

## ONE FAITH

---

**Thursday: One Faith – Plenary, September 1**  
**Rev. Dr. Ted A. Campbell**

Conference Video: <http://worldmethodistconference.com/wp-content/uploads/wmc2016-videos/Wmc16-thursconfplen-campbell-1.m4v>

I want to add my own word of welcome to Texas, my native state, to the area of Southeast Texas where I was raised, and to the great city of Houston.

Methodists, in fact, played a prominent role in the early history of the city of

Houston, so much so that a Catholic missionary priest, the Abbé Emmanuel Domenech, described Houston in 1837 in these words: [TR: I will read in English only. “Houston est une misérable petite ville composée d'une vingtaine de magasins de briques alignés et d'une centaine de cabanes de bois disséminées parmi les troncs d'arbres coupés. Elle est peuplée de méthodistes et surtout de fourmis.” [Houston is a wretched little town composed of about twenty shops, and a hundred huts, dispersed here and there, among trunks of felled trees. It is infested with methodists and ants.]<sup>1</sup>

There are a few more shops and homes now, but you may find that the last sentence about the ants and Methodists rings true, at least while the World Methodist Conference is meeting here. The Abbé Domenech probably did not consider Methodists as sharing “one Lord, one faith, one baptism” (Ephesians 4:5) with him, and the reverse would have been true of Texas Methodists in his age, who likely did not think of Catholics as sharing “one faith” with them. But many Methodists are left wondering today if we in fact share “one faith” even with each other. We aspire to unity as well as diversity, and we would like to believe that unity and diversity can coexist harmoniously. That’s the principle. But making it work today, developing a genuine sense of unity in the midst of our diversities, proves to be a much

more difficult task: for a city like Houston, for my denomination, **The United Methodist Church, and I’m sure for the World Methodist Conference and the World Methodist Council.** The basic principle had been stated by the Lutheran theologian Rupertus Meldenius during the period of inter-Christian bloodshed in Europe in the 1600s, [TR: I will read this only in English.] In necessariis unitas, in non-necessariis [in dubiis] libertas, in utrisque [in omnibus] caritas. In necessary matters unity, in non-necessary matters liberty, in both charity.<sup>2</sup> Many Christian leaders including Pope John XXIII have cited this common quotation.<sup>3</sup> The fact that Methodists frequently want to attribute it to John Wesley shows, I think, a kindred trend toward defining a few “necessary” matters and leaving other matters undefined on which strict unity is not necessary.<sup>4</sup> As many of you know, John Wesley’s sermon on a “Catholic Spirit” makes a similar distinction between “the main branches of Christian doctrine,” on the one hand, and “opinions” and “modes of worship,” on the other hand, on which unity was not necessary.<sup>5</sup> But the principle of “unity in essentials, diversity in non-essentials” has proven difficult at specific moments in the histories of Wesleyan and Methodist communities, and the present time is one of those moments. Who gets to define what is necessary and what is only an “opinion” or a “mode of worship” on which disagreement can be allowed? For example, when early American Methodists added a restriction in the General Rules—a restriction that forbade “the buying or selling the bodies and souls of men, women, or children with an intention to enslave them”—was this restriction a necessary point of unity or a non-essential matter on which difference could be allowed?<sup>6</sup> At another point in our history, was the teaching of entire sanctification as a “second definite act of grace,”

consciously experienced and testified by a believer, a necessary point of unity or a non-essential matter on which difference could be allowed? Today Methodists in Britain and in the United States and elsewhere are asking whether a particular practice in regard to the ordination of homosexual persons and clergy ordination to perform blessings of marriages between persons of the same sex are necessary points

of unity or non-essential matters on which difference can be allowed. It is an appropriate time, then, for the World Methodist Conference to consider our unity in “one Lord, one faith, [and] one baptism.” One of the challenges we face today is that we seem to be at the very verge of losing a huge range of ecumenical leadership and scholarship from the earlier decades of the twentieth century that explored and clarified many of the issues of unity in the faith. In recent decades scholarship has often “privileged diversity” to the point of overshadowing forms of unity discerned in earlier Faith and Order work. Historians today sometimes speak of mutually incomprehensible “christianities,” and theologians today often take it as a fact or a dogmatic principle that there has never been any unity in the faith, as if ecumenical advances and discoveries had never happened at all.<sup>7</sup>

It is also a time when the unity of my denomination, The United Methodist Church, is severely strained, probably to breaking point. Discerning unity in the faith will not be an easy matter today. What I can offer you as a historian and an elder [TR “elder” denoting the office of an elder or presbyter in the church: presbítero, prêtre?] are some insights about unity in the faith, insights that come from listening to our ancestors in the faith, from listening to Wesleyan communities today, from listening to others: to other Christian communities and perhaps to some interesting persons who have only recently become Wesleyan Christians and who may be gifted with privileged insights into our unity in the faith. But I intend not only to offer you my insights. I also intend to issue a call to you for help in the situation of my church today.

