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SUMMARY

This thesis seeks to examine D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ view of Evangelical Unity. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ 1966 address at the British Evangelical Assembly was misunderstood and still is today and he was blamed by some people for dividing British Evangelicals at that time. This research starts from the point of blame, arguing that that is not sufficient understanding of his view for the correct interpretation and that the issue was not simple.

This thesis seeks to address what Martyn Lloyd-Jones said at the Assembly along with his view of Christian unity, through the analysis of his writings related to the topic in the 1950’s and 60’s and some of the early 1970’s. It is an attempt to help understand his view on the topic more precisely. This thesis examines whether D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ view is his own and proposes that his view is based on the Protestant Reformation evangelical position.

Martyn Lloyd-Jones asked all British Evangelicals which is the proper way when considering Christian unity, ecumenical or evangelical. And he appealed for unity to follow the evangelical way as they are evangelicals, not the ecumenical way. For the sake of Evangelical Unity, D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones initially asked What is a Christian? and he also defined the Church as the assembly of Christians, emphasising ‘the evangelical Christian’ What is an Evangelical?

By doing so, Martyn Lloyd-Jones took on the role of the representative of Protestant Evangelicalism. At that time many British Evangelicals seemed to regret the Protestant Reformation, regarding as a tragedy. Lloyd-Jones could not agree with the tendency and he took on the role of keeping Evangelicalism from the Roman Catholicism and he also aimed to prevent British Evangelicals from being united by the Liberals in the name of the Ecumenical Movement.

The movement did not ask the definition of a Christian clearly but D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones asked What is a Christian? To him, the question was vitally important because it is the matter of one’s salvation. He claimed the essentials of faith exclusively as the doctrines are also essential to salvation. So, as his wife said, this thesis also proposes Lloyd-Jones as an Evangelist, who cares one’s salvation primarily, is a key to understanding his 1966 address and the view of Evangelical Unity.

‘No one will ever understand my husband until they realise that he is first of all a man of Prayer and then an evangelist’ - Bethan Lloyd-Jones
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1. INTRODUCTION

Research Questions

This is an ecclesiastical study on Christian unity, a part of systematic Theology. It is also a church historical study to explore a British church-historical event, which occurred at the second National Assembly of Evangelicals on 18th of October in 1966.

At the assembly, an address was given by a British evangelical leader, David Martyn Lloyd-Jones (1899-1981), one of the famous preachers of the last century. The address was Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ view of church unity.

However, when the opening address was finished, the chairman stood up to oppose Lloyd-Jones. The chairman was another famous evangelical leader, John Stott (1921-2011). He was a minister of the Church of England. This became quite an issue. The schedule of the assembly did not go as it had been planned and there were no fruitful discussions at all on the matter. To make matters worse, the mass media was misleading, providing incorrect information of the event. For example, they reported ‘Martyn Lloyd-Jones appealed [to people] to leave their denomination and tried to make one big denomination or church’.

However, those interpretations failed to point out the spiritual situation at that time. The media did not consider why Lloyd-Jones saw the situation so seriously and made the appeal, and they just made article titles with quick and superficial judgements, which contributed to people misunderstanding Lloyd-Jones’ position.

In contrast, Iain H. Murray provides a number of contextual resources: Fight of Faith, the 2nd volume of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ biography, Evangelicalism Divided, Messenger of Grace and the recent one-volume Lloyd-Jones’ biography The Life of Martyn Lloyd-Jones (2013).

My research is to investigate what the contents of the address were and Martyn-Lloyd’s understandings of Christian unity. The following questions will be answered: what was the main point of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ address ‘An Appeal: Evangelical Unity’; why the message had to be given to the Evangelical meeting, at the

---

1 Iain H. Murray, Evangelicalism Divided: A Record of Crucial in the Years 1950 to 2000 (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2000), 47,48; Iain Murray, The Fight of Faith 1939-1981 (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1990), 526-28; John Peters also, dealing with the topic in chapter 4, points out this: “Entrenched positions were adopted, myths circulated widely, and unnecessarily harsh opinions were delivered. One such myth (a politer word would be ‘misnomer’) was that his views were primarily anti-Anglican. This was not true.” John Peters, Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Preacher (Milton Keynes: The Paternoster Press, 1986).


second National Assembly of Evangelicals, at that time; and what the characteristics of Christian unity are. Through these questions, an understanding of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ view of evangelical unity can be gained.

**Significance / Purpose of Study**

More than 50 years has passed since Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ address was given to the British Evangelicals in 1966. However, this is still a worthy topic to research because its argument is still going on. It shows that this topic is quite controversial and it needs to be explained more clearly. With his address, Martin-Lloyd’s address was misunderstood at the time and still is today.\(^4\) So here is an attempt to help understand his view on the topic more precisely.

Another reason for the study is the significance of the topic. This research aims at presenting a good theological understanding for the current church. Every Christian church member should have a clear definition of the church and a definition of what it means to be a Christian. It would also be helpful to review the related historical events in looking for those answers.

**Research Methods**

Citing the studies by Murray, as mentioned above, this is a new research on the ecclesiastic view of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ address of 1966. This will be a summary of his doctrines on the topic, written mostly in support of his thought. The result will be much closer to Iain H. Murray than to John F. Brencher or Alister E. McGrath, but a new approach will be applied and some evaluation will be added.

It will be a different study because it is mainly focusing on using his own writings in describing Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ doctrines and understanding his concerns within the historical context. The topic will be approached in two ways: systematically, to grasp his ecclesiastic view, and historically, to understand his concerns within the context.

It is a study aiming to understand Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ ecclesiastic view, specifically of Christian unity, with his evaluation of the ecumenical movement at that time.

**Limitations**

This research is related to the controversial address by D Martyn Lloyd-Jones, focusing on his main point and exploring his reasoning in the evangelical atmosphere of the time.

The questions will be answered by analysing his address of 1966 first and related sermons and lectures given in the 1950–60s, will also be analysed and described.

However, this research does not cover the view of the Church of England on the issue, including John Stott and James Packer’s views, respecting one of their reasons for not leaving their denomination. This was

to continue the role of evangelicals within the denomination, hoping the Church of England, which has the Protestant tradition, would be reformed and become more evangelical. However, in spite of the good intention and their huge endeavours, in practice the task seemed quite difficult. It seemed they found themselves constantly remaining with the initial intention, with little or no progress. Eventually in 1979, Packer left for Canada.

This study does not deal with Stott’s position, role and policy in the Church of England. Iain Murray specifically discussed this matter in his many related books such as *Evangelicalism Divided* (2000), from the Nonconformists’ view. From the Anglican angle, Andrew Atherstone dealt with it in *Engaging with Martyn Lloyd-Jones* (2011).

This study does not cover Packer’s position, either. James I. Packer (1926- ) was one of the representatives of reformed theology among the British evangelicals at that time. Notably, when he wrote books such as *Fundamentalism and the Word* (1957) and *Evangelism and the Sovereignty of God* (1961), Packer was faithful to maintain the essential doctrines of evangelical faith. He opposed his denomination’s tendency to regard the fundamental evangelical doctrines as less important in solidarity with the ecumenical movement.5

However, his theological position changed to reflect the majority of his denomination in the mid-60s.6 Pre-1965, Packer had a similar doctrinal position to Martyn Lloyd-Jones. The same thing happened to J. Stott in the middle of 1950s.7 Since then and in the 1960s, John Stott influenced the evangelical Anglicans, supporting the ecumenical movement as a leader. In 1967, as I. Murray points out, J. Stott expressed regret for the narrow-minded attitude that evangelicals had shown previously to those outside of his group.8 However, those matters cannot be dealt with in this research.

6 Iain Murray, 88.
8 Iain Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, 42.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The first compilation of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ life and thoughts, Chosen by God, was contributed to by sixteen people including James Packer, John Stott, Phillip Hughes, Elwyn Davies and Hywel Jones, edited by Christopher Catherwood, and published in 1986. Another collection of D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ thoughts published in 2011 was Engaging with Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The life and legacy of ‘the Doctor.’ Eleven scholars, including David Bebbington, Philip Eveson, Andrew Atherstone and David Ceri Jones, contributed to this recent compilation.9


Relating to this topic, Andrew Atherstone’s writing has some value because it provides the conformist’s view. It shows the policy of the Church of England to the ecumenical movement and the response to Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ address. In particular, it describes both reactions of evangelicals within the denomination after the National Assembly of Evangelicals of 1966: the people10 in the mainstream who consented to the denominational policy and the people11 who agreed with the main idea of Lloyd-Jones address. The former stuck to their denominational position and the latter acted according to their beliefs.12

A. Atherstone and D. Ceri Jones, as the editors of the book Engaging with Martyn Lloyd-Jones, provide the history of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ studies including his biographies, in the introduction chapter. They introduce Iain Murray and Christopher Catherwood as the representing biographers of Martyn Lloyd-Jones; John Brencher’s thesis as the first official critique on D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones; and Alister McGrath as J. I. Packer’s biographer13, and a supporter of John Brencher. Atherstone and Ceri Jones add that the more severe critique on Lloyd-Jones’ ecclesiastic view in relation to the event of 1966 was made by Carl R. Trueman.

---

9 Andrew Atherstone and David Ceri Jones (eds.).
12 Andrew Atherstone points out: “The Testimony of these Anglican evangelical seceders of the 1960s and early 1970s has been largely airbrushed from the history books, resulting in a skewed and simplistic picture of exclusivist independent versus ecumenical Anglicans”(Italics, researcher’s). Relating to this point, A. Atherstone provides a number of sources. See Appendix. Atherstone concluded: “In fact, as has been shown, Lloyd-Jones’s heartfelt appeals for evangelical unity in the face of ecumenical confusion had a stronger groundswell of support within the Church of England than has previously been recognised. Lloyd-Jones’s teaching had a significant impact on intra-Anglican debates concerning evangelical identity. It was for this very reason that his public pronouncements generated such passionate reactions among Anglican evangelicals, as they continue to do more than generation later.” in ‘Lloyd-Jones and the Anglican secession crisis’ (2011), in Atherstone and Ceri Jones (eds.), 292.
Atherstone’s presenting outline of the studies on D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, with evaluations both agreeing and disagreeing with Lloyd-Jones’ thoughts, is useful to grasp the research history on the topic and it is also helpful to this research.\footnote{Andrew Atherstone and David Ceri Jones, ‘Introduction: Lloyd-Jones and his biographers’, in Atherstone and Ceri Jones (ed.), 11-37.}

Another useful insight is found in the compilation book \textit{Engaging with Martyn Lloyd-Jones}. John Maiden presents one of the reasons that Lloyd-Jones opposed the ecumenical movement, which was the relationship of the movement with Roman Catholicism. J. Maiden sees that Lloyd-Jones did not emphasise Roman Catholicism as a warning object in the 1950s as much as he did in the 1960s. Maiden explains Martyn Lloyd-Jones saw the tendency of the ecumenical movement to become closer to the Roman Catholic Church in pursuit of one great world-church, minimising the theological differences between Evangelicalism and Roman Catholicism.\footnote{John Maiden, ‘Lloyd-Jones and Roman Catholicism’, in Atherstone and Ceri Jones (eds.), 232-60.} By doing so, John Maiden provides a key for understanding Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ emphases in the 1960s, including his address of 1966.

In the same book, John Coffey researches Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ relationship with the heritage of the Protestant Reformation.\footnote{John Coffey, ‘Lloyd-Jones and the Protestant Past’, in Atherstone and Ceri Jones (eds.), 293-325.} Coffey especially deals with Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ understandings of Puritanism by contrasting with others: J. I. Packer, R. T. Kendall and C. R. Trueman. Coffey tries to reveal that Lloyd-Jones’ understandings on the core value of Puritanism is different from Packer’s. Coffey insists that Lloyd-Jones understood the Puritans in the light of an ecclesiastical perspective. He also insists both the Puritans, whom Lloyd-Jones often mentioned, and the Puritan books published by Banner of Truth, are theologically limited, Calvinistic evangelicalism. In other words, Coffey says that the approach of Lloyd-Jones is not wholly the way of Puritanism, which shows that Martyn Lloyd-Jones was faithful to the Protestant Reformed tradition. It can be another key for understanding Lloyd-Jones and his address, as it would be easier for people who have the same theological position as Lloyd-Jones to understand the topic well.

After A. Atherstone’s (2011) book was published, the new I. Murray’s (2013) and C. Catherwood’s (2015) were published.\footnote{Christopher Catherwood, \textit{Martyn Lloyd-Jones: The Life and Relevance for the 21st Century} (Nottingham: IVP, 2015); Iain H. Murray, \textit{the Life of Martyn Lloyd-Jones} (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 2013).} These two authors also continued to discuss the topic.

Jones, the editor of the book. These books are related to the topic and helpful to understand Martyn Lloyd-Jones and they are in support of his thoughts.

When the magazine *Fountains* edited by Eryl Davies, was published, it was 30 years after the historic event. Another 20 years has passed since then. In that time many more books have been published on the topic. The following books are all considerably related to the topic and regarded as significant for this study: John Brencher published a vastly critical biography on Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Martyn Lloyd-Jones and Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism* in 2002. Iain H. Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided* in 2000, *Messenger of Grace* in 2008, *The Life of Martyn Lloyd-Jones* in 2013, and Christopher Catherwood’s books, *Church History* in 2007 and *Martyn Lloyd-Jones: His Life and Relevance for the 21st Century* in 2015. A collection of topical writings on Martyn Lloyd-Jones published in 2011, edited by Andrew Atherstone and David Ceri Jones: *Engage with Martyn Lloyd-Jones: the Life and Legacy of ‘the Doctor’*, can be compared to another collection, *Chosen by God* (ed. C. Catherwood, 1986).

---


3. CONTEXTUAL REVIEW

The event of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ 1966 address is related to the evangelical context of the time. Specifically, the Ecumenical Movement led by the World Council of Churches (WCC) was advancing in the context of the 1960s. Lloyd-Jones’ address was held at the National Assembly of Evangelicals and the Assembly was organised by the Evangelical Alliance, which was founded in 1846.

In Britain, there had been unity between Evangelicals which was one of fellowship and belief: the Evangelicals of the Protestant denominations and the ‘Evangelical party’ of the Church of England until the middle of the last century.

