

# The Last of the Calvinistic Methodists

## D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones and his Problematic “Revival” Theology.

**G**roping through the dense fogs of apostasy in the present-day churches of Western Christianity, the modern evangelical Calvinist clings doggedly to the one notion that constitutes his last hope.....revival! God will send a mighty revival! Things were once as bad as this before the Great Awakening, but God sent revival.....and what wonders took place then! How the nation was transformed! Surely, He will do it again.....

One such proponent of “revival” was the late Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, (M.L-J), one of the most eminent Calvinist preachers of the mid-20th Century. His fundamental thoughts on this topic are distilled into, amongst other places, a paper he read at the Puritan and Reformed Studies Conference in London in the winter of 1959, entitled “Revival: An Historical and Theological Survey”<sup>1</sup> For “twenty-six Sunday mornings” of that year, we learn ML-J had preached on revival at Westminster Chapel, hence by the time he came to the Puritan Conference in the December one might say that he would thoroughly know what he was talking about. In this paper, he defines “revival” as “an experience in the life of the Church when the Holy Spirit does an unusual work”, and that, “primarily amongst the members of the church”, that is, the believers. And “new power comes into the preaching” with the Spirit anointing the ministers with a hitherto unusual intensity. Two major results issue, the “extraordinary enlivening of the members of the church”, and the “conversion of masses of people” hitherto “outside in indifference and sin”.<sup>2</sup>

Such phenomena are reckoned by ML-J to be “an outpouring of the Spirit of God. It is a kind of repetition of Pentecost” which God dispenses sovereignly. “Revival” he adumbrates, “does not always come after a preliminary reformation. Revival sometimes follows reformation, but revival sometimes precedes reforma-

<sup>1</sup> Published by the **Banner of Truth Trust** in: “*The Puritans: Their Origins and Successors*” 1987, and pages 1- 23. This whole tome is a collection of pertinent addresses ML-J made to the Puritan and Reformed Studies Conferences from 1959 on, through to the Westminster Conferences as far as 1978. We shall be referring herewith to various addresses contained in that volume.

<sup>2</sup> **Lloyd-Jones Op. Cit.** pp1 - 2. This is ML-J’s position in brief. Elsewhere in this tome he enlarges on this two-fold phenomenon, cf. for example: pages 282-302, and 348-371.

tion; and for us to lay it down that reformation must precede revival, and that doctrinal orthodoxy is essential to revival is simply to fly directly into the face of the facts.”<sup>3</sup> This sudden and electric stab ML-J delivers here against “doctrinal orthodoxy” leads him on later to posit the question “Do we recognise and acknowledge that in the Sovereignty of God an Arminian may be ‘filled with the Spirit’ and greatly used by God in the salvation of lost souls, and the edification of the church?” Following from his prior reasoning, this question emerges, as he says, as “an inevitable question”, and it is a question which ML-J clearly implies deserves the answer “Yes” judging by the tone of his perorations.<sup>4</sup> And along the way to this conclusion ML-J asserts: “...John Wesley was to me the greatest proof of Calvinism (sic....gawp !!!! *Ed.*) Why? because in spite of his faulty thinking he was greatly used of God to preach the Gospel and to convert souls!”<sup>5</sup> Indeed, to raise eye-brows even further, ML-J suggests that it is a “very subtle form of Arminianism if we maintain that correct doctrine and understanding are essential to our being used by the Spirit of God.” And, “It is sheer Arminianism to insist upon a true and correct understanding as being essential,” <sup>6</sup> “If you say that God cannot give revival until first of all we have had a reformation, you are speaking like an Arminian, you are saying that God cannot do this until we ourselves have done something.”<sup>7</sup>

It must be pointed out that at this juncture in his reasoning, ML-J is not exegeting

---

<sup>3</sup> Lloyd-Jones in address: “*Howell Harris and Revival*” delivered at Westminster Conference 1973, printed in *op. cit.* above pp. 282-302. The quotations here are taken from page 289. ML-J further says on page 15 that “It is amazing that any man holding the Reformed position can be guilty of such a contradiction as to say that you cannot have revival unless you have reformation first”..... “That is to put a limit on God...” (!). However, it should be noted that in the first paper ML-J was forced to contradict what he is saying here. For this see *op.cit.* page 14 concerning Henry Cooke of Ulster.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p.302.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p.297

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* p 297 again. Karl Barth would have loved this! For what ML-J is propounding here is a Barth-like disjunction between Scripture meaning and the Spirit of God working internally in the life of the believer. True and proper understanding of Scripture is not necessary to godliness and usefulness in the work of God’s Kingdom, on ML-J’s position. Significantly in this respect, on page 309 of this work he has to point out how Wesley at the 1770 Methodist conference went “back to Justification by Works openly”, and that when he later appeared, partially at least, to retract, “one of his assistants, John Fletcher of Madeley - a very saintly, godly man - defended what Wesley had said in the 1770 Conference”. (!!!) That is, ML-J is effectively saying here that a man can be so Arminian as to believe in “Justification by works” and yet still be a “very saintly, godly man”. St. Paul exploded at the Galatians over such a notion as this, calling “Justification by works” an “accursed gospel”. But further implications arise unavoidably out of ML-J’s reasoning here. If what really matters is this “mighty spiritual anointing”, and not orthodox doctrine, then, in that an insistence on orthodox doctrine creates dissension, quarrelling, and division, then orthodoxy will be seen as a pariah in the fellowship of the saints, and will consequently get “dumbed down”. And of course, as Marc Carpenter has shown herewith in his analysis of Iain Murray’s book, that is precisely what happens in these revivals.....orthodoxy gets shut up, then shut down.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p.15. Thus ML-J displays the convoluted contradictions that a false theology inserts into the logic of one’s understanding. All his Calvinism here is mollified, indeed *vitiated*, by this one over-riding consideration.....revival, above all revival.....evidently more important than Biblical Orthodoxy.

