baptist, the Rev. Errol Hulse of Liverpool, reviewing this volume says "The doctor builds his case on these texts in typical pentecostal fashion" (Reformation Today No. 84 p13-14).

As is made clear from the summary of his teaching by Mr Catherwood, Dr Lloyd-Jones rejected the Reformed Doctrine of the "Cessation of the Charismata" so carefully enunciated by B. B. Warfield of Princeton (see B. B. Warfield — *Miracles Yesterday and Today* p3-31, 233-247 and the more recent statement by Richard B. Gaffin Jr. — *Perspectives on Pentecost* — Baker Book house 1979). Errol Hulse writing just after Dr Lloyd-Jones' death said of him, "he could not tolerate nor abide what he called the B. B. Warfield position" (Reformation Today No. 62 p13).

In the mid-60s Lloyd-Jones wrote a commendatory note of a book called "I believe in the Holy Ghost" by Holiness teacher and editor of "Flame" Magazine, Maynard James. Lloyd-Jones' comment printed on the back of the book is as follows, "I think the way you have handled the question of tongues is quite perfect — I cannot imagine a better statement."

As to what these views were that Lloyd-Jones regarded as a perfect statement, they can best be summarised as being practically identical to the two British Pentecostal denominations that grew directly out of the so-called Welsh Revival of 1904. This is all the more significant in that these two denominations differ slightly from the larger Assemblies of God on their Theology of Tongues. The Assemblies of God hold that speaking in Tongues is the initial evidence of Spirit Baptism, whilst the two smaller groups deny Tongues speaking to be essential to Spirit Baptism.

It is evident that Dr Lloyd-Jones held the view on Tongues that was the prevailing view in the Wales of his youth and early manhood.

(For a discerning assessment of the Welsh 1904 Revival see Geoffrey

Thomas — The Welsh Revival of 1904 — Banner of Truth No. 74, Nov. 1969 p16-21. For the connection of the Welsh 1904 Revival to British Pentecostalism see W. J. Hollenweger — The Pentecostals, S.C.M. 1972 p176-205).

(b) Historical Analysis

Iain Murray has himself written a review article of "Joy Unspeakable" under the heading "Martyn Lloyd-Jones on the Baptism with the Holy Spirit" (Banner of Truth No. 257, February 1985 p8-15). Whilst being mildly critical of the book, and distancing himself from it, the general thrust of the article is one of defending Dr Lloyd-Jones.

One aspect of this defence was to say we are not to read today's controversy back into these sermons preached 20 years ago. Mr Murray writes "Twenty years separate these pages from today's scene. There was no proliferation of Charismatic Churches and house groups at that period" (p8). It is to be regretted that in this instance Mr Murray's historical analysis lacks its usual discernment and discrimination.

Dr Lloyd-Jones preached these sermons in 1964-65 just three years before his retirement in 1968. Hence they were surely expressive of his most mature thought and were preached at just the time when they would have the maximum impact.

The early 60s witnessed the birth of the Modern Charismatic Movement. The London of the mid-60s saw its two leading Evangelical Ministers differing over the doctrine of the Baptism with the Holy Spirit. Anglican, John Stott of All Souls Langham Place (in whose church one of the leading British Charismatics Michael Harper was Curate) was writing against the second blessing doctrine (c.f. his "The Baptism and Fullness of the Holy Spirit", I.V.F. 1964). Dr Lloyd-Jones, who had already preached a series of sermons on Ephesian 1 in 1954-55, and on Romans 8 during 1960-61, that enunciated his "second blessing teaching," was, at the very time Stott was opposing his curate, preaching the sermons that now form "Joy Unspeakable".

In these critical early days of the Charismatic Movement, a person who would eventually be one of its leaders, was himself going through a crisis experience and did not understand what was happening to him. That person was the Anglican, David Watson, who would in later days introduce dance-drama into his church, and call the Reformation one of the greatest tragedies that ever occurred in the church. Let Watson himself explain what happened next. "With three friends I went to see a man whose ministry we immensely respected . . . Dr Martyn Lloyd-

Jones. As we spent the day with him at Westminster Chapel, he began by asking us to share our testimonies with him, since we had all known a fresh working of the Spirit of God in our lives over the last few months. The testimonies had obvious personal variations, but were significantly the same. To our surprise Dr Lloyd-Jones then shared a very similar testimony of his own, when the Spirit had come upon him shortly after the Hebrides Revival in 1949, through the ministry of Duncan Campbell. He said that it had given him a new authority in his preaching ministry. As we walked a little further he said, 'Gentlemen, I believe that you have been baptized with the Holy Spirit'." (D. Watson — *You are my God*. Hodder Stoughton, 1983 p56-57).