In 1954 the London Billy Graham Crusade, organised by the Evangelical Alliance, with 38,000 people who made decisions, gave a deep impact to evangelicals. For this matter, many evangelicals, including the Evangelical Anglicans, showed their favour. However, this positive attitude not only for Graham Evangelism but also for the Ecumenical Movement, caused division among the British Evangelicals. In particular, the Evangelical party of the Church of England, tended to welcome and support the movement. This led to tension among British Evangelicals. Especially, the Church of England tended to welcome and

---

22 “…August 1948, in Amsterdam, that the World Council of Churches was officially founded. 147 churches from different confessions and many countries came together to commit themselves to the ecumenical movement.” [https://www.oikoumene.org/en/about-us/organizational-structure/assembly/since-1948](https://www.oikoumene.org/en/about-us/organizational-structure/assembly/since-1948)

23 Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 2.

24 „EVANGELION (that we call the gospel) is a Greek word; and signifieth good, merry, glad and joyful tiding, that maketh a man’s heart glad, and maketh him sing, dance and leap for joy.” Tyndale, [Doctrinal Treatises](Cambridge: Parker Sociey, 1848), 8 cited in Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 1.

Iain Murray gives more information of the term, *evangelical*: “So William Tyndale wrote in 1525, and at the same period all who so thought became described as ‘gospeller’ or, less commonly, as ‘evangelicals’. Over two hundred years later it was the latter term that was to pass into more permanent usage at the time of the ‘Evangelical Revival’. That it did not do so earlier is largely due to the fact that all the churches of the Reformation were ‘of the gospel’ in their creeds and confessions. By the eighteenth century, however, while the profession of the national churches in England and Scotland remained orthodox there were many pulpits from which no gospel was heard and when the evangel was rediscovered a term was necessary to distinguish its preachers from others: they were the *evangelicals.*” Ibid, 1.


25 Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 40.


27 “Yet there is no doubt that from the mid-1950s the connection between the two (Billy Graham and the evangelical Anglicans, researcher’s parenthesis) became very close. At that time John Stott had acted as an ‘informal pastor to the team’ and a warm friendship had developed between him and Graham” Dudley-Smith, John Stott, 297 cited in Ibid.

28 “In retrospect it looks as if the Conservative Evangelical movement in Britain crossed the ecumenical watershed at Dr Billy Graham’s Crusade at Harringay in 1954.” John Lawrence, Hard Facts of Unity (London: SCM, 1961), 68 cited in Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 43. I. Murray says, “D. M. Martyn Lloyd-Jones was of the same opinion (Knowing the Times, 310)”.
support the movement and the Evangelical party was not exceptional in this matter. Due to the attitude of
the movement, there was tension among British Evangelicals.

Historically, the Church of England separated itself from the Roman Catholic Church, particularly in the
sixteenth century at the time of the Protestant Reformation led by Martin Luther in Germany from 1517. It
maintained its reformed theology, keeping Thirty-Nine Articles and its own confession of faith.\textsuperscript{29}

However, in the middle of the twentieth century, the evangelical\textsuperscript{30} Anglican position changed. It was not
the same as at the time of Reformation, nor as at the early part of the twentieth century. They started to show
high regard for the WCC movement and consented to the policy of the movement.\textsuperscript{31}

There was tension between the two evangelical groups on the understanding of unity. The ecumenical
movement regarded the existence of many denominations in the church as an offense to the Lord's will
according to the Scripture John 17:21. However, the other group considered the pursuing of one church by
the ecumenical movement as, diminishing any theological differences in denominations without determining
the Christian beliefs clearly.\textsuperscript{32} This group asked what Christian unity is according to the Gospel of John 17,
what makes unity and to whom the Lord’s commandment was given. The division between the British
evangelicals and the ecumenical movement can be summed up as: Christian unity – ecumenical or
evangelical? At that time, British evangelicalism was divided by the ecumenical movement. The dividing
question can be described like this: Christian unity: ecumenical or evangelical?

\textsuperscript{29} A reformed Church “In the reign of Henry's son Edward VI the Church of England underwent further reformation,
driven by the conviction that the theology being developed by the theologians of the Protestant Reformation was more
faithful to the teaching of the Bible and the Early Church than the teaching of those who continued to support the
Pope. ...The religious settlement that eventually emerged in the reign of Elizabeth gave the Church of England the
distinctive identity that it has retained to this day.” https://www.churchofengland.org/about-us/history/detailed-
history.aspx

\textsuperscript{30} A comprehensive Church “The history of the Church of England from the 18th century onwards has been enriched by
the co-existence within it of three broad traditions, the Evangelical, the Catholic and the Liberal.”
https://www.churchofengland.org/about-us/history/detailed-history.aspx Former an Anglican priest and now a Catholic
priest Fr. Dwight Longenecker gives more explanation of the co-existence: “There are three wings of the church:
Liberal, Evangelical and Anglo Catholic. The Liberals go for the whole secular agenda. The Evangelicals are Protestant.
The Anglo Catholics are more Catholic in practice and theology. These three groups have three very basic belief
systems. Within these three groups there are sub groups: Liberal Evangelicals and Liberal Anglo Catholics,
Conservative Evangelicals and Conservative Anglo Catholics. ...... The conservative Evangelicals follow a Protestant,
Bible-only theology. ...... The conservatives believe the Church is founded by Jesus Christ on Divine Revelation and
the truths of the faith cannot be changed or adapted because of pressures or trends in society. Indeed, the church, they
believe, is there not to conform to the world, but to challenge the society in which it finds itself—even if that means they
are unpopular and misunderstood. Liberals believe the church and Christian beliefs are the result of certain societal and
 cultural conditions and therefore the church has a duty to adapt and change the message and the method in order
to listen to and reach out to the society in which it lives. The divisions in the Church of England are historical and deep.
The Church is held together by a shared national loyalty and a sense of practicality in mission. There is no real doctrinal
unity or unity of form of worship, but there is a shared sense of tradition, English customs and a willingness to tolerate
another one and “muddle through” which keeps a tenuous truce in place.” “Understanding the Crisis in the Church of
england.html

\textsuperscript{31} Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 42,43.

\textsuperscript{32} “This brief description of our objective leaves many questions unanswered. We are not yet of a common mind on the
interpretation and the means of achieving the goal we have described.” ‘New Delhi Statement on Unity’ (WCC 3rd
statement-on-unity.
D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ address was delivered within the context of the 2nd National Assembly of Evangelicals in 1966 when John Stott, a minister of the Church of England, was Chairman. It seems a collision between the two groups was expected. Though there were many denominational groups, the Church of England group was in the majority.
4. MARTYN LLOYD-JONES’ VIEW OF EVANGELICAL UNITY

Iain Murray provides some background to the Second Assembly in connection to the previous one. He shows the Commission of the Evangelical Alliance acknowledged that there existed different views of church unity among evangelicals and that the Alliance leaders also knew Lloyd-Jones’ view.

The main thing before the Assembly was known to be the question of Christian unity and, particularly, the finding of the Commission set up after the First Assembly [1965].

As the leader of the Alliance were both familiar with this finding and with Dr. Lloyd-Jones’ differing views (which they had heard in private), it may seem surprising that he should have been asked to restate his position as the main speaker at the Rally which marked the Assembly’s opening. They obviously thought that it would be good to bring into the open a difference of opinion within the evangelical world which had been known about for some years.

The chairman … Stott also knew the general nature of what ML-J would say, having had a personal conversation with him on the subject at the International Congress of Christian Physicians on Oxford that summer. Stott was scheduled to take ten minutes before the main speaker on order to state his own, i.e. the evangelical Anglican, point of view on unity so that the meeting would clearly understand that ML-J was not speaking for all evangelicals.

So it seems to be important to know the atmosphere of that night before Lloyd-Jones’ address.

Analysis of the 1966 message

Martyn Lloyd-Jones starts his address by stating the reason for this assembly and that the message is not new having previously been presented to the members of the Commission at the 2nd National Assembly of Evangelicals.

My subject is church unity, and I am speaking on this at the request of the Commission to which reference has been made. I think that is important, lest anybody should think that I am taking advantage of the kindness and generosity of the authorities in inviting me to speak here tonight, to foist my own views upon you. I had the privilege of being called as a witness to appear before this Commission and I made a statement of my attitude with regard to these matters. It was the

---

33 Report of the Commission on Church Unity to the National Assembly of Evangelicals, The Evangelical Alliance, 1966, p. 10: “There is no widespread demand at the present time for the setting up of a united evangelical Church on denominational lines . . . This does not mean that there could not be a effective fellowship or federation of evangelical churches at both the local and national level.” cited in Iain Murray, The Fight of Faith, 522.

34 Unity in Diversity, ten papers given at the Assembly in 1966’ Iain Murray, Ibid. Murray stated, “…and there was probably the expectation that a public airing of ML-J’s views would show that they had comparatively little support and thus reduce pressure action according to those views.” Ibid, 523.

35 Ibid.
members of the Commission themselves who asked me to state in public here tonight what I am now proposing to say to you. So it is really their responsibility. They have already heard it, and they asked me to repeat it to you.36

He calls attention to the subject he is addressing as vitally important and most urgent.

I am very glad indeed of the opportunity because I believe we are considering tonight what is incomparably the most important question that Christian people can be considering and facing at this present time.37

He proceeds by addressing the vitally important subject of the church: its nature and unity. “The question of the church is always important. Look at the prominence given to the doctrine of the church in the New Testament itself.”38 And it is a most urgent subject because it is the condition of the church, including the position of the world and of the UK at this time. “We do not seem to count as the church once counted in this country.”39

Lloyd-Jones calls attention to the fact that “the word ‘evangelical’ is a limiting term”40, which will be dealt with in a later section, and he reminds them how the Evangelical Alliance was started. When some evangelicals such as John Henry Newman saw the trend to Rome as a danger sign, they came together in 1846. In the same way, Lloyd-Jones sees the ecumenical movement as a serious new situation for evangelicals to face in this time. However, Lloyd-Jones sees this new situation more seriously than ever since the Protestant Reformation41:

Since then, in spite of changes and movements here and there, the position has remained more or less static, but it is so no longer. Something entirely new has come among us, affecting all the major denominations throughout the world. These denominations are telling us plainly and openly that they are prepared to reconsider their whole position. They are prepared to throw everything into the melting pot, in order that a new world church might come out of it. This is a great fact which we have got to face. Denominational leaders…feel that the divisions of Christendom are a scandal, that a divided church is an offense to God, and that it is the divisions of the church that account for her weakness and her ineffectiveness. Therefore, they

37 Ibid.
38 Ibid, 247.
39 Ibid.
40 Ibid.
41 See his address: Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘Remembering the Reformation’(April 1960), in *Knowing the Times*, 93,98,99. In “Lloyd-Jones and the Protestant Past”, J. Coffey says, “…he gave lectures to mark the quatercentenary of the Scottish Reformation (1960), the tercentenary of the Great Ejection (1962), the four hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Luther’s Reformation (1967), and the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Pilgrim Fathers (1970). He was inclined to discern ‘a very close parallel’ between these momentous historical turning points and the crisis of the 1960s. The modern church, he declared, was confronted by ‘the very same problems’ as Christians on the eve of the Reformation.” in Atherstone and Ceri Jones (eds.), 304.
say, we must become one, and promote the idea of one great world church.\(^{42}\)

Lloyd-Jones sees a change including the new attitude to the Roman Catholic Church.

*In addition to all this there is the new attitude towards Rome. A change, a profound change, has taken place in the attitude of Protestants towards the Roman Catholic Church. The situation is indeed so novel that I am afraid that many of us as evangelicals do not yet quite realise it and are not aware of what is happening.\(^{43}\) ... On top of all this, this position is moving and changing very rapidly.\(^ {44}\)*

Then, he charges evangelicals with some negative attitudes. The first charge is its passive attitude to church unity and division with each other.

*Everybody seems to be talking about church unity except evangelicals. Surely, with our view of Scripture and with our knowledge and understanding of it, we, of all people, ought to be the first to preach the vital necessity of church unity; but we are the last to do so. Not only that, the position is that we are confused and divided among ourselves. There are statistics in the Report which will show you what I mean. Perhaps this very meeting in which we are gathered is already showing it. ... The most pathetic thing of all, to me, is that our attitude towards the question of church union is always a negative one. ... We are always negative; ... always on the defensive; ... always bringing up objections and difficulties. ... The impression is given that evangelicals are more concerned to maintain the integrity of their different denominations than anybody else in those denominations.\(^ {45}\)*

The second charge is silence. Evangelicals remain silent when they should protest. “Our silence is very nearly becoming a criminal silence. ... because we, as evangelicals, are divided ... scattered about in the various major denominations. We are small groups in these, and therefore we are weak and ineffective.”\(^ {46}\)

Again this charge has a correlation with the division among evangelicals.

The next charge, and Lloyd-Jones sees it as very important, is that evangelicals have never met to discuss the doctrine of the church other than in terms of movements.

*I have been associated with evangelical activities and movements for nearly thirty years here in London, and I have noticed throughout those years that we could never get a discussion on the doctrine of the nature of the church. Why not? Because we have always been happy to act in terms of these movements, and the authorities in the movements have always pointed out, you cannot do that, you will offend this person or that in other words, if you discuss the doctrine of*
the church you would cause division. The result has been that, so often, we have neglected the
document of the church altogether. … we have faced our problems in terms of movements and
societies, instead of facing them on the church level.47

However, Lloyd-Jones goes beyond these charges. His message goes towards something positive. He
suggests taking these negative points with the ecumenical movement as ‘an opportunity’ for evangelicals to
be renewed.

Is it not about time that we realised that we are confronted by a new situation, that we have a
most remarkable opportunity right before us, if we could but see it? I want to make an appeal to
you this evening. I have not come here to debate; my friends here know that I am not opposed to
debating, but I have not come here to debate ... I regard the position as too serious, too urgent. I
believe that evangelical people have got an opportunity today such as they have never had and, I
fear that we may never have it again. That is why I say we have met together at a most critical
moment.48

Lloyd-Jones suggests there are two major questions evangelicals need to consider. The first is “Are we
content, as evangelicals, to go on being nothing but an evangelical wing of a church? Without a question, the
whole tendency at the moment is towards a territorial, comprehensive, national church. That is the view
taken by many evangelicals as well as others.”49

Lloyd-Jones sees this as serious because establishing such a church means, in reality, sacrificing
evangelical peculiarities. He sees the one great world church proposed by the ecumenical movement would
include the Roman Catholic Church.