---

Scripture, rather, he is exegeting, or rather, interpreting, according to the a-prioris of his own hermeneutic, certain *aspects* only of certain phenomena recorded in church history *peculiarly* in the main of British and American churches. It has to be said that the matter of whether or not orthodoxy is necessary for effective preaching of the one Biblical true gospel is a question to be decided by the Word of God, and the Word of God alone, and not by church history, not by church traditions, not by “mighty revivalists”, not by any evangelical shibboleths or predilections, no matter how persuasive such may be. And furthermore, Church history is not a tool to be used in the exegesis of Scripture. If it was, then you could make Scripture say what you like simply by a cunning selection of those areas of Church history that can be made to orientate with your own predilections. What is evident here is that ML-J is manifestly and openly starting, in fact on page 2 of this book, with Church history. Nay, worse! *He is starting with certain selected aspects of certain phenomena recorded in Church history!* He says, on page 2 of his paper “Revival: An Historical and Theological Survey: “.....our best approach perhaps is to *start* with the actual historical survey.”(Emph.mine *Ed.*) ML-J does not begin to introduce Scriptural considerations until some 10 pages later, (half way through his address) and then in an altogether inadequate way, as we shall see.

But what saith the Scripture ?

**Isa 8:20** *To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, [it is] because [there is] no light in them.*

**Notice that:** “to the Law and to the testimony....” Not to “Church History”. Let alone to certain selected aspects of Church history. Scripture must be the starting place for the interpretation, and evaluation of Church history, not the other way round. It is to be regretted that ML-J was operating “the other way round” on this topic.

Now ML-J is evidently hooked on the notion that Arminians can be godly men and greatly used of God, because “Church history” demonstrates this. “Church history” reveals to us the “godly” John Wesley, the “saintly” Fletcher, et al., who were mightily used of God in preaching the Gospel and bringing “true revival”. The phenomenology of “revival” is taken as the “Archimedian point” in ML-J’s reasoning, rather than Scripture and Biblical Orthodoxy. And logically he follows on into the theological mess whereby Arminianism is accepted into the parameters of the true Church of God. In short, ML-J takes his leave of the Canons of Dort, the Westminster Standards, the Savoy Declaration, the Baptist 1689 Confession, and all the great theologians of the Church from Ambrose through Augustine, Gottschalk, Bradwardine, to Wycliffe, Huss, Luther, Calvin, Owen.....etc, etc. Worse. He takes his leave of Scripture, for what, again, saith the Scriptures of that Arminian gospel held doggedly by the “godly” Wesley and the “saintly” Fletcher ? What saith the Scripture concerning Wesley and Fletcher’s open resistance to “Justification by Faith alone” and their espousal in 1770 of “justification by works”?

Writing to the Galatians on this very topic, the great Apostle to the Gentiles exploded at them over the notion of introducing “works” into justification, and condemned such innovations as accursed, viz.:

**Ga 1:6** *I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel: 7 Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. 8 But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. 9 As we said before, so say I now again, If any [man] preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.*

Let the reader judge. Will Scripture allow us the liberty to reckon a propounder of “justification by works” like Fletcher or Wesley to be a God-sent, God-annointed preacher?

Returning to ML-J, his proclivities for “revival” have also implications for his understanding of “preaching”. While it must be emphasised that in many areas of pulpit principle the good Doctor was a leading light, on this matter of revival, he became decidedly wobbly. Taking Jonathan Edwards as his mentor, he states: “The first and primary object of preaching is not only to give information. It is, as Edwards says, to produce an impression. *It is the impression at the time that matters, even more than what you can remember subsequently.*” (Emp. mine Ed.) “In this respect”, ML-J continues, “Edwards is, in a sense, critical of what was a prominent Puritan custom and practice. The Puritan father would catechize and question the children as to what the preacher had said. Edwards, in my opinion, has the true notion of preaching. It is not primarily to impart information....”<sup>8</sup> But what becomes then of the Gospel as “good *news*”? What becomes of St. Paul’s example: **Acts 20:27** *For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God.*? What becomes of **II Tim. 3: 16** “all scripture” as being inspired of God, and “*profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness*”? What becomes of “instruction” if the primary aim of preaching is merely to “produce an impression”?<sup>9</sup> It goes without saying that the Christian preacher will be looking to produce a deep spiritual impression on his hearers, but the

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p360. in ML-J’s 1976 paper, “*Jonathan Edwards and the Crucial Importance of Revival*”. Note that “*crucial* importance of revival” ! More “*crucial*” than Biblical Orthodoxy ?

<sup>9</sup> Karl Barth would have loved this too! For that is really the sum and substance of Barth’s Theology of the Word of God, Preached, Written, and Revealed....in which the expositor of Scripture is effectively setting in motion an effect, an impression, in which the information contained in the Scripture need have little or no connection with the “impression” made on the individual by the expositor. See Barth’s *Church Dogmatics*, Vol I part 1, with special refs. to Sect. 3 and 4, and Part 2, Chapters II and III. Truth is, that Barth could sound very evangelical, and would quite possibly have exulted in one of the “revivals” ML-J was so keen to eulogise. But ML-J contradicts himself somewhat in this tome when in his address on Preaching (Cf. *ibid* pp.372 - 389) he commends Perkins’s 4 “great principles” on preaching (*ibid.* p.382) where Perkins, in his “*Art of Prophesying*” clearly adumbrates the conveying of information as a central feature of the sermon.

Scriptural preacher will do that by means of conveying to them the *information* contained in the Scriptures. It is the **truth** in this **information** that will convict and convert them, will nurture them, will promote their growth in grace,.....if not, well.....what else? ML-J lets a cat out of the bag here. He compares preachers to college lecturers. The same applies to them as to preachers, he says, “the tragedy is that many lecturers simply dictate notes....That is not the business of a lecturer or professor. The students can read the books for themselves; the business of the professor is to put that on fire, to enthuse, to stimulate, to enliven. And that is the primary business of preaching.”<sup>10</sup> Now there are indeed certain truths adumbrated here. It is, however, the application that is dreadful. Expounding Scripture is here put on a par with college lecturing. Granted, Professor Dry-as-dust’s students can read all the stuff in the books, the Prof.’s duty *is* to enthuse, impress, enliven, what would otherwise be a stuffy old load of convoluted equations in the Tensor calculus, say. To do that, the Prof. must needs study a bit of technique, a bit of oratory say, he must cultivate a bit of style, learn to project his personality like a thespian from the “Royal Shakespeare”, hold his students in rapt attention, never mind the nitty gritty of the information so much, they can get all that out of the library! We say, excellent! Would that college lecturers took such advice seriously! But, all this is paralleled in preaching the Word of God? Is the minister to study “personality projection”, oratory, thespian style, the art of voice inflections and projections, in order to “impress” the congregation with something or other attached to the Bible, but not “primarily to impart information”? Is the Truth of God to be “put over” as an “impression” by thespian and oratorical dynamics, or by the Holy Spirit applying the information of the Truth to the individual soul? What exactly is ML-J implying here? Well, he says “we should tell our people to read certain books themselves and get the information there.”<sup>11</sup>