This quotation from David Watson provides a most interesting side light on Lloyd-Jones' own "baptism with the Spirit", which apparently took place under Duncan Campbell who belonged to the Arminian-Holiness organisation — the Faith Mission. (For a penetrating critique of the so-called "Lewis Revival" in which Campbell was so largely involved see Kenneth A. Macrae. "The Resurgence of Arminianism" p24-29).

As histories of the present Charismatic Movement and sketches of Dr Lloyd-Jones' life are now being written it is becoming clear that Dr Lloyd-Jones played a part in encouraging those early charismatics.

Christopher Catherwood in a sketch of his grandfather's life has written, "The doctor was always willing to encourage those involved in the Renewal movement. Many of the early meetings of the Fountain Trust took place in Westminster Chapel and leading charismatic Anglicans such as Michael Harper have paid warm tribute to all the help and encouragement he gave them in the early years." (Five Evangelical Leaders, Hodder and Stoughton, 1984 p93).

For a charismatic assessment of Dr Lloyd-Jones' role in the origins of the British Charismatic Movement see the recently published "Streams of Renewal" by Peter Hocken (Paternoster Press, 1986 p83, 87, 119, 228).

(c) Dr Lloyd-Jones' approval of Peter Lewis' message

The foreword to "Joy Unspeakable" is written by the Rev. Peter Lewis of Nottingham who was the final preacher at the thanksgiving service held in Westminster Chapel shortly after Dr Lloyd-Jones' death. Mr Lewis who would be quite happy to be called a Reformed Charismatic writes in his foreword,

"The past 20 years have seen the widespread growth of two radical and potentially mighty movements in Great Britain. These are the reformed

movement with its stress on doctrine, expository preaching and total loyalty to scripture; and the charismatic movement with its stress on the Holy Spirit's Baptism and Gifts, its strong sense of personal guidance and its bold inventiveness in worship.

The weaknesses of the reformed churches have often been their traditionalism, their lack of evangelism and their contentment with sound doctrine sincerely approved. The weakness of the charismatics have tended to be their self indulgent and sometimes uncritical enjoyment of experience, their lack of interest in doctrine and their naivety in church polity.

Both of these groupings have known considerable blessing in recent years, but both may well expect an element of divine rebuke to enter their life if they do not now begin to learn from one another." (Joy Unspeakable p7).

At the British Evangelical Council Meeting in Carlisle in November 1980, Lewis delivered a paper in which he advanced the idea of pulpit exchanges between non-ecumenical charismatics (in the Assemblies of God and Elim Churches) and Reformed Ministers, such that the pentecostalists would preach in Reformed pulpits and "vice-versa". This procedure would according to Mr Lewis modify "the Reformed peoples' timid and drab conservatism in worship". (See *Evangelical Times*, December 1980 for a news report and the January and February 1981 issues for the text of Lewis' lecture).

When Dr Lloyd-Jones died Lewis wrote an appreciation of him in the *Evangelical Times* that give the following staggering information with respect to Lewis' B.E.C. paper. Mr Lewis tells us that it was Dr Lloyd-Jones who had driven him to a fresh and strenuous study of the whole Reformed/Charismatic issue. It was also to Dr Lloyd-Jones that he went in the summer of 1980 full of excitement with his paper that he intended to deliver at the B.E.C. conference. After showing Lloyd-Jones the paper calling for a new "rapprochement" between Reformed and Charismatic, Lewis tells us Lloyd-Jones gave him more than encouragement, he positively glowed. "But," said Lewis, "is there nothing that you disagree with or disapprove of?" "Nothing at all," replied Dr Lloyd-Jones emphatically, "I am with you 100 per cent without reservation." Mr Lewis then adds, "he followed up his encouragement with constant and fervent prayer. 'I am praying for this every single day — and it is a burden from the Holy Spirit'." (*Evangelical Times*, April 1981 p17).

Errol Hulse who has written against this union of Reformed and Charismatic in an article in "Reformation Today" called "Will you attend

the wedding?" (Issue No. 84 p13-16) writes, "Peter Lewis does not hide the fact that the idea of the marriage is not his. It is the doctor's. Peter is correct, because I personally heard the doctor propounding this idea in a sermon, shortly before his decease."

(d) Interpreting Lloyd-Jones

For Mr Murray to posit Dr Lloyd-Jones as being misunderstood, or that he did not mean what he was saying, is, to quote Mr Hulse, "to think sentimentally not realistically." Dr Lloyd-Jones was a highly intelligent and articulate man and he does not need Mr Murray as his expositor. During his lifetime Dr Lloyd-Jones knew quite well that his name was being linked with Charismatic Theology, and if he wished, he could have easily distinguished his position from that of the Charismatic Movement with its pretensions to tongue speaking.