To remain in a church in which there are many who may hold views on the Bible which we
deplore, view on the very being of God in some cases – you have heard of ‘the death of God’
movement. These things are happening in the Christian church. Are we content with just being
an evangelical wing in a territorial church that will eventually include, and must, if it is to be a
truly national and ecumenical church, the Roman Catholic Church? There will be certain
modifications, of course.50

Lloyd-Jones points out the tendency of the movement is towards denying Protestant Reformation. The
movement basically has a presupposition that there are no doctrinal differences between Protestant
evangelicalism and Roman Catholicism. Lloyd-Jones believes the differences still exist between them. That
is why he poses this question.

47 Ibid.
48 Ibid, 250.
49 Ibid, 251.
50 Ibid.
The following question, as a result, is a suggestion. Lloyd-Jones mentions that people in the ecumenical movement make every effort to achieve their goal. For the one great world-church\(^{51}\), they are very ready to throw everything into the melting pot of amalgamation. Lloyd-Jones asks evangelicals to start anew facing the challenge\(^{52}\): ecumenical unity, not evangelical unity. He challenges evangelicals to ‘start from the New Testament’ rather than the current situation. He emphasises going back to the church which is described in the New Testament and highlights that it was evangelical in nature.

Are we content to start with the situation as it is and try to modify it and improve it as best we can or are we prepared to accept the challenge of the ecumenical movement and the times in which we live and say, Let’s start afresh. Let’s go back to the New Testament? These other people are saying that. They are prepared to put everything in the melting pot. Let us say, then, Let’s start afresh, not merely modify what is already in existence, but start afresh and anew, and discover what the New Testament church is really meant to be.\(^{53}\)

Then he asks about the doctrine of the church: what is the Christian church? Lloyd-Jones emphasises that we need to have a clear answer before discussing church unity and he points out the ecumenical people put fellowship before doctrine unlike what Acts 2:42 shows: “We are evangelicals; we put ‘doctrine before fellowship’. ... what we read in Acts 2:42 is that they continued steadfastly in apostles doctrine [or teaching] and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. This is of the very essence of the church.”

And he also mentions the Protestant definition of the church. “The famous Protestant definition of the church is that it is a place ‘where the true doctrine is preached, where the sacraments are properly and regularly administered, and where discipline is exercised’. Surely, as evangelicals, we do not want to go back on that.”

Then, he asks what this true doctrine is.

Reference has been made to it already: our view of the Scripture as the infallible Word of God; our assertion of the unique deity of the Lord Jesus Christ – yes, His virgin birth; the miraculous and supernatural; His atoning, sacrificial, substitutionary death; His literal, physical resurrection; the person of the Holy Spirit and His work. These are the doctrines which are essential to salvation; there is the truth that is to be preached, the message which is the first of the true mark of the church.\(^{54}\)

And Lloyd-Jones states that the church is not a building or institution but a gathering of people.

A church, surely, is a gathering of people who are in covenant together because they believe these things. Not only do they believe them, but they are men and women who have experienced

\(^{51}\) “They are prepared to throw everything into the melting pot, in order that a new world church might come out of it.” Ibid, 248 (Italics is researcher’s).
\(^{53}\) Ibid, 251.
\(^{54}\) Ibid, 252.
their power. They are men and women who are born again and born of the Spirit, and who give
evidence of this in their daily life. Surely, that is the evangelical view of the Christian church. ... 
A church consists of saints. That is the New Testament view: the ‘saints’ who are at Rome, the
‘saints’ who are at Corinth, and so on.55

Martyn Lloyd-Jones urges evangelicals to return to the New Testament church and he expresses a desire
for more such churches in modern times.

We must come back and realise that this is our basic view of the Christian church, and that what
we need, above everything else at the present time, is a number of such churches, all in
fellowship together, working together for the same ends and objects. They are one already in
their views, in faith, in their ideas and they must not, as our general secretary so excellently put
it, divided upon secondary, subsidiary, and non-essential matters.56

Lloyd-Jones gives a definition of schism. First of all, he points out what is not schism: to leave a church
which has become apostate. “Of course, the Roman Catholic Church would charge us all as being in schism
because we are Protestants, but to leave a church which has become apostate is not schism. That is one’s
Christian duty and nothing else.”57 Then, Lloyd-Jones gives the definition:

What then is schism? As outlined and defined by the apostle Paul, especially in the First Epistle
to the Corinthians, schism is ‘a division among members of the true visible church about matters
which are not sufficiently important to justify division’. Look at the case in Corinth. In general,
they were agreed about their doctrine, but they were dividing over personalities. ... They were
dividing the church. That is schism – holding the same doctrines but dividing over the persons.
... over meats offered to idols ... They were going to law against one another. .... Here were
people who agreed about the centralities, about the doctrines. They disagreed ... about the
spiritual gifts and other matters. They were the things causing the schism, the division, the rents
in the one body of Christ. ....according to the apostle, that is ‘the essence of schism. It is
division among people who are agreed about the essentials and the centralities, but who
separate over secondary and less important matters.58

With the definition of schism, Lloyd-Jones asks who can be guilty of the sin of schism. They are
evangelicals because “people who do not believe the essentials of the faith, the things that are essential to
salvation, cannot be guilty of schism.”59 In other words, evangelicals are the only people who can commit
the sin of schism. And Lloyd-Jones presents an argument that evangelicals are committing the sin of schism
when we see their current situation.

55 Ibid, 252,253.
56 Ibid, 253.
57 Ibid.
58 Ibid.
You and I are evangelicals. We are agreed about these essentials of the faith, and yet we are divided from one another. We meet like this ... in an occasional conference, but we spend most of our time apart from one another, and joined to and united with people who deny and are opposed to these essential matters of salvation. We spend our time with them. We have our visible unity with them. Now, I say, that is sinful.60

And he suggests rethinking what has made us remain in denominations. In other words, he asks, which shows our identity: evangelical or denomination. Lloyd-Jones points out a tendency of thinking and acting in the denominational aspect, not in line with the evangelical view. This tendency and the current situation show division among evangelicals as a result.

Why are we as evangelicals thus divided? Why are we divided up among the main denominations? I think if we are honest we will have to admit that most of us really do not know. ... because I was born there, I stay there and I am prepared to fight for it. How often is that the case? I am arguing that for us to be divided – we who are agreed about everything that really matters – for us to be divided from one another in the main tenor of our lives and for the bulk of our time, is nothing but to be guilty of the sin of schism. And we really must face this most urgently.61

It seems that evangelicals tend to act according to denominational policies rather than to stick to their evangelical position, causing the current situation of the ecumenical movement. Thus Martyn Lloyd-Jones makes an appeal for unity among evangelicals.

His appeal is for evangelicals to show unity by being united to one another, working together and spending much more time together than now. He asks if there is any reason to prevent them from becoming one and he asks anyone for an answer, whether it is positive or negative. Lloyd-Jones approaches positively.

What reasons have we for not coming together? I think we ought to be able to give an answer to that question. ... What cogent reason have we for staying as we are when we have this new, and as I regard it, heaven-sent opportunity for doing something new? What are our reasons for rejecting and refusing the need for change?

Let me put it positively. Do we not feel the call to come together, not occasionally, but always? It is a grief to me that I spend so little of my time with some of my brethren. I want to spend the whole of my time with them. I am a believer in ecumenicity, evangelical ecumenicity. To me, the tragedy is that we are divided. Is it right that those of us who are agreed about these fundamental things should only meet occasionally...62

60 Ibid.
61 Ibid.
62 Ibid, 254,255.
He appeals for evangelicals to take a *positive* approach. He points out their calling is not to be negative, to object, oppose, reject and refuse denominational policies or their leaders. Rather they have a higher calling to *succeed* the historical Christian evangelical faith which began in the New Testament, especially the church in the second chapter of Acts of the Apostles.

Now you and I have been called to a positive task. We are guardians and custodians of the faith, the faith that has been given once and for ever to the saints. Traditionally it has always been we evangelicals who have been the guardians and custodians of the New Testament heritage. We believe the Bible; we take it authoritatively; we do not impose our philosophies and ideas upon it; and we are the only people who are doing this. God, I believe, has given us the solemn charge of guarding and protecting and defending the faith of the Bible; we are the modern representatives and successors of glorious men who fought this same fight, the good fight of faith, in centuries past. Surely as evangelicals, we ought to feel this appeal. We are standing on the position of the Protestant reformers. ... We are modern representatives of these men, and of the Puritans, the Covenanters, the early Methodists. Can you not see the opportunity?63

I believe that God is calling upon us to maintain this ancient witness, not occasionally, not haphazardly, but always, and to put it to the people of this country.64

On the other hand, Lloyd-Jones does not minimise *its hardship*, which is mostly relating to living costs, when the people respond to the call to be faithful to evangelicals’ position.

...great and grievous difficulties; I am aware of them ... men, ministers and clergy, in this congregation at the moment, who, if they did what I am exhorting them to do, would have a tremendous problem before them, even a financial, an economic and family problem. I do not want to minimise this. My heart goes out to such men ... great problem confronting us if we act on these principles.65

In spite of those difficulties, Lloyd-Jones challenges that it is still worth following because it has been the typical way of living for every generation of evangelicals.

...has the day come when we, as evangelicals, are afraid of problems? The true Christian has always had problems. The early Christians...ostracised from their families and the threat ever facing them. They were not daunted; they went on...would rather die than not stand for the truth....Martin Luther...confronted by a problem when he saw the truth....but he was not deterred by the problem; and so all the martyrs and confessors throughout the ages.66

---

63 Ibid, 255.
64 Ibid, 256.
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Finally, in the address, Lloyd-Jones emphasises how evangelicals should live because of the belief that “the Holy Spirit will only bless His own Word”. That is why Christian unity should be made with the doctrine, ‘the essentials and the vitals of the faith’. That is also why Lloyd-Jones does not accept the ecumenical movement and the argument among some evangelicals, that “we will miss an evangelistic opportunity perhaps… Where is the Holy Spirit? Surely He will honour truth if we stand for it together”.

Therefore, Martyn Lloyd-Jones diagnoses the current situation that evangelicals are facing relating to the ecumenical movement. Firstly, he sees it as a very serious danger, breaking evangelical unity. However, Lloyd-Jones, at the same time, regards it very positively as a ‘heaven-sent opportunity’. As an opportunity, Lloyd-Jones notes that there is one condition: that evangelicals should stand for God’s truth, having ‘one objective only, namely the glory of the Lord, and the success of His Kingdom’.

Martyn Lloyd-Jones' View of Evangelical Unity

It is not good enough to grasp what Lloyd-Jones says on the topic only with the message made at the address of 1966. He also said, “The difficulty confronting me at this moment is to deal with such a subject in a short space of time”.

Thus, for a better understanding of his view on the topic, it is necessary to look at his other writings.

It is important to note that his 1966 address was not accidental or new, but it was continual because Martyn Lloyd-Jones had been emphasising the same point for many years. In 1957, at the Evangelical Alliance Annual Meeting, Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ address was followed by another speaker, Frank Colquhoun. They both dealt with the same topic as that of the 1966 address: Evangelical Unity. Lloyd-Jones had dealt with the topic for many years before 1966, going back to 1952. At the Inter-Varsity Fellowship Conference at Swanwick, the President’s address was given under the title Maintaining the Evangelical Faith Today, which shows Lloyd-Jones did not have the same mind as the movement driven by the World Council of Churches (WCC).

In 1952, Martyn Lloyd-Jones started a sermon series on John Chapter 17 which was made up of 48 sermons. In the series, on Sunday mornings between 1952 and 1953, he dealt with this topic. Lloyd-Jones

---
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also dealt with the topics, *The church* and *The marks and government of the church* including *The sacraments - signs and seals*, *Baptism* and ‘*The Lord's Supper*.’

He also held a Friday night Lecture series, *Great Doctrines of the Bible* between 1952 and 1955.

In 1957, Lloyd-Jones gave three addresses at a Conference of the General Committee of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students (IFES), which was about the authority of Jesus Christ, the Scriptures and the Holy Spirit. At that time the questions about the nature of authority such as ‘Is there any final authority?’, ‘Is there any objective source for this authority?’ or ‘Can the truth be known; be defined; or be stated in a number of propositions?’ were frequently being asked in many places. Lloyd-Jones said “this whole question of the nature of authority is being raised, I think, acutely at the present time by movements such as the World Council of Churches (WCC) and the World Student Christian Federation.”

From 1954 to 1962, Lloyd-Jones gave a series on Ephesians on Sunday mornings. In this series, Lloyd-Jones dealt especially with the topic in Chapter 4. It is noted that the Lloyd-Jones’ exposition of this chapter was made up with 22 sermons and it was published with the title *Christian Unity*.

After this series, the exposition of the Gospel of John, Chapter 1 was given on Sunday mornings between 1963 and 1965 and John, Chapters 3 and 4 followed until his retirement in 1968. At the same time Lloyd-Jones gave a series on Acts on Sunday evenings from 1965 until he retired. Those expositions, especially Acts, contain some of the contents with regards to the topic.

In addition, *Life in Christ*, the exposition of the Epistle of 1 John, was given in 1948 to 1950, which still relates to the topic.

As we see, the topic which Martyn Lloyd-Jones dealt with at the second Assembly of Evangelicals in 1966 was not accidental or a separate one but it was the extension of what he had spoken about since 1952.

MLJ Trust provides Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ audio sermons of approximately 1,600 sermons. It is also possible to search topically. With regard to the topic, when searching with the key word ‘unity’, it shows 31 sermons. The sermons related to the topic are mostly found in his exposition of Ephesians, especially Chapters 4 and 2, Romans Chapter 12 and Acts Chapter 2. One thing that should be mentioned is that this

---

76 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Great Doctrines of the Bible* (Three Volumes in One): God the Father, God the Son; God the Holy Spirit; The Church and the Last Things (Kindle Edition), Kindle Location 9780.

77 Ibid, Kindle Locations 30,31, ‘Preface’: “…a series of lectures on those great subjects. … and after that he began his magisterial series on the epistle to the Romans which continued until his retirement in 1968.”


82 See Appendix 1.

83 Martyn Lloyd-Jones’s *Christian Unity* (Ephesians 4:1-16) consists of 22 sermons related to the topic.
site did not include his sermons on John Chapter 17 because it seems that they do not have those audio files. As already noted, Lloyd-Jones dealt with John Chapter 17 specifically, regarding the topic.