And how is the preaching to create this “impression” the good Doctor calls for? Is he actually advocating thespian technique for the pulpit here? On page 2 of this very tome we saw him insisting that “revival” occurred when, together with the “enlivening of the members of the church”, the “New power comes to the preach-

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p.360.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 360 again. Tough if you live in places like Burma, China, and Russia, and can’t get the books ! Tough if you can’t afford them even where they’re available ! Tough if you lived in this world during the millenia preceding Gutenberg’s invention of the printing press. However, as the provisions that God has made for His children in His Word were obviously intended for all ages and states of mankind, then His instructions on preaching must encompass the feature of conveying information in all ages and states of mankind, which includes the 1400 years from the time of Christ to Gutenberg.. The method of teaching required by the Scriptures must facilitate the imparting of information to illiterates and to people who lived centuries before the advent of cheap and readily available Bibles and books. ML-J tends to denigrate Catechising here. Biblical Catechising is a wonderful way of imparting, and indeed, *impressing information*. But again, catechising is hard work. Evangelicals and their revivals are not characterised by such spiritual determination....they want the oratory, the style, the impressions.....the sensations of the mighty revivals..... the glory road.....the drama.....yea! ..... the *entertainment!*

ing of the ministers". What is that "New power"? Sheer thespianism? ML-J would clearly deny that. In his address on preaching he indicates, with approval, how the Puritans were opposed to "ornate, artificial, oratorical kind of preaching."<sup>12</sup> That is, they were opposed to "acting" in the pulpit. But right here at this point a notable distinction arises in his reasoning.....whilst it is wrong to "act" in preaching in the same sense as a thespian "acts" a part on stage, nevertheless, the Christian preacher with the "New power" on him will be every bit as lively, dramatically animated, convincing, and gripping an orator as the professional thespian. The difference is that the thespian is "playing", whereas the "New power" of the Christian preacher, though just as dramatic, and just as, if not more, effective, is not "playing", it emerges naturally out of a heart and soul filled with it. To preach like this is allegedly what St. Paul means in **1Co 2:4** *And my speech and my preaching [was] not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power:*

It is thus, that ML-J can seemingly contradict himself here. Whilst eschewing, and rightly, all artificial acting, he endorses the dramatics if he believes that they have been generated by the revival "New power". This much is evident from his eulogy of George Whitefield, given in pages 101 - 128 of this tome. Whitefield, he says, "was a born orator. He could not help it." And "like all orators, he was characterized by the great freedom and appropriateness of his gestures. The pedantic John Wesley.....sometimes tended to be a bit critical of George Whitefield in this respect." In an account of Whitefield preaching at Dublin, "Wesley refers to (Whitefield's) gestures, and says that.....Whitefield tended to speak with his hands as much as with his lips and mouth." "But," says ML-J, "that is oratory". ML-J then defends Whitefield, approvingly, by quoting Demosthenes, the ancient pagan Greek orator, who advocated that true oratory was "action, action, action." Approvingly ML-J then goes on to tell how the famous leading actor of those days, David Garrick,<sup>13</sup> would always go to hear Whitefield whenever the opportunity arose. ML-J tells us that Garrick was "not so much interested in the Gospel as in the speaking and in the gestures and so on. Garrick is reported to have said he would give 100 guineas<sup>14</sup> if he could only say 'Oh!' as George Whitefield said it. And somebody else said that if he could only utter the word 'Mesopotamia' like Whitefield he

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* p.384.

<sup>13</sup> The Garrick Theatre in London is named after this all-time master thespian. Garrick became such a regular hearer of Whitefield that, with his own knowledge of the exigencies involved in the arts of stage and theatre, he could tell whether Whitefield was preaching a new sermon, or an old one that he had preached many times before. Naturally, in a new sermon, Whitefield's 'dramatics' would be, as of actors on the stage during a "first night", somewhat unpolished and lacking. By about "the tenth or fifteenth performance, Whitefield's delivery was so tuned that Garrick marvelled at his art.."(See **Harry S. Stout: "The Divine Dramatist":** Eerdmans 1994 page 237). Such a testimony rather casts doubt on claims that Whitefield's dramatics were the direct and spontaneous result of the Holy Spirit's inspiration. Practice, it seems, was required to make it all perfect.....just as on the stage.

<sup>14</sup> 100 guineas equals £100 and 100 shillings, or £105. That sum in c.a.1750 would today be worth thousands of pounds.

would be completely happy". ML-J takes the time too, to tell us now of how the famous and learned Bolingbroke came often to hear Whitefield, and testified of him that "he had a greater commanding eloquence than any man he had ever heard". And from politicians, preachers, statesmen to thespians, Bolingbroke had heard the lot. And Whitefield outshone them all.<sup>15</sup>

But here ML-J turns to something else. These oratorical gifts that Whitefield had, were, yes, purely natural gifts. But "God knows what He is doing, and when He chose this man George Whitefield, to whom He had given these natural gifts, He knew what He was doing." And the implication is clear, Whitefield was chosen by God to be an orator, God's thespian, or the "Divine Dramatist" as one recent author has called him.<sup>16</sup> Behind the dramatics there was a deep Calvinist piety, and the impassioned dramatics and oratory displayed freely by Whitefield in the pulpit were justified on the grounds that they were the outward lively expression of a lively inward piety. The "New power". And this, allegedly, was the Pauline "demonstration of the Spirit and power," the "New power" that marks "revival" preaching.