The plain fact is, that whilst he vigorously condemned non-experiential Calvinism as dead orthodoxy, there is no condemnation of the central tenets of the Charismatic position.

A. Wesley Richards, a Pentecostal pastor, in a tribute to Dr Lloyd-Jones after his death confirms this assessment. He writes, "Some classical pentecostal leaders, who had recently returned from a high level dialogue in Rome, were in London. Would the Doctor care to meet them? Indeed he would. And so we gathered for a two hour discussion that was, to all of us, a revelation about this famous standard-bearer of evangelicalism.

What the Doctor did not know about the Catholic Charismatic scene was, it soon transpired, not really worth knowing. He had followed its development with great interest and diligent study and was as keen as his brethren not to quench anything that was genuinely of the Holy Spirit. But he said he was concerned that subjective experience should not precede objective truth.

That was all very well, one of the dialogue team replied forthrightly, but evangelicals, especially those among whom the Doctor was prominent, had in their fierce stand for truth been guilty of regularly quenching the spirit among people who may have needed instructing, but who were at least hungry for God. The pentecostals had bitter experience of this, now it was the turn of Catholics, it seemed.

The Doctor listened patiently, but would not be smeared with an anti-charismatic brush. He had always dissociated himself from such extremism. He wanted no part of it, he said. Indeed no-one had spoken more consistently than he to stress the need for a movement of the Holy

Spirit today. But he insisted everything must be decided by scripture. He welcomed 'truth on fire', wherever it might be.

The Doctor's advocacy left his 'critic' demolished, but much impressed. 'You are one of us' he told the Doctor warmly" (*Evangelical Times*, April 1981 p16).

Hence at the very heart of the renewed interest in Calvinism in England and Wales was a teacher with a distinct pentecostal type theology that embraced both a second blessing concept, and belief in the continuance of the miraculous Charismatic Gifts.

(e) Lone Voice?

It is rather surprising that Mr Murray has seen fit to single out the Free Presbyterian Synod for criticism, as if they alone were so extreme as to raise a warning voice. One can only speculate at the motivation for such strictures when far stronger statements by his associates have gone without comment. Mr Hulse has written in 1985:

"My chief difference with my close and longstanding friend, Iain Murray, of the Banner of Truth, is that he has always believed that the doctor's spiritual stature would be adequate to cover the fact that on paper he was always an old time pentecostalist. As my colleagues in the ministry will testify I always predicted that as soon as the doctor left this world the Charismatics would capitalise on his pentecostal views, and all the restraints set up by Iain Murray or anyone else would be about as effective to stop an incoming tide as inflatable children's toys left on a beach. That is precisely what is happening. All the doctor's sermons on tape are in the hands of Charismatics who have wasted no time in bringing out their own book to add to the Banner of Truth's pentecostal material in the volume on Romans 8" (Reformation Today No. 84 p13).

Wide ranging criticisms have also been voiced with regard to Dr Lloyd-Jones' Pentecostal Theology by Professor Macleod of the Free Church. (See Free Church Monthly Record, January 1979 p3-5, material that has recently been re-issued in his book "Spirit of Promise" Christian Focus Publications 1986).

(f) Division in the *Evangelical Times*

In May 1986 the board and the editorial staff of the *Evangelical Times* were rent asunder. The editor Robert Horn resigned and a new publication under his editorship has commenced called *Evangelicals Now*. The ostensible reason for Mr Horn's resignation was that a new and more orthodox board were curtailing his editorial freedom.

Robert Horn's concept of editorial freedom was freedom to use the *Evangelical Times* to promote Charismatic emphases, and freedom to suppress letters critical of his position. (See John Marshall in "Reformation Today" No. 90 p30-32). Robert Horn is in broad agreement with Dr Lloyd-Jones' teaching on these topics and attends the church that distributes the Lloyd-Jones' tapes and claims to be both Reformed and Charismatic. Since its commencement *Evangelicals Now* has reflected Horn's position and it is surely not without significance that Dr Lloyd-Jones' son-in-law, Sir Frederick Catherwood, is Chairman of its Board.

The December 1986 issue of *Evangelicals Now* contains a sympathetic review of a recent biography of the two pentecostal Evangelists George and Stephen Jeffreys. A footnote following the review bears on the matters we have been discussing. It states:

"George Jeffreys . . . at a later stage asked him (i.e. Dr Lloyd-Jones) if he would consider being the Dean of his Bible College.