Iain Murray also provides an analysis of the sermons on Ephesians. With regards to the topic, he gives some keywords for the sermons.

With regard to the topic, there are also some lectures, which are in the three books: Knowing the time (1942-1977); The Puritans (1959-1978); and Unity in Truth (1967-1979).

The list of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ sermon series, preached in the 1950s and 1960s shows that his 1966 address is not an independent one but part of a series of what Lloyd-Jones had often said and emphasised relating to the topic. It tells us that Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ addresses and lectures show not only that he had been concerned with the topic until 1966 but also that he made an effort to propose some aspects for the time and the future as well.

For a better understanding of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ 1966 address, it is necessary to look at what he said on the topic and his view of evangelical unity during the period 1952 to 1965. They will be described by some related subjects. “We are not simply defending the Christian in general, but we are defining the evangelical Christian.”

When Martyn Lloyd-Jones says ‘evangelical unity’, what does evangelical mean?

What then are the characteristic notes of the evangelical? What are the particular truths that he is concerned at all times to emphasise? I cannot do better than to read from a summary

---
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87 Iain Murray, Messenger of Grace (2008), 199: “It was not that he had taken a sudden interest in church issues. Rather he was persuaded that compassion for souls required the protest he made against a policy that was compromising the truth. He was not against a ‘territorial church’ because, as a Welshman, he disliked an English institution, as has been said. He spoke against it because it is a deception to suppose entrance into the church of God is according to the country in which anyone happens to be born. In the same way his hostility to Roman Catholic teaching rested upon the way it presents false grounds of salvation to sinners. His concern that Protestantism was being lost was no bigotry. He grieved deeply that at a point in history, when the churches and the nation were in a state of mankind transition, there were so few safe guides to heaven.”
88 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘What Is an Evangelical?’, in Knowing the Times, 306: “We are not simply defending the Christian in general, but we are defining the evangelical Christian, and we do that, of course, because we believe that ultimately the evangelical faith is the only true expression in doctrine of the Christian faith itself. You can be a Christian and yet defective in your doctrine, but our concern and our endeavour is to have the true doctrine presented in its fullness because we believe that it is only as this is believed and preached and propagated that men and women are going to be converted and added to the church. When the church has gone wrong in doctrine, she had ceased to be converting influence. Here again is something that stands out very clearly in the long history of the church. That is why we should be so concerned about defining the meaning of this term evangelical and defending it even to our very ‘last breath’.” (Italics is researcher’s).
According to Lloyd-Jones’ definition of evangelicals, they are the people who believe those doctrines, regarding them as their essential beliefs. In other words, evangelical unity should be doctrinal. Lloyd-Jones calls those doctrines the essential, fundamental, vital, or primary doctrines and he regards them as “essentials of faith” because, as he mentioned at the 1966 address, those are the “essential matters of salvation” \(^{91}\).

Martyn Lloyd-Jones points out that there is no Spiritual unity between one person who believes these doctrines and another person who does not believe. Lloyd-Jones says, in his exposition of John Chapter 17:

> The unity that our Lord is concerned about is a unity which is spiritual. It consists of a unity of spirits, and it is a unity, therefore, which is based solidly upon the truth. It is based upon the whole doctrine – regeneration and the rebirth, the receiving of the Holy Spirit – and obviously the doctrine must be dependent ultimately upon the Person of our Lord and upon his work. It is a unity of people who have become spiritual and who have been born again: we are made one with one another, because we first of all are united to Christ and made one with him, and, through him, one with God. \(^{92}\)

Martyn Lloyd-Jones **denies** the idea that *It does not matter what you believe* as long as you call yourself a Christian.’ His reply for that is:

> ‘No, that is impossible.’ And I must ask that man certain questions and get his answers. What is his view of the Lord Jesus Christ? Is the Lord Jesus Christ just a man to him? There are many people in this world who call themselves Christians, yet who, alas, regard the Lord Jesus Christ as nothing but a man. Well, all I can say to that is that I have no fellowship with such people. I have no unity with them for they take from the very foundation and basis of my faith, and my whole position and standing. What do these people believe about the work of the Lord Jesus Christ? What is their view of his death? Is it just a tragedy; is it just the death of a passive resistor; is it the death of someone who was not understood by his contemporaries? Is it a murderous death or is it a substitutionary death? Is it the Son of God dying because that is the only way whereby my sins may be forgiven, and therefore the essential preliminary to my becoming a child of God, and a partaker of the divine nature? If it is essential, and the other man says it is not, how can it be possible for there to be unity between us? And the same is true

---
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91 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *Knowing the Times*, 254. Sinclair B. Ferguson and Joel R. Beeke and Michael A. G. Haykin, *Church History 101: The Highlights of Twenty Centuries* (Reformation Heritage Books, Kindle Edition), Kindle Locations 563-65: “But after further study, he came to see that the righteousness Paul had in mind is the righteousness of Jesus Christ that God offers to us as a free gift, to be received by faith. Luther felt the chains of guilt and shame fall away as he grasped this fundamental truth of the gospel for the first time.”

with all these other cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith. Now there is no unity unless we stand on this – one Lord, one faith, one baptism. There is only one Lord Jesus Christ, and I must be clear about his Person and about his work.93

In other sermons, Lloyd-Jones says that “Christianity is Christ”94 and “Christianity has nothing to give to anyone who does not believe it.”95 Lloyd-Jones does not regard one as Christian who does not believe Jesus as the Lord and Saviour, ‘Lord Jesus Christ’, though one thinks of oneself as a Christian. This is because Christ is so vital for every Christian that it is impossible to think of separating Christ from Christian faith. “There is no such thing as Christianity apart from Him.”96 This is the uniqueness of Christian Faith from other teachings.

Christianity is Christ, this One Lord. He makes it. Without Him there is no Christianity. He is essential to it. In this respect it is unlike all other teachings. Other teachings can be divorced from their propagators, for example, Buddhism from Buddha; it would not make any vital difference. But in Christianity our Lord is everything. It all results from this amazing, unique fact of the Incarnation and of what He has done.97

Regarding the doctrine of Christ, Lloyd-Jones also emphasises the blood of Christ. “People hate what they call this theology of blood, but there is no theology worthy of the name apart from the shed blood of Christ.”98 However, Lloyd-Jones says “Our gospel is a gospel of blood; blood is the foundation; without it there is nothing.”99 So he says “You cannot get away from this blood in the New Testament. It is central; without it there is no salvation.”100 That is why “Spurgeon used to say, and I am increasingly convinced of the rightness of his dictum, that the ultimate way to test whether a man is truly preaching the gospel or not, is to notice the emphasis which he places upon ‘the blood’. It is not enough to talk about cross and the death; the test is ‘the blood’.”101

Lloyd-Jones again emphasises the importance of the essential doctrines as the basis of evangelical unity.

There is only one faith (I do not mean here my faith in him, but the faith about him), the faith that the apostles preached. They preached that Jesus is the Lord, the Son of God, that he died for our sins and that he was made a substitute for us. That is their faith, the word that they preached, and it was as the result of hearing and believing this word that the people became members of the church, and one with others who were in the church before them. So you see that these things

---
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are vital; this is the unity that was to be found in the early church; it is the unity that is found at all times of true reformation and revival.\textsuperscript{102}

Martyn Lloyd-Jones asks what makes and produces this unity. He says that John 17:20 gives the answer clearly: “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word;”\textsuperscript{103}

What, then, is going to preserve this unity? ‘Well,’ says our Lord in effect, ‘it is the word, which these followers of mine are going to preach after I am gone; and as the result of the preaching of this word people are going to be converted and come into the church.’ In verses 16 and 17 he says that it is like this:\textsuperscript{104} ...The same thing, of course, has already been said in verse 11, and we saw, when we considered in detail our Lord’s phrase ‘through thine own name’, that it meant that the Lord Jesus Christ has revealed his Father’s name to those people who belong to him, but not to the world. The world does not understand it, but these people do, and what makes us really the people of God is that through the word we have understood the meaning of the name of the Lord. So we are back again to this same question of the word; indeed, we might argue that the one thing that produces unity is what our Lord tells them in verses 6 to 9\textsuperscript{105} ... ...

What makes these people, and what makes the greatest unity of these people, is this word, this message of God which has been given to them, first by the Lord himself, and subsequently by his apostles and disciples – that is the basis of the unity.\textsuperscript{106}

‘Word, truth or doctrine’ produces unity and preserves it. Actually John 17:21, ‘that they may all be one,’\textsuperscript{107} is often used with regard to the ecumenical movement. While the movement’s emphasis is on ‘one’, Lloyd-Jones asks who ‘they’ are in this verse. Likewise, Lloyd-Jones asks the same question again of Ephesians 4:15.

This principle is seen also in the phrase ‘speaking the truth in love’ (v. 15). We must not put love before truth; we are to speak the truth in love. We are not merely to speak lovingly, or simply to be nice and friendly; we are to speak the truth in love. Truth must always come first. The result is that it is quite impossible to discuss unity with a man who denies the deity of Christ. Although he may call himself a Christian I have nothing in common with him. If he does not acknowledge this one Lord, born of the Virgin, who worked His miracles, and died an atoning death, and rose literally from the grave in the body, I cannot discuss the unity of the Church with him. There is

\textsuperscript{102} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, \textit{The Assurance of Our Salvation}, 524,525.
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So it is essential to define who or what a Christian is when researching Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ view of evangelical unity, because Christian unity exists between Christians. That is why Lloyd-Jones is sceptical of the people who call themselves Christians but deny these doctrines and refuse to believe them. Lloyd-Jones suggests there is no Spiritual unity between the two: one believes and the other denies; because it is inevitable for Christians to believe those doctrines, which are literally essentials of Christian faith.

If 'speaking the truth in love', 'holding the truth in love', means that we are to smile upon all views and doctrinal standpoints, and never criticize and condemn and reject any views at all, how do we avoid being 'children, tossed to and fro and carried about by every wind of doctrine'? ... The very text itself, and especially the context, make that interpretation completely impossible; indeed it is a denial of the Apostle’s statement.

One of the reasons Martyn Lloyd-Jones opposed the ecumenical movement is because the ecumenical people tend to avoid defining Christianity doctrinally. Instead, they pursue fellowship as Christians. However, Lloyd-Jones asks who is a Christian? And what is Christianity? And he points out that Christian fellowship does not stand without doctrines. The ecumenical movement, in the name of love, puts fellowship before truth and this cannot be justified. As he mentioned above, the basis of such a lovely fellowship is truth. Lloyd-Jones emphasises, as Acts 2:42 shows, that doctrine comes first and then fellowship.

The following characteristic of Christian unity is Spiritual unity. In other words, men cannot create this unity. Martyn Lloyd-Jones draws us to pay attention to the capital letter for the Spirit in Ephesians 4:2.

Let us next observe that the word 'Spirit' has a capital ‘S’—‘Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit’. This refers to The Holy Spirit. Paul is not writing about the manifestation of some human spirit of friendship, he is not thinking in terms of the so-called public school spirit, or the cricket team spirit, or that of the football team. It is a capital S, it is The Holy Spirit. In verse 4 he repeats the same emphasis, ‘There is one body, and one Spirit’, the Holy Spirit. Everywhere in this context the word ‘Spirit’ must be interpreted as referring to the Holy Spirit Himself. It is because this fact is so constantly forgotten that most of the modern talk about unity seems to me to be entirely un-scriptural. It is entirely human, it is something that belongs to man; it is not the unity that is produced by the Spirit Himself. ...The unity about which the Apostle is concerned here is produced and created by the Holy Spirit Himself. He alone can produce this unity; and it is He alone who does produce this unity. This is obviously a matter of fundamental
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Martyn Lloyd-Jones believed this unity already existed: “The unity is in existence at the present time, in spite of the multiplicity of denominations and organisations.” That is why Lloyd-Jones says the thing that Christians can do is not to make the unity but rather to maintain it.

What he asks us to do is to be careful not to break the unity that is already there, and which has been produced and created... We are to maintain it, not create it. It is the unity of the Spirit. It is His work, it is something that He does in us. Because that is true the following deductions are also true. The unity about which the Apostle is concerned is a living and a vital unity. It is not a mechanical unity. There is all the difference in the world between a coalition or amalgamation and a true unity.

Therefore, according to Lloyd-Jones, evangelical unity should be doctrinal, which means the basis of the unity is truth. And the unity is made by the Holy Spirit Himself, which means that it cannot be made by such movements which are artificial. This is Spiritual unity and it is Christian unity because it exists between Christians. And they should maintain the unity which is already in existence. Though they cannot produce the unity, they can maintain it and should do so. These are the characteristics of what Martyn Lloyd-Jones holds and emphasises on Christian unity.

According to these principles of evangelical unity, there are some cases which have nothing to do with the unity. First, as already discussed, Martyn Lloyd-Jones does not believe in unity with some people who deny the essentials of Christian faith even though they call themselves Christians: “You do not start with fellowship, you must start with doctrine. There is no fellowship apart from the doctrine. The order is absolutely vital.” It can be said that “life must come before unity because, after all, unity is a result of life.”

This explains why it is sometimes so difficult to discuss this subject with certain people. They do not agree about the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, they do not agree about regeneration and rebirth. Their idea of Christianity is that it simply means doing good and being moral and religious, or taking an interest in a particular denomination and its activities. No profitable conversation or discussion is possible with such people as their whole conception of the Spirit is different. No unity is possible between such people and those who take the scriptural view of the work of the Spirit. If the Holy Spirit is not in us we cannot experience this unity; it can only be experienced by those in whom He dwells and whom He has enlightened. But if the Holy Spirit is in that other person and also in me, at once we are conscious of a bond of unity because the
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same Spirit is in us both, and we recognize it in one another. These surely are quite basic and fundamental considerations.  

The definition of a Christian is related as well. “The definition of the New Testament is that a Christian is a man who possesses eternal life.” This can also explain why Martyn Lloyd-Jones dealt with the matter of evangelical unity so seriously. Lloyd-Jones did not see the matter of unity in and of itself. Rather, he approached it with the matter of salvation. He believed there was no salvation without Christ. He did not believe universalism which means that all people would be eventually saved.  