In the same manner Jonathan Edwards had justified Whitefield's dramatics 200 years previously. "By properly distinguishing supernaturally infused affections from the natural passions, Edwards could defend emotional preaching without defending the passions."<sup>17</sup> And under such dynamic preaching multitudes were swept along on a sea of emotional response.....ML-J glories in this, recounting the story of Lord Chesterfield's visit to hear Whitefield. Whitefield was illustrating a point in his sermon via a story of a blind man with a dog edging ever nearer a precipice. So powerful was Whitefield's thespian technique that Chesterfield "sprang to his feet shouting, 'Good God! Stop him!', and sprang forward involuntarily to try to stop the blind man falling over the abyss." "That", says the good Doctor, "that is not only oratory, that is also preaching....."<sup>18</sup> One might here however, ask pertinent questions about hypnosis..... But to ML-J, such and other manifestations are "beyond oratory, this is inspired oratory - oratory inspired by the Holy Ghost, conveying the message of the Word of God and its glorious gospel."<sup>19</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Lloyd-Jones, *Ibid.* pp.117-118

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Harry S. Stout: "*The Divine Dramatist*" Eerdmans 1994.

<sup>17</sup> Stout: *Op. Cit.* p.186. But note the actor David Garrick's perceptive observations of Whitefield, given in footnote 13 above.

<sup>18</sup> Lloyd-Jones: *Op.cit.* p. 124. The reader will understand, that it is not for nothing that folk pay premium prices to attend the Royal Shakespeare Company at Stratford-on-Avon, or at London play-theatres. A master thespian is virtually hypnotic, and can transport an audience right into the spirit of a drama, it might be said, more so even than Hollywood's "silver screen".

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.* p.125. On the same terms, of course, why might one not regard Ira D. Sankey, or Cliff Barrows, or for that matter, yes, Cliff Richard, as ones to whom natural gifts of song were given by God, that they might sing under the inspiration of the Spirit and so lead praise to God before large audiences? One might disapprove of "pop" music per se, but yet, by ML-J's principles approve of "Divine-inspired pop music". This is not being facetious. The evangelical world is glutted with "gospel pop", and judging by the Great Christian Books Catalogue much of American Calvinism is well oiled with the same thing.

It is a startling fact, however, that the reports of Whitefield's "revivals" have been transmitted to us largely as a one-sided testimony. Doubtless, great multitudes were converted truly, by reason of being convicted by the truth that Whitefield's preaching conveyed to them. But vast numbers suffered manifold deleterious effects from those revivals, and this fact has been swept under the carpet. Dramatics in the pulpit can and does, and did in Whitefield's case, produce an undesirable by-product, an unstable host of "converts", their "born-again" experience being no more than the psycho-emotional effects of a drama-induced quasi-hypnotic trauma. An "impression" indeed. Such converts wither in the hot sun of reality, "having no root in themselves"(Mark 4:17). And so it was, sadly, with vast multitudes of Whitefield's "converts", and similar patterns are clearly traceable too from other revival ministries when *all* the facts are taken into consideration, not just the "glory road" accounts.

As a boy, and as a youth, Whitefield had been trained in a drama school. And he was evidently so proficient in the dramatic arts that he used to be chosen to act the most difficult parts. And in his subsequent pulpit career, his talents in the dramatic arts were freely manifest, often spontaneously, but as often, too, they appear to have been contrived, practiced, and perfected. Let us attend to the observations of a Scotsman, contemporary of Whitefield, an acknowledged expert on revivals, John Gillies. Observing Whitefield carefully, he noted "his theatrical talent", "his perfect self-command", "solemnity of manner and an anxious expression of countenance." Having begun the sermon, Whitefield's "actions captivated hearers, every accent of his voice spoke to the ear, every feature of his face, every motion of his hands, and every gesture spoke to the eye; so that the most dissipated and thoughtless found their attention *involuntarily fixed*." ( Emph.mine Ed. Immediately one sees the generation of a suggestible state of mind in the audience). Gillies went on to note how Whitefield moved with "such vehemence upon his bodily frame" that the effect tended to drain the audience of energy.<sup>20</sup>

Such then, the natural powers of the orator! ML-J enthusiastically approves. Others, contemporaries of Whitefield, thought otherwise, but this other side of the "Great Awakening" has largely been censored out of the popular accounts of it that

---

<sup>20</sup> Stout: Op. cit. pp.140-141. See also in Stout pp. 5-10 for data concerning the young Whitefield's studies in drama. Fascinating and disturbing, Stout insightfully can tell us that 18th Century theatre was marked by the rise of a scientific approach to acting, the aim being to enrapture audiences. Whitefield's later pulpit techniques evidently reflect his training in the thespian principles of such 18th cent.experts as Aaron Hill, whose manual "*The Art of Acting*" lays down all the methods of "putting it over" that Whitefield manifested later in the pulpit. Anyone who thinks that acting is but a matter of learning one's lines, getting on stage and getting on with it, is very badly mis-informed indeed. Acting is a highly-skilled profession, replete with more than art.... it has a science and an epistemology of its own, where-with it knows how to achieve desired effects in an audience. Possibly one of the greatest exponents of the dramatic arts off the stage in our own times was Adolf Hitler....whose oratorical skills were finely honed down and could enthrall enormous crowds, indeed, a whole nation went wild after him.....There is nothing supernatural in any of this.....it is all a matter of the genius of the dramatic arts. And to aver as ML-J does, that in Whitefield it was supernatural is purely gratuitous.

---



have circulated in the ensuing 200 years,<sup>21</sup> and a whole “folk-lore” of “mighty revivals” has been established in the evangelical mind of today in which half the facts have been brushed aside. And any recalling of the negative facts concerning these revival phenomena gets automatically treated with contempt by the powers that be in mainstream Evangelicalism and neo-Calvinism. Neglected, too, are the facts pertaining to hundreds of solid orthodox ministers whose labours bore lasting and extensive fruit through generation after generation without ever experiencing the mass emotional frenzies of “revival”. Many such men existed, and suffered vilification from “revivalists” like Whitefield, and Tennant, and, in a later generation, from Finney.