"The two men met again before Jeffrey's death in the early 1950s. Jeffreys, with a remnant of his revival party, turned up at Westminster Chapel on Whit Sunday morning. The doctor preached from Acts 2 on the Baptism of the Spirit. Later they talked together and Jeffreys was approving of the doctor's ministry. 'I always told you, you were one of us,' quipped Jeffreys. 'But I don't believe that speaking in tongues is an essential element of Spirit Baptism,' remarked Lloyd-Jones. 'Neither do I,' retorted Jeffreys."

(*Evangelicals Now*, December 1986 p19. The reference to George Jeffreys' death in the early 1950s is incorrect, he died January 26th 1962).

(g) A Timely Warning

The Free Presbyterian Synod in 1986 gave a timely warning. It is to be regretted that, unlike "Reformation Today" and the "Sword and Trowel", the "Banner of Truth" magazine is giving a less than certain sound on these issues.

How many more Reformed Churches are to be divided on the Charismatic issue? How many more of the rising generation are to leave us? How many more magazines are to be divided before the whole Reformed community lifts up a united voice against this most potent error that has grown so dramatically in our day, — even if this does involve a warning about an aspect of Dr Lloyd-Jones' teaching?

Repentance and Faith

As sure as the servants of God have to preach repentance towards God, they have to preach faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and faith is the gift of God. It is the eye which the soul receives to see Christ, and the hand to lay hold on Him and to appropriate Him as its own. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life," and faith, you see, is a thing that rests upon a warrant, rests upon the promises of God, and receives them as absolutely true. Many, many, a sinner went to eternity rejoicing in such a promise as this:— "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy sins and thy transgressions and iniquities will I remember no more." When the Spirit of God speaks thus to the sinner, He enables the sinner to believe — "He means me, that is spoken to me, and I believe it."

Now, as they had to preach that all men are lost by nature, on the way to eternal ruin, and have need of turning from their evil ways unto God by repentance, so they have to set Christ before sinners as the one way, the only way to the Father, and that by faith in Him, by receiving Him as their only personal Saviour, turning to Him with their whole heart and soul and mind and closing in with Him as their own Saviour for time and an endless eternity, that they might be saved.

— From a Sermon by Rev. N. Cameron on Matthew 28: 18.

Notes and Comments

Disregarding the voice of Ulster

It is a most remarkable fact that one third of a million people, all of one mind, gather in the centre of Belfast, a British city, and the significance of that seems to be lost on the vast majority of our members of Parliament including those responsible for administering the affairs of Northern Ireland. If it had occurred in Glasgow, or London or Birmingham there would, we feel sure, have been some attempt made to redress the grievance of such a massive number of Her Majesty's subjects but in the case of Protestant Ulster men and women it is as if it had never taken place! Or if a Petition bearing over half-a-million signatures were handed in to Her Majesty the Queen requesting action on a specific matter affecting the peace and security of another part of the United Kingdom would it not be taken very seriously and some action taken? These lawful and constitutional moves to have the Anglo-Irish Agreement abrogated or even suspended have been altogether unproductive. It would appear to us that it is more important, in the eyes of our Government, to please

Rome's Pope and Cardinals and pro-Roman Catholic leaders of other nations rather than give just consideration to the genuine fears and grievances of our Protestant subjects of Northern Ireland. We hope a future Parliament will look at matters in a more democratic manner.

Financial crisis in the Vatican

If Press reports are correct the Vatican seems to be in financial straits and certain drastic measures are proposed to restore solvency. Some of its precious works of art are, we are told, to be sold in order to meet debts and finance the church's work throughout the world. Reports of the Vatican's involvement in the financial scandals linked with the murder of certain prominent individuals in the criminal underworld still rumble on and the man who was in charge of the Vatican bank, Archbishop Marcinkus, is still skulking within the walls of the Vatican despite attempts by the Italian authorities to have him brought to justice. These reports, it is said, have restricted the flow of "Peter's Pence" and more especially it would seem from West Germany and the United States upon whom the Roman Catholic Church has in the past been heavily dependent. Unlike his predecessor Leo X the present Pope dare not send a Tetzels across the Alps and further afield to press indulgences into the hands of superstitious and credulous buyers. "From the Seven Hills," it was then envisaged, "would flow a river of spiritual blessing. To Rome would flow back a river of gold." Instead the gorgeously appraised Pontiff himself is off again jetting from nation to nation stirring up the 'faithful' to support that system of which he is head. It would be good if nations and individuals began to realise at last that the Vatican represents an evil, secular organisation which is under the dominion of the god of this world and that the Roman Pontiff for all his strutting on the world stage is none other than the "man of sin" and "son of perdition" whom "the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming."