There is nothing in Scripture anywhere to suggest what is called ‘universalism’, the teaching, very popular today, that at the final consummation every human being who has ever lived anywhere will be saved. The Bible nowhere teaches us that all are going to be saved.

Furthermore, Lloyd-Jones does not believe in a sort of territorial church, which means that there is no unity with a person who regards themselves as a Christian because the country in which the person was born is a so-called Christian country.  

The fact that our parents, grandparents or forebears were great Christians does not mean that we are Christians. That was the whole tragedy of the Jews, as we have seen. Put next to birth, family, nation - none of these things matter at all. But oh, how much they have mattered through the centuries; how much they still matter! There are still people who think of this country as a Christian country. What utter nonsense! There is no such thing. There never has been a Christian country, and there cannot be in the light of this teaching.

I have no fellowship with a man who says that being born in this country makes us Christians. I cannot have fellowship with a man who tells me that because I was christened as a baby I am therefore a Christian. These things are absolutely vital and central, and the same applies to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the doctrine of the nature of the Christian Church. Such is the truth which we are to speak in love.

Lloyd-Jones also provides the following questions and answers on this matter:

1. Is there such a thing as a Christian country? The answer is, No.
3. Are baptized children of necessity Christians? The answer is, No.
4. Are all who are baptized, whether children or adults, and all who are church members of
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necessity Christians? The answer is, No. 123

Lloyd-Jones also does not accept someone is Christian because of their baptism in the Church. Nor does Lloyd-Jones believe that a person who belongs to the church is necessarily saved. With regard to this, the Roman Catholic Church is considered.

Advocating the ecumenical movement, some argued that evangelicals and Roman Catholics are closer to each than to the liberals.

Now many of us have said throughout the years that in some respects we have found ourselves nearer to the Roman Catholics than to the liberals because the Roman Catholics, after all, believe in the being of God, the deity of Christ, the virgin birth, the two natures of Christ in one person, the miracles, the atonement, the literal, physical resurrection, and the person of the Holy Spirit. On these truths we have always found ourselves in closer agreement; and sometimes we have found that by reading books by certain Roman Catholic authors our faith was strengthened because they believe what we believe, whereas the liberals and the modernists deny all this. I say this to illustrate the same point, that the trouble with the Roman Catholic is what he adds on and what he adds to or subtracts from what is stated in his belief. So we must be careful, and remember the warning in the book of Revelation, where we are told we must not add to, or take from, anything that is written in that particular book, and the command belongs equally to all the other books of the Bible. We have got to keep our eye on these two sides: what men do not say, and what they add on, over and above what we regard as the true faith. 124

That is why Lloyd-Jones believes that there is no evangelical unity with the Roman Catholic Church: ‘what he adds to or subtracts from what is stated in his belief’. Lloyd-Jones also acknowledged that there were some Roman Catholics who received ‘baptism of the Spirit’ 125.

It is being said that men and women may receive the Spirit in all His fullness and continue as Roman Catholics, believing in transubstantiation and in all the magic of the Mass, and the sacramental views of the Roman Catholic Church. What people believe is not important; what matters is that they have the Spirit within them. Such talk is becoming quite common at the present time. People are saying that you can have true unity in spite of profound disagreement concerning vital and essential doctrines. But I want to put it to you again this is a complete denial of the teaching of this one verse, Romans 12:5 126, even without going any further. You cannot have unity unless it includes unity of mind and thinking. 127

If you could tell me about Roman Catholic bishops and cardinals who, as a result of the baptism
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of the Spirit, have tried to reform the Roman Catholic Church and have consequently been turned out or have decided to leave, then I would wholeheartedly accept the genuineness of their experience, ... There is no suggestion (in the New Testament) that she is a ‘co-redemptrix’. Nor can you find the immaculate conception or transubstantiation.  

Lloyd-Jones does believe that “there are individual Roman Catholics who are undoubtedly Christian. We are not discussing that.” What he points out on this matter is the religious system of the Roman Catholic Church: “With the whole Roman system the Holy Spirit was ignored; the priesthood, the priests, the Church, Mary and the saints were put into the position of the Holy Spirit.”

From the standpoint of orthodoxy and doctrinal beliefs I find myself nearer to many a Roman Catholic than to many within the ranks of Protestantism but where I part company with them and must part company is that they add these pluses—Christ, plus the Church, plus the Virgin Mary, plus the priests, plus the saints and so on. Christ alone is not enough and He does not stand in all His unique glory at the centre.

As he already emphasised, this unity is made by the Holy Spirit Himself and it is doctrinal. Lloyd-Jones calls attention to the failure of the nation of Israel, implying that any church on earth has the possibility of becoming apostate if not being guided by the Spirit with the truth of the Scripture.

If the nation of Israel could be apostate, then it is possible for anybody to be apostate. The fact that the church is the church does not prove that she is always right. The visible people of God can go all wrong. It has happened many times, and I believe it is happening today. So we must
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not assume that because people say, ‘We belong to the church, they are all right’. Neither must
the church assume that, ‘because she is the church, she is all right’. The church must always put
herself under the judgment of the word of God.  

In this regard, the Roman Catholic Church does not draw a distinction between the visible church and invisible church, regarding them as the same as the Kingdom of God. However, Martyn Lloyd-Jones does not believe this, as he does not believe all church members are Christians. This is the same view as the ‘Protestant Reformers’. 

There is this essential and vital distinction which the Protestant Reformers rediscovered in the Scriptures and re-emphasised as over against the Roman Catholic Church and her teaching: the distinction between the visible and the invisible church. All belong to the visible church, but all do not belong to the invisible church.  

As for the invisible church, Lloyd-Jones says that “there is only one really continuous church, and that is this invisible spiritual continuity of those who are ‘led of the Spirit’.”

As mentioned earlier, Lloyd-Jones has an understanding of the matter of separation and division. When the Protestant Reformers took an action from the Roman Catholic Church it was not an act of division but separation. “Now that is what I say is the principle of separation. You cannot possibly remain in an apostate church. You must separate yourself from unbelief and from explicit denials of the ‘gospel’.”

Justification removes the guilt of sin; sanctification removes the pollution of sin and renews us in the image of God. And therefore, last, by definition justification is a once-and-for-all act. It is never to be repeated because it cannot be repeated and never needs to be repeated. It is not a process but a declaration that we are pronounced just once and forever, by God. Sanctification, on the other hand, is a continuous process. We continue to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the Lord until we are perfect beyond the veil. So there is nothing quite so erroneous and confusing and unscriptural as to mistake the essential difference between justification and sanctification. That is the whole trouble with Roman Catholic teaching and all Catholic piety. If you confuse sanctification with justification, you will be doubtful as to whether you are justified or not. If you bring in your state and condition and sin that you may commit, then you are querying your justification. ... justification is forensic, external, and declaratory.
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In this respect, Martyn Lloyd-Jones maintains the Protestant Reformation tradition, upholding the representative doctrine, ‘justification by faith alone’¹⁴⁰ and he also follows a Puritan, John Owen with regard to separation. John Owen had to advocate the clear definition of separation and division [schism] for the Protestant Reformation position because, in his time, English Protestants including the Church of England were accused of schism by the Roman Catholic Church.¹⁴¹ So John Owen wrote many theses on the topic and he researched the Scriptural definition of schism. It should be mentioned that Lloyd-Jones’ understanding is the same as John Owen’s.¹⁴²

Lloyd-Jones takes ‘schism between Christians’ seriously: “schism is a very great sin, it is a very serious matter. Nobody should be guilty of the sin of schism, and it is vital therefore that we should be clear in our minds as to what exactly it is.”¹⁴³ In his 1971 IFES (International Fellowship of Evangelical Students) address of ‘What Is an Evangelical?’, Lloyd-Jones dealt with the essential doctrines and the ‘secondary’ doctrines which are still important, but not as essential for Christian faith as to be separated from other religions.

There is a multiplicity of denominations, and men do not hesitate to set themselves up and to start denominations - not in terms of vital truth but in terms of matters which are not even secondary, but of third-rate, fourth-rate, even perhaps twentieth- or hundredth-rate importance!¹⁴⁴

Lloyd-Jones does not seem to be a person who makes quick judgements but he seems to act by principles. “If I am not certain, I am prepared to be charitable; I stand for certainties, not for things that are doubtful or uncertain. … In things essential, unity; in things doubtful, liberty; in all things, charity.”¹⁴⁵ He also seems to be able to distinguish when to bear and when to act.

There is a danger that we may confuse sentimentality and a doctrinal laxity and looseness for a true spirit of charity. The New Testament uses the language of which I have just been reminding you and here it is in its essence – liars. So then, how do we reconcile these things? Well, there is a very real distinction drawn in the New Testament between what we are to endure for ourselves and our response when the truth is attacked. … With regard to ourselves and our own

¹⁴² In 1962 Lloyd-Jones gave a lecture: Puritan Perplexities – Some Lessons from 1640-1662 at the Puritans Conference and continued, in 1963 a similar topic: John Owen on Schism. Lloyd-Jones mentioned what he referred to of John Owen’s writings. They were Of Schism; A Review of the true nature of Schism; A Brief Vindication of the Nonconformists from the Charge of Schism; A Discourse Concerning Evangelical Love, Church Peace and Unity; An Inquiry into the Original, Nature, Institution, Power, Order, and Communion of Evangelical Churches; An Answer to Dr Stillingfleet’s Book of the Unreasonableness of Separation; and The Nature of a Gospel or a New Testament Church Ibid.
¹⁴³ Ibid.
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personal feelings we are to endure anything and everything; we are not to stand up for ourselves; we are not to call people liars who attack us in person. But where the truth is concerned, where doctrine is involved, where the whole essence of the gospel comes in, and especially the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, we are to stand and be strong and we are not to hesitate to use language like this.\textsuperscript{146}

We must underline in a very special way the substitutionary aspect and element of the atonement, the penal, piacular aspect.\textsuperscript{147}

Lloyd-Jones says clearly that he cannot \textit{pray with} people who don’t believe the essential doctrines.

\begin{quote}
[We cannot unite] if we disagree about the very vitals and fundamentals of the faith. I have no union with a man who denies the unique deity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, the miracles, the atoning sacrificial death, and the resurrection of our Lord and the Person of the Holy Spirit. I cannot pray with such a person because we are not praying in the same manner. Paul teaches us in chapter two that we can only pray acceptably as ‘We both [Jews and Gentiles] have access through Him [Christ] by one Spirit unto the Father’—and this is the only way.\textsuperscript{148}
\end{quote}

However, the ecumenical movement approaches in \textit{reverse order}: not doctrine first and then pray but pray first.

\begin{quote}
We must bear this in mind constantly as we read modern books about ecumenicity or listen to sermons and appeals. Their great argument and appeal is that as hitherto divided and separate people we must begin to act together, to work together, to pray together, and then we shall begin to feel the spirit of unity. But that is a denial of the Apostle’s teaching. In every manifestation of life the internal principle comes first, and then the outward manifestation.\textsuperscript{149}

Men cannot pray without doctrine; they cannot go into the presence of God except ‘by the blood of Jesus’. There is no other way of getting there, there is no entry into ‘the Holiest of all’.\textsuperscript{150}
\end{quote}

Lloyd-Jones points out preachers do not preach what makes unity, the \textit{gospel}, but preach unity only:

\begin{quote}
To me one of the major tragedies of the hour, and especially in the realm of the church, is that most of the time seems to be taken up by the leaders in preaching about unity instead of preaching the gospel that alone can produce unity.\textsuperscript{151}
\end{quote}
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If we united all the denominations and added all the power of each other, even that would not create spiritual life. The burial of many bodies in the same cemetery does not lead to resurrection. Life is more important than unity.\textsuperscript{152}

As the basis of Christian unity, life should come first.\textsuperscript{153}

*The essence and the end of Christian salvation is the possession of eternal life: ‘As thou hast given him power over all flesh’—Why?—that their sins might be forgiven? No—‘that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.’ That is what makes the difference, ...John Wesley, for example, found his favourite definition of Christianity in the title of a book that was written in the sixteenth century by a Scotsman called Henry Scougal: The life of God in the soul of man. That is it, the possession of the life of God in one’s own soul. That is the essence and the end of salvation.*\textsuperscript{154}

And he makes it clear **who gives** this life:

*There are those who tell you that you can know God and begin to share his life immediately just as you are. They say that the moment you begin to feel your need of God all you have to do is to turn to God and he will begin to speak to you. They do not mention the Lord Jesus Christ at all. But, my friends, it is he and he alone who can give eternal life. He claims it here [Jn 17:2] and Scripture says it everywhere: ‘As thou hast given him [Jesus] power over all flesh that he should give eternal life. . .’*\textsuperscript{155}

Lloyd-Jones understood that “true unity between Christians is inevitable and unavoidable. …there is such a unity at this moment among true Christians”. So it was clear that evangelicals, in search of unity, need to be more focused on preaching **the truth** not more on unity.

*There are those who seem to think that the one problem in the Church today is the problem of unity. So they give all their time and attention to this. That people are going to hell does not seem to matter to them, they are always preaching about unity, and writing books about it. ‘The Unity of the Church’ is their Gospel. But that has never saved anyone. If all the Churches in the world, including the Roman Catholic Church, became amalgamated and you could say that now we had one great world Church, I venture to prophesy that it would not make the slightest difference to the man in the street.*\textsuperscript{156}

The ecumenical movement believed they would have more **influence** on people outside if they made one big world church. They saw churches which were divided into many denominations as one of the biggest
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barriers to draw people to church. Meanwhile, Martyn Lloyd-Jones saw this differently. According to Lloyd-Jones, to have one big world church which includes eventually the Roman Catholics is to nullify the reason the Protestant Reformation happened. Consequently, people will get more confused in grasping authentic Christianity. And he did not believe the solution suggested by the movement would be successful because Lloyd-Jones considered they failed to diagnose why people outside did not come to church:

_He is not outside the Churches because the Churches are disunited, he is outside because he likes his sin, because he is a sinner, because he is ignorant of spiritual realities. He is no more interested in this problem of unity than is the man in the moon! And yet the Church is talking about the problem of unity as if it were the central problem. And while we are talking about unity the devil is getting his great victories, is conquering individual people, and the whole position of the Church is shaking. Unity is not the first or the greatest problem._

That is what Lloyd-Jones preached when dealing with Spiritual Warfare mentioned in Ephesians 6:10-13. Lloyd-Jones could not agree to the movement which puts much more emphasis onto the goal, one great world church, than the essential truths.