It is interesting to refer here to a testimony of Dr. John Kennedy of Dingwall. Living when he did, he knew first hand the nature of those mass movements that swept across Scotland in 1839, and in 1859, and were certified as “visitations from God” by the orthodox Calvinists of that day. Kennedy opens for us a door yielding a startling view across a gulf of time, when he says:

“Soon after I became a preacher, I was in a district, where such was the people’s sensitiveness of feeling, that I could not read the opening Psalm without many being in tears, and the sounds of sobbing compelling me to pause. A sensational address would have laid the whole congregation prostrate on the earth. But this impression passed like a morning cloud away.”<sup>22</sup>

Now it is a manifest fact that Kennedy’s own ministry was extremely fruitful in the advancement of God’s Kingdom, not merely for the few months of a “revival” season, but virtually for forty years. Well outside the parameters of the 1839 and 1859 revivals, well outside the influences of Moody & Co., Kennedy’s faithful ministry stirred multitudes with a lasting godly influence over a whole generation, whilst he yet remained somewhat skeptical and wary about the revivals. Numerous testimonies abound to verify the fruitfulness of his ministry.<sup>23</sup> Importantly, he has quite a bit to say concerning the revivals of his time in Scotland and in Ireland. “I also confess...” he says “to a tendency not to be very sanguine as to results (of

---

<sup>21</sup> Significantly, large numbers of Whitefield’s contemporaries, orthodox Calvinist men, either had their doubts, or downright openly disapproved of his pulpit methods. Even Samuel Davies initially was skeptical, but effectively got swept along on the hypnotic torrent of Whitefield’s thespian techniques. (See: **Stout**: Op. cit. pp.216-217). Contrastingly, the influential Boston ministers, notably Wadsworth and Chauncey, were initially entranced, but then had serious second thoughts. Chauncey actually accused Whitefield of “**preaching from the passions up**”. Such was the degree of disenchantment with Whitefield in New England by as early as 1743 that “many ministers who initially had been curious or supportive of Whitefield now turned against him and organized petitions to exclude him from their pulpits.” (**Stout**: *Ibid.* pp. 185-186).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. “*Evangelism: A Reformed Debate*” **John Kennedy v. Horatius Bonar**, (James Begg Society 1997) p.113.

<sup>23</sup> For a summary of these, see **British Reformed Journal** Issues:10 and 11, espec. Issue 11 pp. 24-34. Kennedy avoided all “dramatics”, and his ministry was characterised by gravity and sobriety. Churches would be packed to the doors when he preached, the services being void of the emotionalist outbursts characteristic of revivals, but yet with steady, consistent and solid results.

revivals). But I can not help this. My experience has been such as necessarily to induce that state of feeling.”<sup>24</sup> He goes on to adumbrate his experience:

“I early found myself in the midst of a revival movement. It was in the Highlands, too. The preaching which was mainly instrumental in producing it was preaching which I greatly admired. ‘The Apostle of the North’ was the leader then. Hundreds have I seen deeply affected in one congregation. This was the season, too, when the crisis of my own life had come. I went then to hear the gospel as one to whom the issue was to be life or death for ever. I craved with all my heart to share in the impression made on other hearts, if it verily resulted from the operation of the Spirit’s power. *But the greater the excitement, the less, to my consciousness, the power.* (Emph. mine Ed.) I well remember when, in the midst of hundreds of mourners, an old man, who had spent the two nights preceding on the hill-side in an agony of distress, arose, and, in a loud wail, exclaimed, ‘tha mi cailte’ (I am lost). But not four days had passed before he was as callous and as worldly as before. Nor was his case, in its last phase, an exceptional one; for *those who knew the district well could tell of scarce any abiding fruit as the result of that remarkable movement.*”<sup>25</sup>

In Kennedy’s times, none was so dramatically successful as a revival preacher in Scotland perhaps, as the famous young William Chalmers Burns, whose ministry prior to his departure to the China mission field was the catalytic force in the 1839 revivals. Kennedy witnessed this phenomenon in Aberdeen at the time, and again, his account is disillusioning:

“I passed to Aberdeen, and found myself there in the midst of the movement, in which William Burns was the leader. For that man of God, with his rare talents, his rich attainments, his devotional spirit, and his burning zeal, those who knew him had such respect, as if in him an apostle of Jesus Christ had risen again from the dead. I was a witness to the marvellous effects of his addresses. I went to hear him with a fervent desire to be impressed; but, with all my reverence for the preacher, and my heart’s hunger for benefit from his services, I was constrained even then, young and inexperienced as I was, to conclude that his method was not judicious. Five or six addresses he would sometimes deliver during the time of service, assured that what he said was given to him, and that when he ceased to speak, it was because the Lord had ceased to supply. This impressed me, even then, as indicating far more zeal than discretion, and as what would, in the case of a less gifted and spiritual man, be very dangerous. A year thereafter, I was present when Mr. Burns asked those who were impressed, during his former visit, to meet in a certain place at an appointed hour. I resolved to be, and I was, present there and then. Eleven young women appeared, and no more; and their cases, if one might judge by their demeanour, were not very hopeful. I am far from saying that this was all the fruit of the wonderful movement

---

<sup>24</sup> “*Evangelism: A Reformed Debate*”, p112.

<sup>25</sup> *ibid.* p.112. Emph. mine again, Ed. The italicised sentences in this section should make every reader take stock seriously as to what he believes concerning these old revival traditions. Drama, and emotionalism, twin factors of deviation, were the well-springs of these religious phenomena.

in Aberdeen; and, even after this experience, my soul was fired with indignation at the conduct of the men who scoffingly decried it, and would brand the servant of the Lord, because of his earnestness in seeking to bring souls to Christ. Precious would the fruit have been, if but these eleven had been truly turned to God, for unspeakably great is the salvation of one soul. But how different this result from the sanguine estimate of the year before, when Mr. Burns, as he pointed to hundreds before him, declared his persuasion that they were all true converts! Mr. Burns entered the place of meeting, looked down on the little group before him, crossed his arms on the book-board, bent his head on them, and wept. That most impressive scene I cannot forget. I learned a life-lesson then.”<sup>26</sup>

Not only in Scotland, but also in Ireland the waves of spurious emotionalism were fanned by orthodox men who ought to have been more judicious. Dr. Kennedy took the opportunity to check out the phenomena in Ireland, and can tell us:

“I went to Ireland during the great revival season.(1859). I went panting to find the best accounts that I had heard to be true. So ardently did I seek this, that I scarce think I could have endured the joy of not being disappointed. I had ample opportunity of examining the first results of the movement. I was present at a converts’ meeting. There was a desk for preaching practice at one side of the hall in which they were assembled. One after another mounted it, and delivered a discourse. I heard four of these, but in none of them was there any reference to the law, to the necessity of regeneration, to the Divine person or atoning blood of Christ, or to any of the Divine perfections but love. Vague declamation about the danger of unbelief, and the desirableness of peace and joy in believing, was all that they contained. I thought then, and I still think, that the themes ignored by those speakers could not be passed over in a true convert’s address; and I was not unprepared for the answer given, two years thereafter, by an Irish minister, to my question, when I asked, ‘What is now the result of the revival in your district?’ His reply was, ‘During that wonderful movement I laboured with all my strength, and at such a pitch of hope, that I thought none around me would remain unsaved; but, at this moment, I know no result besides the spread of Plymouthism, and a prevalent contempt for the stated means of grace, the last of those whom I regarded as converts having recently gone back to the world.’ ” <sup>27</sup>