Church Notes

Meeting of Synod

The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland will meet (D.V.) in the Free Presbyterian Church, Inverness, on Tuesday, 19th May, 1987, at 6.30 p.m. when public worship will be conducted by the retiring Moderator, the Rev. D. B. Macleod, Dingwall.

Presbytery Meetings (D.V.)**Western:** At Laide on 16th June at 11 a.m.**Southern:** At Glasgow on 16th June at 6 p.m.**Northern:** At Dingwall on 16th June at 2 p.m.**Australia and New Zealand:** At Auckland on 29th May at 2.30 p.m.

Acknowledgement of Donations

The General Treasurer, Mr Wm. D. Fraser, acknowledges the following donations with sincere thanks:—

Sustentation Fund: A. M., Harris, £35; A. M., Harris, £50.**Home Mission Fund:** A. M., Harris, £15; A. M., Harris, £25.**Foreign Mission Fund:** A. M., Harris, £15. A. M., Harris, £12.50; "Galatiann 6: 2", £300; Mr and Mrs Sutherland, £50, last two for famine relief.**Organisation Fund:** A. M., Harris, £12.50.

On behalf of Helmsdale Congregation: Anon., £30 towards church expenses.

The Treasurers of the following congregations acknowledge with sincere thanks the following donations:—

Dumbarton: Anon., Inverness, £100 for tape recording, per Rev. G. I. M.**Fort William:** Friend, Caol, £10; Mrs B., £10; K. C., Lochaline, £50; P. C., Lochaline, £100; C. C., £20, for church floor repairs, last one in plate, rest per Rev. J. A. M.: Friend, Caol, £10 per D. MacN.; Friend, Caol, £10 per Rev. J. A. M., both for Sustentation Fund; Anon., £2; Anon., £3; Anon., £1; Anon., £15; Anon., £5; Anon., £2; Passer by, £1; all per envelope in plate; Glasgow Friends, £5 for Communion Expenses, per D. MacN.**Greenock:** "Two Friends, St. Jude's," £10 for Communion Expenses, in plate.**Kames:** "Rismor," Dunoon, £20 for Church Funds.**Laide:** M. R., Inverness, £10; Maggie, Strathburn, £5; "Friends," Ardessie, £20; M. R., Inverness, £23; "Friend," Kyles Scalpay, £5; "Friend," Tarbert, £10; S. M., Tarbert, £20; "Friend," Stockinish, £1; "Friend," Stockinish, £5; "Friend," Stockinish, £5; "Friend," Harris House, £5; M. G., Arina, £500; N. M. R., £9.11; Diana MacAskill, London, £10; Mrs Joan MacKenzie, Aultbea, £50; Anon., Gairloch, £40; J. and D. McL., £10; Anon., £25, all per Rev. D. A. R.; R. and M. McGregor, Aultbea, £10; Anon., £10; Anon., MacRaes, Aultbea, £20; "Friend," Opinan, £10; Rhoda McL., £10; Anon., £10; Anon., £10; Anon., £100; Anon., £200; all per envelope in plate; Muriel Goddam, Ireland, £200, per K. McK, 2nd Coast, all for Church Building Fund; Anon., £15, for Congregational Purposes, envelope in plate; F. B., £10 in plate; Anon., £10, per C. Ross; "Friend," Tarbert, £10, per Rev. D. A. R., all for catering.**Portree:** "Tunbridge Wells Friend," £15 for Congregational Purposes, per F. M.; M. A. M., Budhmer, £10 for Communion Expenses, envelope in plate; "Friend," £10; "Ps. 119: 60," £15, both for "where most needed," first per F. M., last per envelope in plate; Anon., £5, envelope in plate.**South Harris:** Mrs M Wroe, Southport, £10 for Congregational Fund, envelope in plate; L. MacQueen, Northton, £10; Mrs M. Morrison, Lingerbay, £20, both for Congregational Fund, first per A. MacCuish, second per D. Mack.; "Friend," Geocrab, £20; Anon., £30, both for Communion Expenses, first per D. MacD., second per envelope in plate.**Stornoway:** Anon., £50; "Friend," Kyles Scalpay, £10; "Friend," Tarbert, £10; "Friend," Stockinish, £5, all for Car Fund, per Rev. J. MacL.; Envelope in plate, £20, for Sustentation Fund, per Treasurer.**N.B.:** In April issue "Bracadale" should have read "Breasclete."