_We must both be rooted and grounded in the truth, and believe in all the doctrine taught in chapters 1, 2 and 3—the sovereignty of God, who has called us and chosen us before the foundation of the world; the unique deity of Christ and the shedding of His blood for us and our sins on Calvary’s Cross;_

_Whatever be the unity of which the Apostle speaks, it is a unity that results directly from all he has been saying in the first three chapters of the Epistle. You must not start in chapter 4 of the Epistle to the Ephesians. To do so is to violate the context and to ignore the word ‘Therefore’. ...I know of no unity except that which is the outcome of, and the offspring of, all the great doctrines which the Apostle lays down in those chapters._

Lloyd-Jones takes note when ecumenical people dealt with the Scripture without considering the context. A typical example is John 17:21. They give an impression that they picked up this one verse, even a part of the verse, without considering its context.

_The people concerned are very fond of quoting John 17, it seems to be the chapter on which they base everything, but what interests me is that they invariably seem to speak of this chapter as if there were nothing in it at all except this plea for unity. Well, I think that the time we have spent with this chapter is proof positive that, at any rate, is completely wrong! There is no richer chapter in the whole Bible than John 17 ...How little we hear about the work which the Father_
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had given the Son to do, about the people whom he had given to him, and so on. Instead, the impression is given that John 17 has only one message in it, and that is this great question of unity.

In other words, we see the terrible danger of isolating a text, extracting it from its context, and forgetting the need to have a balanced view of Scripture and to grasp what we may call the wholeness and the unity of the scriptural teaching. Because if you read this chapter thoroughly, and study it as it should be studied, you will see that this whole question of unity is not something that our Lord deals with on its own; it is a part of the entire outlook, and of this whole petition that he offers for his followers. ... For that is our trouble; we constantly regard the truth of God as if it were a number of propositions, instead of realising the truth as a whole, seeing that each particular part belongs to the whole, ... My suggestion, then, as we approach this subject of unity, is that we can only begin to understand it if we are perfectly clear in our minds as to what constitutes a Christian.\textsuperscript{162}

It seems that Lloyd-Jones wanted to start from the Bible and he was reluctant to put anything into action without principles based on the Scripture. However, to Lloyd-Jones, the ecumenical movement seemed to act before full consideration of the passage of the Scripture relating to what they are doing. For example, in John chapter 17 verse 21: “…that they may all be one, just as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that you have sent me”\textsuperscript{163}, the ecumenical people seemed to miss simple questions: in the verse, who [what] are ‘they’? or what [who] is ‘the world’? They are the basic questions hermeneutically and they are, no doubt, to be asked first before deciding on an action. That is why Lloyd-Jones viewed the movement as having meagre biblical basis. Martyn Lloyd-Jones insists that the definition is so vital that we cannot skip it before moving on because the Lord sees this as important.

Our Lord says that in verses 6 to 8 of this chapter [John 17], ... our Lord takes care to define who a Christian is, and to show how Christians are utterly different from the world. In the same way, he has also dealt with this vital subject of our sanctification. I cannot see, as I study this chapter, that one can ever say that it does not matter very much what people believe, or how they live or behave, so long as they call themselves Christians. According to our Lord, we use this designation of a Christian wrongly. Christians are those who have been sanctified by the Father— and nobody else— and you see the relevance of this in the modern situation. Surely we must all agree that not all who use the name Christian can, in the light of this chapter, be called Christians; ... do face the word of God and seek to be guided by it.\textsuperscript{164}

A discourse on issues of the ecumenical and Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ view of Christian unity came to the conclusion that it is a matter of the definition of Christianity. Eventually, it requires us to answer one question: ‘who [what] is a Christian?’ It can be summarised that to the people in his time, Lloyd-Jones

\textsuperscript{162} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, \textit{The Assurance of Our Salvation}, 517, 518.

\textsuperscript{163} English Standard Version

\textsuperscript{164} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, \textit{The Assurance of Our Salvation}, Ibid.
asked the same question as the Protestant Reformers, such as Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin and Tyndale, asked in the sixteenth century, and Wesley and Whitefield also asked in the Evangelical Revival of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{165}

**Evaluation of 1966 Address**

It can also be said that this question is one of the keys to understanding the 1966 address, especially what Lloyd-Jones considered related to the situation. There are some points to be mentioned concerning what he said at the assembly in 1966.

First, Lloyd-Jones does not oppose church unity but he does desire for unity to be as John Calvin and George Whitefield had wanted.

…both men who longed, perhaps more than any of their contemporaries, for unity amongst evangelicals. In this Conference we have considered that point in connection with Calvin. Calvin was tremendously concerned that all Reformed and Evangelical people should come together in unity. He bemoaned the division and the differences that had risen, and he was prepared to do anything he could—he said he was ready to cross, if necessary, ten seas in order to attend a conference which would help to promote this unity amongst Reformed Evangelical people.\textsuperscript{166}

Lloyd-Jones speaks up for unity which is based on the truth and he raises his voice up to oppose putting unity before the truth because he believes unity comes from truth.

Second, Martyn Lloyd-Jones does not hold the perfectionist’s view of the church. Lloyd-Jones knows that “the purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of Satan. Nevertheless, there shall be always a Church on earth to worship God according to his will.”\textsuperscript{167} Lloyd-Jones emphasises “pure doctrines and the right use of discipline”.\textsuperscript{168} That ‘in the visible church the evil be ever mingled with the good’\textsuperscript{169} does not support the idea that the church’s becoming doctrinally impure may be permitted because the church is a “congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached”\textsuperscript{170}. Therefore keeping the doctrine pure is not optional but vital concerning the nature of the church. In this regard, what McGrath emphasised, that the

\textsuperscript{165} Iain Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, 154-61.
\textsuperscript{166} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, “John Calvin and George Whitefield (1964),” in *The Puritans*, 103,104.
\textsuperscript{168} *The Homilies of the Church of English*: “The true church …hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: Pure and sound doctrines; The sacraments ministered according to Christ’s holy institution: and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline.” cited in Iain Murray, *Evangelicalism Divided*, 282,283.
\textsuperscript{169} Article 26 of Thirty-Nine Articles cited in Ibid, 282.
\textsuperscript{170} Article 19 of Thirty-Nine Articles cited in Ibid.
church is a body of sinners, should be considered more than the definition of the church as primarily a body of saints.  

Iain Murray adds:

The parable of the tares does not contradict texts which require church discipline; it is rather a warning against excessive strictness in the exercises of such discipline. To turn the warning of the parable into a permission for the church to tolerate all and sundry in her membership is to change the whole nature of the church. Because the authenticity of what ‘appears to be’ Christian Faith and experience is not finally susceptible to human determination it does not follow that the church has no obligation to seek to be all that she [the church] professes to be. ...in the absence of that attempt she will sooner or later cease to be the church at all. As Calvin wrote: ‘those who trust that without this bond of discipline the church can longer stand are, I say, mistaken;’ (Institutes vol. 2, 1232)

So Martyn Lloyd-Jones stands on nothing but the same tradition as the Protestant Reformation with regard to the mark of the Church. Here is the Belgic Confession of Faith (Art. 29):

The true church can be recognised if it has the following marks: The church engages in the pure preaching of the gospel; it makes use of the pure administration of the sacraments as Christ instituted them; it practices church discipline for correcting faults. In short, it governs itself according to the pure Word of God, rejecting all things contrary to it and holding Jesus Christ as the only Head. By these marks one can be assured of recognizing the true church- and no one ought to be separated from it.

In addition to the mark of the church, what Lloyd-Jones dealt with was the matter of the church: visible and invisible. Lloyd-Jones denies the concept that all the members in the church are Christians, for example, when someone who does not believe in Jesus as the Christ, insists that he or she is a Christian on the basis of his or her membership of the church. For this matter, the view that the Roman Catholic Church has that the visible church has the same meaning as the ‘people of God’ or the ‘Kingdom of God’ is rejected; and in the same way, the view of the territory or the national church is also rejected.

The reason his address was rejected by some evangelicals, especially by the Church of England group, was not only because of its different view of the church, visible and invisible, but also because they were in favour of the ecumenical movement at that time. However, it should also be mentioned that there were also some who agreed with the Lloyd-Jones’ address such as Fellowship of Evangelical Churches, Grace Baptists,

---

171 Alister McGrath, To know and Serve God, 121.
172 Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 281,282.
173 The Belgic Confession (Grand Rapids: CRC Publications, 1988), 35: “The marks by which the true Church is known are these: If the pure doctrine of the gospel is preached therein; if it maintains the pure administration of the sacraments as instituted by Christ; if church discipline is exercised in punishing of sin; in short, if all things are managed according to the pure Word of God, all things contrary thereto rejected, and Jesus Christ acknowledged as the only Head of the Church. Hereby the true Church may certainly be known, from which no man has a right to separate himself” cited in G. I. Williamson, The Westminster Confession of Faith: for Study Classes (P&R Publishing. Kindle Edition), Kindle Locations 4262-67.
‘New Churches which has the view of the church as the body of Christians’ and The Fellowship of Independent Evangelical Churches (FIEC).\textsuperscript{174}

A documentary of Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Logic on Fire, was published recently. In the video, some current theologians and pastors showed themselves following Lloyd-Jones’ view.\textsuperscript{175}

On the other hand, there was a voice from the Church of England which was in accordance with Martyn Lloyd-Jones, which was the Anglican Paper the English Churchman.\textsuperscript{176}

Few seem to accept the fact that whether we like it or not our present denominations are doomed, and if present tendencies are anything to go by they are doomed to be swallowed up by Rome. Some will label this talk as defeatist and perhaps it is, but we are more inclined to regard it as realistic. ... Who is really giving a definite lead in the Church of England at this time? Who will define the line beyond which we will not go? We have surrendered on a number of issues which in earlier days we would never have accepted. We have heard it said that when the Articles go then will be the time to depart, but we believe that the authorities are quite capable of devising a formula which will enable those evangelicals who so desire to remain in the Church of England without straining their consciences unduly. In these circumstances it is not enough to attack the idea of evangelical union as an attempt at perfectionism. The Scriptures never give us any excuse for failing to seek the best in our lives or in the life of the Church, and those who use the perfectionist argument as ammunition seem to us to be in danger of condoning sin. We recognise that there will be no perfect Church on earth but we are nevertheless meant to keep it


\textsuperscript{176} English Churchman, Oct. 28, 1966: “He was not putting forward some negative scheme into which we are to be reluctantly forced, but rather was pointing us to the glorious opportunity of taking positive action because we realise we ought to if we are to be true to our evangelical convictions. Non-evangelicals have realised that visible disunity among Christians is sinful and a breakdown of the unity which our Lord willed for His people. We as evangelicals make much of our spiritual unity but are content to let it be disguised effectively by our visible disarray.

Anglican Evangelicals would appear, on the evidence of the Assembly to be the most intransigent on this matter. Although it was allowed by some that the time might come when they would be forced out of the Church of England they were content to wait until that time comes, rather than take some positive steps towards evangelical union now. A few gave the impression that nothing would move them at all. But is it not a misunderstanding to look at this problem only as one of secession? Does entry into a scriptural union with other Christians deserve that name? We feel sure it will not be applied to those who enter a united Anglican-Methodist Church.” cited in Iain Murray, Fight of Faith, 527,528.
as pure as we can, and this we are very far from doing at the moment.\textsuperscript{177}

Iain Murray presented another minister of the Church of England, an evangelical Anglican, who saw the situation seriously: “In one of the addresses published prior to the Keele Congress of 1967, Dr Phillip E. Hughes presented a very different scenario from the one which was to command popular appeal among his younger colleagues.”\textsuperscript{178} Here is some more of what Hughes himself said:

\textit{This is the assassination of Christianity and its gospel. There is no juster way to describe this spirit which is now rampant in the Church than as the spirit of antichrist . . . Unless the ecumenical movement resolutely and explicitly sets its face against this antichristianity, the prospect of the organisation in a worldwide scale of a vast and immensely powerful church of antichrist, embracing any and every form of pseudo-Christianity, paganism, and heathenism, is far from fanciful. And this will be a ‘church’ so incredible as to be unrecognisable as the Church of Christ, so totally assimilated to the image of the unregenerate world that the church and world will be indistinguishably merged into one.}\textsuperscript{179}

As Murray said, it was not a counsel of despair, but “a comparatively lone voice facing facts.”\textsuperscript{180} The speaker of the second day of the 1966 assembly, Julian Charley did not mention any possibility of getting involved in the Roman Catholic Church that Lloyd-Jones and Hughes were concerned about. However, Lloyd-Jones’\textit{ anticipation was not unreal:}

\begin{quote}
In 1999 Charley was himself a member of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission whose report endorsed the primacy of the Pope and expressed regret\textsuperscript{181} that ‘for four centuries the Anglican Communion and the Catholic Church developed their structures of authority in separation from each other, and Anglicans lived without the ministry of the Bishop of Rome.’\textsuperscript{182}
\end{quote}

Further, the WCC movement seems to\textit{ have changed}, starting from merging all denominations of the Christian church, including the Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic,\textsuperscript{183} to including non-Christian religions. Of course, it cannot be said that the religious pluralism is the official theology of the World

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{177}Ibid, 528. \\
\textsuperscript{178}Iain Murray, \textit{Evangelical Divided}, 289,290. \\
\textsuperscript{179}Guidelines, 178: ‘The Credibility of the Church’ cited in Ibid, 290. \\
\textsuperscript{180}Ibid. \\
\textsuperscript{181}Once Lloyd-Jones expressed that “I am getting very tired of evangelicals attacking pietism. I maintain that true evangelical is always pietistic and it is the thing that differentiates him from a dead orthodoxy.” in Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘What Is an Evangelical? (1971)’, in \textit{Knowing the Times}, 333. \\
\textsuperscript{182}The Commission published its report \textit{The Gift of Authority}, 12 May 1999, cited in Iain Murray, \textit{Evangelicalism Divided}, 284. Murray also informed that “the report was rejected by a statement of the Church of England Evangelical Council (29 June) in Church Assembly evangelicals have entirely failed to prevent the acceptance of ARCIC reports.” \\
\textsuperscript{183}“Is the Roman Catholic Church a member? No, although there is no constitutional reason why the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) could not join; in fact it has never applied. The RCC’s self-understanding has been one reason why it has not joined. The WCC has close links with the RCC. A WCC/RCC joint working group meets annually.” \url{https://www.oikoumene.org/en/about-us/faq#is-the-roman-catholic-church-a-member}. \\
\end{flushright}
Council of Churches movement. But it can be said that the atmosphere of the movement at that time when D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones raised his voice of evangelical unity is not the same as today. The question is: Is the official defining statement\(^\text{184}\) of the World Council of Churches, which was made in 1961 at the Third Assembly, being maintained today?\(^\text{185}\) And it does not seem to be easy to answer yes for that.