This testimony concerning the Irish revivals of 1859 is backed up by one Rev. R.H. Carson, the godly, and eminently useful minister of Tobermore Baptist Church in Ulster. The Baptist Irish Society Chronicle for 1869 contains the following testimony to the church and its minister: “Tobermore is a name well known as the field of the late learned and beloved Dr Carson’s labours. Here the church, under the fostering care of Mr. (R.H.) Carson, is doing a good work for God’s glory, and the salvation of souls.” At this time, some ten years after the wave of revival had stormed through that province, Dr. Carson’s successor, the Rev. R. H. Carson, could write

---

<sup>26</sup> *ibid.* pp.112-113

<sup>27</sup> *ibid.* pp113-114.

to the Baptist Home Mission in London in this vein:

“The past year has been with us here one of great spiritual drought ... there may have been hindrances to success now that did not formerly exist. Indeed, I cannot but think that the comparatively small results of the past few years may be traced, at least for the most part, to what we all regarded at the time as a great spiritual movement, the Revival of 1859. As it now appears and so far as we here are concerned, that movement was anything but a blessing. Out of some 80 to 90 individuals at that time, scarcely one remains to us at this moment. And what is worse than their mere exclusion or withdrawal, their evil conduct, or their spiritual apathy while among us, did not fail to leave its mark behind. I have often wished they could have all been taken away in one day. They have been our Achan in the camp, and till we see the last of them, or nearly so, I scarcely venture to hope for success. As regards attendance at Public Worship, I am thankful to say that it never was better, never, indeed, perhaps so good. In this respect have I everything to encourage me.....”

Significantly records of membership for Tobermore Baptist Church during the period 1858 - 1869 speak volumes. Straddling the revival year (1859) at the beginning, membership was 176. Subsequent to the revival, which as Rev. Carson says, he along with the rest, “regarded at the time as a great spiritual movement”, membership leapt to 269. By 1865 it was down to 223, and in 1869 it was recorded at 213. It is evident that the “revival surge” was temporary.<sup>28</sup>

“I have seen so much of all this” concludes John Kennedy, “that I cannot but fear it. Where I expected a ‘wilderness’ to be changed into a ‘garden of the soul,’ *I have only seen a desert becoming more a waste than before.* (Emph. mine Ed.) Looking over the known results of revival movements in our country, I have the impression that, in connection with each of them, there was, to a greater or less extent, a genuine work of grace, but that this was not unfrequently covered out of sight by a superficial excitement which alone caught the eye of the public.”<sup>29</sup>

Out of the 1859 phenomenon in Ireland comes, too, the penetrating analysis of the whole movement by a Presbyterian minister who lived and moved through it all, the Rev. William Hamilton.<sup>30</sup> He wrote a 296 page study,<sup>31</sup> in which he shows “that it is a duty to examine this movement”, and that in this examination “the Scriptures are sufficient for that purpose”. Suffice it to say here that in this work Hamilton used Scripture as his “Archimedian point”, and not certain selected aspects of cer-

---

<sup>28</sup> The above data ref. Tobermore has been quoted from the article “*The Ulster Revival of 1859*” by Alfred Russell Scott, of the “Mid-Antrim Historical Group”, and was published in 1962 by the Irish Baptist Society’s Chronicle. Scott’s article appears to major on giving a fully up-beat eulogy on the revival, so his inclusion of this negative testimony is quite surprising. He considers other opinions to be “fairer than Mr. Carson’s individual assessment”. Notable however is how Carson’s view coincides with Kennedy and Kennedy’s Irish contact.

<sup>29</sup> “*Evangelism: A Reformed Debate*” p.114.

<sup>30</sup> Minister of Edenderry, County Tyrone for 34 years 1840 - 1874.

<sup>31</sup> “*An Enquiry into the Scriptural Character of the Revival of 1859*” publ. Alexander Mayne, Belfast 1866, reprinted 1993 by The Reformed Book Outlet, Hudsonville, Michigan USA.

---

tain selected phenomena in Church history. The results ratify John Kennedy's observations, and throw the 1859 revival into an extremely dubious position. Hamilton can tell us, from his wide, and varied, first hand observations of the 1859 revival, that "the apparent, indeed, the real design, in all the exercises is to produce excitement, as though excitement would produce conversion."<sup>32</sup> Hamilton contrasted the wild emotional maelstrom of 1859 with the quiet and solid true work of God's Spirit, in which "True religion never changes. It always has been, now is, and ever will be, one and the same, immutable as the eternal Jehovah, from whom it is derived. It cannot change. It is *obedience to His revealed will*- obedience at all times - obedience in all places - obedience under all circumstances - obedience in thought - obedience in word - obedience in act. It is to believe what he requires us to believe, and do what He requires us to do. Nothing more - nothing less."<sup>33</sup>

Contrary, therefore, to the popular position represented by ML-J, the testimony of responsible orthodox men of the past indicates that oratorical preaching and the hypnotic waves of emotion it generates are actually deleterious to the health of the churches. Kennedy not only provides us with an astute, first hand diagnosis of what was happening, but he also offers us his equally astute prognosis... "I am persuaded that the teacher would act a more Christ-like part who, in such circumstances, brought searching doctrine to bear on the impressed".<sup>34</sup> This sober prescription is a shaker, one knows how superficial converts react to doctrinal instruction.....they take offence...and as Kennedy reminds us, the final results will not "bulk so largely" but "the abiding fruit would be a more unmingled blessing."

Not only, however, on his analysis of the historic testimony of revivals, is ML-J to be found out of strict order. The good Doctor knew that if a doctrine, a belief, was to be finally established as truth, then the Word of God alone is the epistemic ground for establishing its validity. This in mind, after using Church history as his primary source, he then turns to Scripture to try and find support for a dogma that he has already committed himself to.

At this point, ML-J virtually admits defeat, initially, and then dodges round it. Dealing with objections to revivals, he notes that it is "alleged" that "nowhere in the New Testament are we taught to pray for revival."<sup>35</sup> Now far from this objection being a mere "allegation", it happens to be cast iron truth. ML-J must have felt the force of this argument, for instead of answering it, he dodged it. He says: "The New Testament Church was not exhorted to pray for revival because it was in the midst of a revival."<sup>36</sup> And of course, by implication, if you already have something, there is no need to be praying for it to be given you.

---

<sup>32</sup> Hamilton: Op. cit. p.160.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid. p.88.

<sup>34</sup> Kennedy: Op. Cit.. p.115.

<sup>35</sup> Lloyd Jones: Op cit. p.12.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. p.12.

But ML-J's answer here is just not good enough. He is implying, inadvertently, that the Holy Spirit really forgot something when He inspired the New Testament writers, that is, that on ML-J's "revival" principles, times would come in the generations of Christians to come, when the churches would backslide, and *need* to pray for revival. In that the Spirit inspired a mass of prophetic scriptures concerning the development of Christianity, why did He not also inspire the Apostles to warn about the necessity to pray for revival, which duty ML-J now believes to be incumbent on all generations subsequent to the Apostles? God intended the Scriptures to apply to all generations, did He not, not merely to the Apostolic? And is ML-J forgetting, that the New Testament is bristling with data about churches that quite clearly, had apostacised, and *in his terms* at least, needed revival? Did not the antics of the Corinthians indicate wholesale error and apostasy? And that in spite of their claims concerning charismata? Did not the doctrinal deviations over so vital a matter as Justification indicate a need for revival amongst the Galatians? And what about the proclivities of the Colossians for Gnosticism? And what about the Seven Churches of Asia in the Apocalypse? In any one of all these cases is there anywhere an instruction or command to seek "revival"? Why, in the manifestly apostate church at Thyatira, for instance, are the true saints therein not commanded to pray for revival, but rather to "hold fast till I come"? Why, at Pergamos, are they commanded to "Repent", instead of being commanded to pray for revival?

Indeed, if "revival" was Scriptural, and carried the "crucial importance" as ML-J portrayed in his 1976 paper on Jonathan Edwards, it is a wonder indeed that the same "crucial" weight is not given to it in the New Testament. More, it is a wonder that the subject is conspicuous by its absence from Holy Writ.

But ML-J insists on trying to find an exegetical basis for the dogma. A trawl through Scripture to find a few texts, at least, yields for him **Acts 3:19**'s "times of refreshing", which he espouses though acknowledging its exegesis in terms of revival is doubtful,<sup>37</sup> then he takes up **I Thess. 1 : 5**, where the apostle says "For our Gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance..." This latter text however is a testimony to the apostolic

---

<sup>37</sup> It certainly is doubtful! Every individual believer experiences "times of refreshing" on an individual basis. Sometimes whole congregations experience it. But "refreshing" bespeaks the effects of say, a cool drink on a hot day, or a "refreshing breeze" after a heat-wave. This is a far cry from the frenzied waves of emotion that cascaded over such congregations as that of Jonathan Edwards. But there is an exegetical point here which utterly vitiates any attempt to apply Acts 3:19 to "revivals". The verse begins by a command to "Repent, and be converted". There follows a promise contingent on the foregoing,.... "that your sins may be blotted out". This blotting out of sin is a promise to the repentant, and is a promise God faithfully fulfills. The next phrase of the verse, however, speaks of the "times of refreshing" as linked in the promise with the foregoing. Therefore, God, who always faithfully fulfills his promises, must always be sending His saints "refreshing" from time to time. Now in that "revivals" have been absent from our scene for 100 years now, then God has not made good His promise to the last three generations of Saints, if, as ML-J avers, "revival" is the "refreshing" referred to here. This factor also applies to myriad generations of Saints over the two millenia of Church history who never saw any "revivals". Did God never "refresh" them?

gifts that accompanied apostolic preaching...the gospel proclaimed was not “in word only”, but the miraculous powers of an apostle were present with the preaching. Gifts of tongues, healings, exorcisms, working of wonders, all ordained by God as powers to verify the apostles as His apostles, and that thereby they would operate the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. To take this text, as ML-J does, and apply it outside the apostolic charismata, and to make “not unto you in word only, but also in power” apply to the power of such as Whitefield’s dramatic oratory, is effectively to make oratorical power in the pulpit into a charismatic gift. Whitefield worked no miracles, as did St. Paul. Therefore this text cannot apply to Whitefield, as he was not an apostle. And it cannot apply to some category of “annointed oratory” because the apostle himself, who manifested the charismatic powers, denied that he himself was an orator, viz. :**1Co 2:4** *And my speech and my preaching [was] not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power:*

and :

**2Co 10:10** *For [his] letters, say they, [are] weighty and powerful; but [his] bodily presence [is] weak, and [his] speech contemptible.*

Also, it ought to be noted that, in the lists of charismata outlined in **1 Cor. 12: 7-11; 28; and Rom. 12: 6-8** “inspired dramatic oratory” of such as is alleged for Whitefield et al, is not once mentioned as a grace gift.

Eloquence is, true, mentioned with respect to Apollos in Acts 18:24, “an eloquent man”. This is about as far as the English New Testament gets in this direction, and the context rather majors on Apollos as being “mighty in the Scriptures” as being the special feature here. But the Greek original here is not “eloquent”. It is *ανηρ λογιος*, and according to the lexicographical evidence is better understood here as “man of learning” bearing in mind the context of v25.<sup>38</sup>

Evidently, St. Paul’s charismata did not include a Whitefield-like oratorical capability. But then, it is God who converts men, via the inward work of the Holy Ghost pressing home the truth spoken by the preacher. Does the Spirit need the techniques of the drama workshop in order to facilitate this mighty transaction?

Does the Spirit need fleshly, naturalistic techniques to propagate the New Birth? The teaching of the Scriptures will not support such notions. The teaching of the Scriptures will not supply us with a “Theology of Revivals”. Indeed, ML-J laments “If you examine the books on the Holy Spirit published during the past fifty years by men of all schools you will find they do not even mention revival at all”<sup>39</sup> This is significant, because if one was to write a lengthy tome or tomes on the Theology of the Holy Spirit entirely based on the Bible and nothing other than the Bible, you would get nothing about “revivals”. And thus ML-J has to go on and lament that the Puritans do not teach us anything about revivals, and that even the great John

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Colin Brown: *New International Dictionary of NT Theology*. Vol. 3 page 1117.