It is important to understand Lloyd-Jones’ role at that time. Martyn Lloyd-Jones was the defender of evangelical faith. Of course, that does not mean Lloyd-Jones was the only person who was evangelical; there were many, including John Stott and James Packer. However, from his early ministry until the ecumenical movement was actively deployed, Lloyd-Jones had been preaching Bible-based, Gospel, Christ-centred sermons, which were distinctive from other preachers and differed especially from the preachers who were theologically liberal. Martyn Lloyd-Jones is regarded as the main person who contributed to the Protestant Reformed Faith and the Calvinistic Puritanism revival. However, in the 1960s, the ecumenical movement started to ‘rev up’ and it split the British evangelicals in two. People like Stott and Packer supported the movement because they believed that Christians have social responsibility on the basis of evangelical beliefs. Lloyd-Jones did not deny social responsibility as Christians but he denied working together with people who deny essentials of faith, using the name of the Church and as Christians. In addition, Lloyd-Jones also saw the Roman Catholic Church would not be excluded because the movement aimed to amalgamate all denominations. That is why Lloyd-Jones continually asked the question of the Protestant Reformation. In his 1966 address Lloyd-Jones viewed the situation so seriously that he made an urgent appeal. However, after his address, it is understandable that the other group acted opposing him because they thought Lloyd-Jones opposed the ecumenical movement to which they belonged. However, Lloyd-Jones still regarded the other group, including Stott and Packer, as respected evangelicals. Someone needed to keep the basic evangelicalism position and Martyn Lloyd-Jones took the role.\(^\text{186}\)

_Surely, what is at stake at the moment is the essence of the gospel. Nothing less than that. The issues at the present time are not about refinements of the Christian faith and of our beliefs; the whole of the gospel is involved, and we are fighting at the present time for the whole notion of revelation. The prevailing thought seems to be doing away with it altogether, and we are reverting to philosophy, to human reason. That is what is_  

---

184 Yong Kyu Park, ‘A Historical Study of the Ecumenical Movement’, Joo Suk Jo (ed.), WCC, _Is it the True Church Unity Movement?_ (Suwon-si: Young Eum, 2012), 102: ‘…a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the scriptures’.

185 “Nonbelievers too Can Be Saved, Says Pope” (Vatican City, Nov. 30, 2005, Zenit.org – ‘Whoever seeks peace and the good of the community with a pure conscience, and keeps alive the desire for the transcendent, will be saved even if he lacks biblical faith, says Benedict XVI’).


[http://prologue.blog.naver.com/PostView.nhn?blogId=hismessage&logNo=220777873522&parentCategoryNo=&categoryNo=33&viewDate=&isShowPopularPosts=false&from=postView](http://prologue.blog.naver.com/PostView.nhn?blogId=hismessage&logNo=220777873522&parentCategoryNo=&categoryNo=33&viewDate=&isShowPopularPosts=false&from=postView)
at stake! Not only that: the great Protestant doctrines that have made us what we are, are being questioned and queried.\textsuperscript{187}

The \textit{seriousness} and its \textit{urgency} was highlighted in Lloyd-Jones’ speech: \textquote{We are confronted by a situation today such as has not been the case since the Protestant Reformation.}\textsuperscript{188} So with regard to the role, Martyn Lloyd-Jones can be compared to the American evangelical leader, John Gresham Machen in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century.

\begin{quote}
Evangelicals belatedly realized that their denominations had been hijacked by Modernism and began to protest in the name of the \textquote{fundamentals} of the faith. ...Movements to recover the historic Reformed faith were led by able men such as J. Gresham Machen, founder of Westminster Seminary and the Orthodox Presbyterian Church. In Britain, D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones drew large congregations to London’s Westminster Chapel\textsuperscript{189}
\end{quote}

To the challenge of Modernism, \textbf{Gresham Machen} and evangelicals defended the fundamentals of the faith. To the challenge of Neo-Evangelicalism, renouncing the fundamentals of the faith, Martyn Lloyd-Jones defended Evangelicalism.

However, Lloyd-Jones not only saw the situation as serious but he also saw it \textit{positively and as a great opportunity} for uniting evangelicals. That is found as a main point \textit{throughout} the address:

\begin{quote}
But now, if we come back to the true doctrine of the church, they, at the same time, seem to be abandoning the whole thing. Well, here is a heaven-sent opportunity, and I believe that it is an occasion and an opportunity that has not confronted evangelical people for a very, very long time.\textsuperscript{190}
\end{quote}

Some of what Lloyd-Jones was saying should be noted: \textquote{Leave your denominations, says Dr. Martyn Lloyd-Jones} \textit{(The Christian, 21 Oct 1966)};\textsuperscript{191} and \textquote{nothing short of hare-brained} \textit{(CEN}\textsuperscript{192}, 28 Oct 1966). And R. T. France believed the same thing was being repeated \textquote{to evangelical members of the main-line denominations to secede and join a ‘pure’ evangelical church.}\textsuperscript{193} However, as Iain Murray pointed out in \textit{Evangelicalism Divided}, Martyn Lloyd-Jones \textquote{had said no such thing}. And as \textit{The Christian} said \textquote{to summarise his address in such a fashion was inevitably to mislead those who had not heard him}. That was the case of the Paper \textit{CEN}, too: \textquote{instead of addressing Lloyd-Jones’ main case, unsympathetic reporters

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{187} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘Consider Your Ways: The Outline of a New Strategy’, in \textit{Knowing the Times}, 190.  \\
\textsuperscript{188} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘Evangelical Unity: An Appeal’, in \textit{Knowing the Times}, 248.  \\
\textsuperscript{190} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘Consider Your Ways: the Outline of a New Strategy’, in \textit{Knowing the Times}, 193.  \\
\textsuperscript{191} Interestingly, the paper \textquote{was owned by Billy Graham Evangelistic Association (BGEA) from 1962 until in 1969} cited in Iain Murray, \textit{Evangelical Divided}, ‘Footnote 2’, 47.  \\
\textsuperscript{192} \textquote{“The Church of England Newspaper, in which the Graham Organisation had earlier come to purchase a controlling share.”} Ibid, 48.  \\
\end{flushright}
ignored it and represented him as calling for instant separation, as though he was an advocate of extreme ‘come-out-ism’.”

As already mentioned, an article written by a member of the Church of England (The English Churchman, Oct. 28 1966), was a more balanced report.

According to Lloyd-Jones, he had no interest in making an alternative denomination which covers all the evangelicals in Britain. “The situation was far more serious than could be met by any change in organisation” because evangelicals were facing the situation, standing in the middle of the point “where the very foundations of the Christian faith had been undermined and in a day when the masses of the people were totally bereft of gospel preaching.”

But he keeps positively appealing, regarding the situation as one of the greatest opportunities which would never come again. Lloyd-Jones’ appeal in his 1966 address was similar to what the Apostle Paul said in 1 Corinthians 1:10: “We would ‘be united in the same mind and the same judgment’ as evangelicals”.

Martyn Lloyd-Jones did not ignore the existence of the denominations within the Protestant Church but he did not regard them as belonging to the category of the primary doctrines, either. Lloyd-Jones sees denominations as the secondary matter, not the primary.

‘What can we do about it?’ We have to be much more radical and to say to ourselves: Let these big denominations and groupings be what they like and do what they like, our business is to discover the real nature of the Christian Church. Are we not more or less in the same position as Martin Luther in the sixteenth century, when he saw that he had to go right back to fundamental truth and to the origin of the church. We shall have to return to that same position.

What Lloyd-Jones sees as the primary matter is ‘the real nature of the Christian Church’. Whatever relates to the nature of the Christian Church or “the essentials of the faith, the things that are essential to salvation” are the primary and vital doctrines. The primary matters can be found by asking the following

---

194 Ibid, 48.
195 Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 285.
196 ‘I appeal to you, brothers, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree, and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same judgment.’ (ESV) Packer once said, referring to what Douglas Jones said about Lloyd-Jones, “Douglas Jones attacked Dr D. M. Lloyd-Jones for say that Christian Unity only exists where the central doctrines of Paul’s Gospel are believed . . . in principle Dr Lloyd-Jones’s position is unchallengeable. Integral to the Pauline concept of the one church is the notion of a Pauline commitment, confessed in worship, witness and life, to Jesus Christ as set forth in the Pauline Gospel.” Serving the People of God (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998), 36 cited in Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 96 (Italics is researcher’s emphasis).
197 Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 111: “…and the younger men closest to him [Martyn Lloyd-Jones] were often slow to accept a break with Packer because, unlike Lloyd-Jones, they had some personal indebtedness to him in the recovery of Reformed and Puritan beliefs. They could see that a division with Packer would weaken a unity of Calvinistic beliefs. But for Lloyd-Jones evangelical unity took a definite priority over that consideration and it was that unity which, he believed, had broken down at Keele.” (Italics, researcher’s).
198 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Christian Unity, 267.
199 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Knowing the Times, 254.
questions: “What is a Christian?”, “How can we get forgiveness of sins?” and “What is a church?” These questions are also what Martyn Lloyd-Jones primarily asked all the evangelicals at the assembly. “There are certain things to which we must address ourselves at once.”

Are we prepared to accept the challenge of the ecumenical movement and the time in which we live and say, Let’s start afresh. Let’s go back to the New Testament? … Let us say, then, Let’s start afresh, not merely modify what is already in existence, but start afresh and anew, and discover what the New Testament church is really meant to be. … What is the Christian church? That is the question.201

As for this primary matter of the Christian faith, the following illustration shows clearly what Lloyd-Jones’ point is. Alister McGrath sees the Roman Catholic Church as much closer to evangelical than ‘humanistic and secular unbelief’.202 However, Lloyd-Jones sees John Wesley as much closer to John Calvin than the Roman Catholic Church. They are evangelicals who believe “the essentials of the faith, the things that are essential to salvation”.204

Lloyd-Jones believes a certain irreducible minimum is required to be a Christian and in the church.

What then is this true doctrine? … the Scriptures as the infallible Word of God; our assertion of the unique deity of the Lord Jesus Christ—yes, His virgin birth; the miraculous and supernatural; His atoning, sacrificial, substitutionary death; His literal, physical resurrection; the person of the Holy Spirit and His work. These are the doctrines which are essential to salvation; there is the truth that is to be preached, the message which is the first of the true marks of the church. And a church, surely, is a gathering of people who are in covenant together because they believe these things. Not only do they believe them, but they are men and women who have experienced their power. They are men and women who are born again and born of the Spirit, and who give evidence of this in their daily life. Surely that is the evangelical view of the church.206

The last point shows that Martyn Lloyd-Jones saw this matter as so vital. To Lloyd-Jones, this matter was not only at the assembly in 1966 but it also was the main topic through his whole preaching ministry.

---

200 Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 48.
201 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Knowing the Times, 251,252.
202 McGrath, ‘Do We Still Need the Reformation?’, Christianity Today (12 December 1994), cited in Iain Murray, Evangelicalism Divided, 247.
203 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘What Is an Evangelical?’, in Knowing the Times, 352: “I am a Calvinist; I believe in election and predestination; but I would not dream of putting it under the heading of essential. … I do not for the reason that this, for me, is a matter of understanding. You are not saved by your precise understanding of how this great salvation comes to you.”
204 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Knowing the Times, 254.
205 Ibid.

Many of those are related to the topic of this thesis.

MLJ Trust provides Lloyd-Jones’ audio sermons and it is also possible to search his sermons by topics. Here are the topics related to Christian Unity and it is also seen how many times the topics were preached, out of 1,600 sermons: 513 RESULTS FOR CHRISTIANITY, 225 FOR CHURCH.

150 FOR DOCTRINE, 86 FOR TRUTH, 41 FOR ESSENTIAL, 18 FOR FUNDAMENTAL, 11 FOR VITAL.

36 FOR REGENERATION, 28 FOR CONVERSION.

13 FOR REFORM, 3 FOR PURITAN, 32 FOR EVANGELICAL, 19 FOR DIVISION.

7 FOR ROMAN CATHOLIC, 3 FOR LIBERALISM, 18 FOR SEPARATION.

8 FOR ECUMENISM, 16 FOR MOVEMENT.

D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones started his ministry as a preacher with the sermon, 1 Corinthians 2:2, ‘Jesus Christ and Him crucified’ early in 1927. In 1977, he came back to the church where he started his ministry and preached on the same text. It is remarkable that his message and its emphasis was exactly the same as what he preached in his early ministry.

What does that mean? It is not about his personal view but about the principle. It is a matter of the biblical principle and truth which is unchanging, so consistent. John Brencher first tried a critical approach of Martyn Lloyd-Jones in 1997. However, he gave an exceptional evaluation to Lloyd-Jones:

Given the theology of Lloyd-Jones, the idea of biblical unity which he advocated was a perfectly valid one and his disagreement with those who held a more syncretistic view of the church was not unexpected. ... Lloyd-Jones's doctrine and practice were so closely defined, at least in the essentials, that it left him no room for manoeuvre.