<sup>39</sup> Lloyd-Jones “Revival” in *The Puritans*: Op. cit p.7.

Owen in his two volumes on the Holy Spirit (Works Vols. 3 and 4, some 1270 pages) mentions nothing about revival.

ML-J tries to explain away this salient omission...even to the point of arguing that the English racial temperament might be partly to blame !!!!!<sup>40</sup> Worse, he even says here that another reason might be that the Puritans were too anxious that everything should be done “decently and in order” that he found it “very difficult at times to acquit them of the charge of quenching the Spirit” !!!!! <sup>41</sup> At this juncture we have to say that we find it very difficult to acquit ML-J of the charge of abrogating the apostolic injunction: **1Co 14:40** *Let all things be done decently and in order.*

And let the reader note, that St. Paul issued that instruction in the context of dealing with charismata and a situation replete with wonders as great as, if not greater than, any of the “glory-road” revivals that happened to be a naturalistic feature of post-Romanticised Western Evangelicalism from 1735 to the early 1900’s.

If this, then, is what it all comes down to, we are forced to conclude, therefore, that ML-J has confused highly developed dramatic oratory with the Apostolic charismata, and made it the God-given, God-annointed key to unleashing great “revivals”, the nature of which is not consonant with the characteristics of spiritual life as taught in Holy Scripture.

In his long ministry, for which we of the British Isles especially, must be eternally grateful to God, the good Doctor never saw the revival that he preached about, longed for, hoped for, worked for. Yet, under his ministry, thousands were blessed with the “times of refreshing” as of Acts. 3:19. ML-J’s ministry at Bethlehem Chapel, Sandfields, Aberavon 1927-38 was a fountainhead of “times of refreshing”, not only to his congregation there, but right across Wales. A large congregation was gathered, and a harvest of solid converts and edified Saints emerged year by year.....and today, the effects still resound, not only in South Wales, but in various regions the world over. Yea..... “times of refreshing”, times that have had more positive influence for good in the Churches than any effects of any “revivals”.

When ML-J entered the ministry of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists in 1927, it was but 22 years after the world-famed 1904-1905 Welsh revival, which had begun in a Calvinistic Methodist church not so far away from Aberavon, and had swept so “mightily” through that denomination that people all over the world were affected by the events. <sup>42</sup> Yet, at the time of Lloyd-Jones’ ordination, the number of

---

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* pp.10-11. A classic example of “special pleading.” The false implication carried by such a suggestion is shocking, and amounts to saying that the Holy Ghost is not able to produce great revivals in England because the national ethnic temperament of the English is an effective block on His influence, which He finds He cannot overcome! And all this, sadly from a Calvinist preacher!

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.* p.11. Of course, ML-J’s logic over “revival” drove him to this shocking conclusion.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Eifion Evans: “*The Welsh Revival of 1904*” Evangelical Press 1969 and ch.9 where he outlines



Evangelical ministers among the Calvinistic Methodists was deplorably small, I have been given figures of but one dozen only (out of 1200 ministers). ML-J faced an enormous, up-hill battle in his own denomination, and one asks, what about the fruits of the revival? Why were the Calvinistic Methodists so overtaken by Modernist Theology so soon after the “revival”? Why was there apostasy and disaffection on all sides? In fact, why were their churches worse after the “revival” than before?

Now contrast the failure of the 1904 “revival” with the “times of refreshing” that spread from ML-J’s ministry at Sandfields. Mrs Lloyd-Jones was able to write a small book (*Memories of Sandfields: Publ. Banner of Truth 1982*) in which she could exult in the memories of those “times of refreshing”. She could tell us how the Gospel reached into the Welsh working classes, and bore fruit abundantly, even amongst some of the most hardened cases.

From those glorious days of ML-J’s ministry in South Wales, the Evangelical and Calvinistic standards were raised again in the Principality. Solid Biblical ministry produced solid Christian converts and edified Saints. As the years unfolded, they multiplied, many entered the ministry of their denomination, Christian Unions blossomed in the Welsh Universities, and dead churches were brought back to life after a generation and more of apostate modernist ministry. The effects were not like that of the 1904 “revival”, here today, and gone tomorrow. That “revival” had tens of thousands of “converts” who sprang up, each like Jonah’s gourd, only to wither to a frazzle in the hot sun of life’s day. So different to the results of ML-J’s ministry at Sandfields, the leaven of which was to go on working, and does until this day, in the lives of thousands of God’s people world wide.

But looking and hoping for “revival”, vitiated his Calvinism, for he evidently came to regard “revival” as of such “crucial” importance, that he was led away from the anti-Arminian deliberations of the Synod of Dordt, began to value “revival” as more important than the maintainence of Biblical Orthodoxy, and thus opened his mind and vision to accommodate Arminians. Then, ultimately, as the years rolled on, and no “revival” ever came, he opened somewhat to the Charismatic error which had grown up naturally from the last deleterious storm of enthusiasm that had swept his home country, evidently thinking that there the true “revival” was nascent.

the scope of these effects. And from all over Europe people came across to Wales to witness the super-charged meetings for themselves. Apparently the French Government made an official investigation via their Public Health Department (Yes! the *French* Government!), and gave the “revival” a “sympathetic” and “objective” assessment. Evans makes wide claims for the fruits of this revival, claims which clash head-on with the facts as in Wales itself, the very “seat” of the revival fires. Notable, however, in Evans’ observations, and telling, too, is his reference to one who was to become a world-leader of Pentecostalism, namely, T.B. Barrett of Norway, as having connections with Evan Roberts, the Welsh Revivalist. Another who was to become a Pentecostal leading light was the Rev. Alexander Boddy of Sunderland, who spent quite some time down in South Wales on the Revival scene. Thus the Welsh Revival of 1904-5 set the scene for the emergent Pentecostal movement in Britain and abroad, with some of the more extreme developments of it beginning post-revival in South Wales. In fact, “Toronto” was being “out-Torontoed” in South Wales 90 years ago! “Nothing new under the sun” as Solomon said.