---

207 Iain Murray, Messenger of Grace, 209-25.
208 ‘For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified.’ (1Corinthians 2:2, ESV)
209 Iain Murray, Messenger of Grace, 199: “It was not that he had taken a sudden interest in church issues. Rather he was persuaded that compassion for souls required the protest he made against a policy that was compromising the truth. He was not against a ‘territorial church’ because, as a Welshman, he disliked an English institution, as has been said. He spoke against it because it is a deception to suppose entrance into the church of God is according to the country in which anyone happens to be born. In the same way his hostility to Roman Catholic teaching rested upon the way it presents false grounds of salvation to sinners. His concern that Protestantism was being lost was no bigotry. He grieved deeply that at a point in history, when the churches and the nation were in a state of mankind transition, there were so few safe guides to heaven.”
210 John Brencher, 166.
Though Brencher does not say whether Lloyd-Jones’ theology is biblical or not,\textsuperscript{211} he does admit \textit{its consistency} in theology. Bethan Lloyd-Jones once said ‘No one will ever understand my husband until they realise that he is first of all a man of prayer and then an evangelist.’\textsuperscript{212} Martyn Lloyd-Jones \textit{as an evangelist} explains how he has been consistent to the essential doctrines. Lloyd-Jones was very concerned about the matter of \textit{one’s salvation}. As an evangelist, Lloyd-Jones asks the same questions as Luther, which are vital: ‘\textit{How does one become a Christian?’} and ‘\textit{How does one get forgiveness of sins?’} \textsuperscript{213}

\textit{Martyn Lloyd-Jones as an evangelist} seems to be also \textit{the key to understanding his address} in 1966. The reason he gave the address was not to break the unity, but for dealing with the primary issue which is essential for salvation \textit{in an evangelist’s eyes}. Martyn Lloyd-Jones asked the fundamentally crucial questions: ‘\textit{What is a Christian?’}, ‘\textit{How can we get forgiveness of sins?’} and ‘\textit{What is a church?’}

\textsuperscript{211} Iain Murray, \textit{Evangelicalism Divided}, 196.
\textsuperscript{212} Iain Murray, \textit{The Life of Martyn Lloyd-Jones}, 321.
\textsuperscript{213} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, \textit{Unity in Truth}, 40.
5. CONCLUSION

Summary and Conclusion

There are a lot of misunderstandings regarding the incidents in 1966. The purpose of this thesis is to view the incidents correctly and with full understanding by following up Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ sermon, lecture and address on the subject of unity. It is found that his message was not spontaneous but rather conveyed the perspective which he had had for a long time.

What led him to speak the message? It was probably the atmosphere and context at that time when churches were moving towards unity with what Lloyd-Jones considered to be the wrong method. In other words, he was criticised for breaking evangelical unity, but he was not the one who broke the unity. It was the atmosphere between those trying to unify in this wrong method and evangelicalism. If the question was asked of Martyn Lloyd-Jones and if he was given the chance to make his 1966 address again, judging by his past messages and his character, he would give the same message.

Some complain that Martyn Lloyd-Jones did not have a specific blueprint. But evangelicals had not tried to unify, other than a vague deconstructive unification. Someone needed to show the way and Lloyd-Jones took on that role. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ church view is not peculiar: he followed the reformed protestant view. The real peculiarity is the corrupted evangelicalism atmosphere which sees the normal as peculiar. In other words, Martyn Lloyd-Jones pointed out that evangelicals should not act according to the spirit of the age but according to the teachings of the New Testament, and the spirit of the age needs to be determined by the standards of the New Testament.214

Therefore, the overall message of the address in 1966 is not just to ‘withdraw from the group’ but to go back to the New Testament and look closely at what the nature of the church is: the true marks of the church; the church, visible and invisible; who the Christian is - and then act accordingly. In other words, Lloyd-Jones appealed, ‘as evangelicals, let us not pursue the movement unity but pursue the evangelical unity’. It seemed that it was a bold act that no one dared try. His view of the church was not narrow or closed-minded but was broad; he did not support certain denominations. He did not oppose unity and he was in fact regarded as one actively insisting on unity. It is considered that he tried to unite the separated denominations as one, based upon the New Testament.

Today, there is no denial that denominations’ policies, directions and aims are important. However, belonging to a certain denomination or a local church does not guarantee a person’s faith is evangelical. Not all Roman Catholic believers are non-Christian or non-evangelical. Likewise, people who deny the fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith are neither evangelical nor truly Christian even if they belong to an evangelical group.

214 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Knowing the Times, 251.
Was this problem worth struggling with for about 30 years until retirement from the Westminster chapel? It connects with the subject he was emphasising in his books.

In other words, it was a matter of the salvation of sinners. The key to understanding Martyn Lloyd-Jones is that he was an evangelist and a man of prayer. This is crucial. The reason he took the unity problem very seriously is because he saw that unity was not a separate thing but consists of and colligates everything about Christianity. To Martyn Lloyd-Jones, the big issue was the same as what the protestant reformers, including H. Latimer and N. Ridley in the 16th century asked; what John Owen and Bunyan, in the 17th Century, Wesley and Whitefield in the 18th Century, C.H. Spurgeon and J.C. Ryle in the 19th century and J. Gresham Machen and Alan Stibbs and Gerald Bray in the 20th century also asked; and R.C. Sproul and Ligon Duncan in the 21st century also ask: ‘We should be asking: “What is a Christian?”’, “How can we get forgiveness of sins?” and “What is a church?”’

Martyn Lloyd-Jones, with all those mentioned above, believes a certain irreducible minimum, the very vitals and fundamentals of the faith, to be a Christian and to be in the church. What D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones emphasises on Christian Unity is doctrinal unity (Acts 2:42, John 17 and Ephesians 1-3) and Spiritual unity (Ephesians 4) as the Holy Spirit Himself creates this unity. Human beings cannot make, but can only try to maintain the unity which already exists between Christians. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, along with the others, builds the view of Christian unity on the basis of the Scripture, regarding it as the only authority. Finally, Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ view on evangelical unity can be summed up: unity in Truth.

215 Martyn Lloyd-Jones, Knowing the Times, 254.
APPENDIX 1

-List of the Sermons and Lectures related to the Topic

1.1. Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ Audio Sermons by MLJ Trust

The website\(^{216}\) provides 1,600 sermons and regarding to the topic ‘Unity’, 31 sermons are searched.

**EPHESIANS 2:19, CHRISTIAN UNITY**

**EPH 4:2-3, KEEPING THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT**

**ROMANS 12:4-5, ONE BODY**

**EPH 4:14-16, ACTIVITIES AND LIFE**

**EPH 2:20-22, BUILT TOGETHER BY THE HOLY SPIRIT**

**ROM 12:5-6, CHARACTER OF UNITY**

**EPH 2:20-22, AN HABITATION OF GOD**

**EPH 4:4-5, THE BODY OF CHRIST**

**EPH 4:6, ONE GOD**

**EPH 4:4-6, REVIVAL**

**EVANGELICAL UNITY: FROM THE EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE ANNUAL MEETING IN 1957(GIVEN BY FRANK COLQUHOUN AND MARTYN LLOYD-JONES)**


**ACTS 2:46-47, THE DIVIDED MAN**

**ROM 14:17, A SENSE OF BALANCE**

**GENESIS 16:17-18, THE POWER AND THE POSSIBILITIES**

**ROM 10:9-10, WHY CHRIST DIED**

**ROM 1:2, THE HOLY SCRIPTURES**

**ROM 12:3-5, THE BODY OF CHRIST**

**ROM 10:18-21, LEARNING THE LESSONS**

**ROM 1:2, THE HOLY SCRIPTURES**

**LUKE 24:25-27, A PICTURE OF THE CHURCH**

**ROM 12:19-20, GOD’S WRATH, NOT MAN’S**

---

\(^{216}\) [https://www.mljtrust.org](https://www.mljtrust.org)
1.2. An Analysis of Lloyd-Jones’ Expositions of Ephesians by Iain Murray

He gives the Keywords for the sermons.\(^{218}\)

**Keyword: ‘Unity’**

2:19, ‘Christian Unity’

4:2-3, ‘Keeping the Unity of the Spirit’

4:4-5, ‘The Body of Christ’

‘One …’

4:4-6, (One) ‘Holy Spirit’

4:4, ‘One Hope’

4:5, ‘One Lord’

4:5, ‘One Faith’

4:5, ‘One Baptism’

4:6, ‘One God’

‘Speaking …’

4:15, ‘Speaking the Truth in Love’

‘Human Energy’

4:16, ‘Activities and Life’

‘Schism’/‘Division’

6:10-13, ‘Schism in the Church’ (1)

6:10-13, ‘Schism in the Church’ (2)

---

\(^{217}\) Iain Murray, *Messenger of Grace*, 252.

\(^{218}\) Ibid, 246-55.
1.3. The three books: *Knowing the time* (1942-77); *The Puritans* (1959-78); and *Unity in Truth* (1967-79), regarding to the topic.

Here are the lectures which should be listed. The list of Martyn Lloyd-Jones’ sermon series, preached in the 1950s and 1960s shows that his 1966 address is not an independent one but part of a series of what Lloyd-Jones had often said and emphasised relating to the topic.

1952-MAINTAINING THE EVANGELICAL FAITH TODAY (*Knowing the times*)
1954-A POLICY APPROPRIATE TO BIBLICAL FAITH (*Knowing the times*)
1960-REMEMBERING THE REFORMATION (*Knowing the times*)
1961-HOW CAN WE SEE A RETURN TO THE BIBLE? (*Knowing the times*)
1962(JUN)-THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY (*Knowing the times*)
1962-PURITANS PERPLEXITIES-SOME LESSONS FROM 1640-1662 (*The Puritans*) “SHOULD BE READ ALONG ‘FROM PURITANISM TO NON-CONFORMITY’” (*The Evangelical Library Lecture for 1962*)
1963(JUN)-‘CONSIDER YOUR WAYS’: THE OUTLINE OF A NEW STRATEGY (*Knowing the times*)
1963-JOHN OWEN ON SCHISM (*The Puritans*)
1964-THE WEAPONS OF OUR WARFARE (*Knowing the times*)
1965-ECCLESIOA IN ECCLESIAS (*The Puritans*)
1966*-EVANGELICAL UNITY: AN APPEAL (*Knowing the times*)
1967-LUTHER AND HIS MESSAGE FOR TODAY (*Unity in Truth*)
1968-WHAT IS THE CHURCH? (*Unity in Truth*)
1969-HOW TO SAFEGUARD THE FUTURE (*Knowing the times*)
1969(OCT)-SOUND AN ALARM (*Unity in Truth*)
1970-THE MAYFLOWER PILGRIMS (*Unity in Truth*)
1970-WRONG DIVISIONS AND TRUE UNITY (*Unity in Truth*)
1971-WHAT IS AN EVANGELICAL? (*Knowing the times*)
1971(NOV)-THE STATE OF THE NATION ALARM (*Unity in Truth*)
1973-TRUE AND FALSE RELIGION (*Unity in Truth*)
1979-RENDER UNTO CAESAR (*Unity in Truth*)

---

219 Hywel Jones says, "’Puritans perplexities—Some lessons from 1640-1662’" in Hywel Jones (ed.), *Unity in Truth* Addresses given by Dr. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones at meeting held under the auspices of the British Evangelical Council (Durham: Evangelical Press, 1991), 14.
APPENDIX 2

-Memorandum-

(By the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students\textsuperscript{220}:)

The evangelical is one who believes that the Bible itself calls for a particular understanding of its nature and message. It declares itself to be a God-given revelation. It does not merely contain the Word of God, but it is the Word of God. This means that he takes the Bible as his source-book for understanding all other doctrines. Those to which evangelicals at all times have adhered with tenacity are:

(a) The biblical doctrine of man (based upon the historicity of the record in the opening chapters of Genesis) – including his special creation, the Fall, and his consequent state of sin (which is not merely a deficiency, but is active rebellion in heart and mind against God, and a state of pollution in his nature).

(b) The understanding of the death of Christ as being His own voluntary act whereby He offered himself as our Substitute to bear the penalty of our sins and to deliver us from the condemnation of the law and from the wrath of God.

(c) The absolute necessity of the work of the Holy Spirit to bring a man to conviction of sin, to repentance, to faith and to rebirth. Man can stand righteous in the sight of God only as he is ‘in Christ’ and justified through faith alone.

(d) The Church of Christ consists of those who in all ages have been, or are, in vital relationship with our Lord Jesus Christ as a result of the ‘new birth’. The New Testament itself recognises only two aspects of the Church:

(i) the whole company of all true believers in heaven and on earth

and

(ii) the local manifestation, which is the gathering in fellowship of those who are ‘in Christ’ and in the midst of whom, according to His promise, Christ is present, who is the only Lord and Head of the Church, the ‘fulness of Him that filleth all in all.’

-Our Beliefs-

(© 2014 IFES\textsuperscript{221})

\textsuperscript{220} Martyn Lloyd-Jones, ‘Maintaining the Evangelical Faith Today (1952)’, in Knowing the Times, 49.

\textsuperscript{221} https://www.ifesworld.org/en/our-beliefs
IFES is founded on the central truths of biblical Christianity as outlined in the IFES doctrinal basis. IFES is a non-denominational organisation that brings together Christians from all cultures, languages and Christian traditions. Every four years the IFES Fellowship meets at World Assembly to reaffirm their commitment to the biblical truths expressed in our doctrinal statement.

The IFES doctrinal basis shall be the central truths of Christianity, as revealed in Scripture, including:

- The unity of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit in the Godhead.
- The sovereignty of God in creation, revelation, redemption and final judgment.
- The divine inspiration and entire trustworthiness of Holy Scripture, as originally given, and its supreme authority in all matters of faith and conduct.
- The universal sinfulness and guilt of all people since the fall, rendering them subject to God's wrath and condemnation.
- Redemption from the guilt, penalty, dominion and pollution of sin, solely through the sacrificial death (as our representative and substitute) of the Lord Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God.
- The bodily resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ from the dead and his ascension to the right hand of God the Father.
- The presence and power of the Holy Spirit in the work of regeneration.
- The justification of the sinner by the grace of God through faith alone.
- The indwelling and work of the Holy Spirit in the believer.
- The one holy universal Church which is the body of Christ and to which all true believers belong.
- The expectation of the personal return of the Lord Jesus Christ.
APPENDIX 3

There were a number within the Church of England, albeit a beleaguered minority among the evangelical clergy, whose sympathies lay more with Lloyd-Jones and the Westminster Fellowship than with John Stott and the Church of England Evangelical Council. They resisted the post-Keele trends and some felt conscience-bound to resign their ministry in the national church. 222

Here are some sources that Andrew Atherstone used in his thesis ‘Lloyd-Jones and the Anglican Secession Crisis.’ 223

**Church of England Newspaper**


**English Churchman**


222 Atherstone and Ceri Jones (eds.), 292.


**Life of Faith**


Truth and Light: *All Saints Church, Leyton Parish Magazine* (July 1964), Waltham Forest Archives.


BEC *Newsletter*, no. 5 (July 1970).
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