#### A. Listening to the Ancestors

First, we listen to our ancestors in the faith to discern our unity in the faith. We listen to the ancient scriptures, the ancient creeds, and the liturgies that our ancestors in the faith consistently recited as the core of their faith. Listen to how John Wesley himself listened to his ancestors in the faith. He wrote:

From a child I was taught to love and reverence the Scripture, the oracles of God; and, next to these, to esteem the primitive Fathers, the writers of the three first centuries. Next after the primitive church, I esteemed our own, the Church of England, as the most scriptural national Church in the world.<sup>8</sup> Discerning our unity in the faith has to begin, as Christian leaders and reformers in past ages have consistently done, by returning ad fontes, “to the sources” of our common faith. Here is a treasure of ancient wisdom reported in the New Testament, but reported as coming from the time before the New Testament itself was written down: For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures... (I Corinthians 15:3-4, NRSV). Encapsulated in a formula indicating the transmission of an oral text, Paul appealed to what he knew, and what he believed the Corinthians would recognize, as the “gospel” or “good news” about Jesus Christ, the gospel that had been preached or proclaimed even before the New Testament itself was written down.<sup>9</sup> If we’re going to listen to our ancestors in the faith, this is a good place to start.

Martin Luther wrote in one of his famous Ninety-Five Theses that “The true treasure of the Church is the most holy gospel of the glory and grace of God.”<sup>10</sup> The gospel message focuses on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. There is no more basic teaching or doctrine for historic Christian communities. The narrative of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ became the heart of the historic creeds, the consistent focus of Christian preaching and training in the faith, the center of annual Christian celebrations from Advent to Christmas to Epiphany to Lent to Easter.<sup>11</sup> We baptize new Christians into the death and resurrection of Christ (Romans 6:3-4), and in the Lord’s Supper we “proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes” (I Corinthians 11:26). The gospel is not merely a summary of the New Testament: the gospel existed before the New Testament, as the New Testament testifies: St Peter proclaimed the message about Jesus Christ on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:14-36); St Paul recited (“handed on”) to the Corinthians the gospel message he had “received” and which he presumed the Corinthians had already received (I Corinthians 15:1 and 3). The gospel message itself structured the canon of the New Testament as our ancestors in the faith rejected writings that did not proclaim the literal, human reality of Jesus Christ, and rejected writings that did not maintain that Christ’s work was “according to the [Jewish] scriptures” (I Corinthians 15:3-4).<sup>12</sup> The gospel remains the key to interpreting the New Testament and

the Christian faith. Our unity in “one faith” is grounded in the gospel. Now at some points John Wesley represented the basic Christian message in a slightly different way than this. He did not in any way deny the basic message about Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, but in his Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament, commenting on Romans 12:6, Wesley wrote that the Bible should be interpreted according to “that grand scheme of doctrine which is delivered therein, touching original sin, justification by faith, and present, inward salvation.”<sup>13</sup> That is to say, he could represent the most basic Christian message as having to do with what he called elsewhere “the way of salvation” that embraced some of the most distinctive Methodist teachings: universally available prevenient grace, the possibility of a personally experienced assurance of divine pardon, and the pursuit of entire sanctification.<sup>14</sup> This is important because a particular phrase in Romans 12:6, the phrase “the proportion of faith” or “the analogy of faith” (τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως), had become a coded phrase among theologians for whatever gives the general sense of the Bible as a whole. Many theologians favored the sense of the gospel as the objective message about the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ as the central message that gives meaning to the whole of scripture.<sup>15</sup> In this passage, Wesley pointed to the message about what Christ has accomplished for us, including the elements of the “way of salvation,” as the key to the meaning of the Bible as a whole.<sup>16</sup> These two senses of what is at the heart of Christian scripture are not exclusive. Most Christian communities want to see both the objective message about Christ’s work and the subjective message about Christ’s work for us at the center of our shared or common faith. But they do alert us to what Wesleyan communities are likely to see as the more distinctive contribution of their own tradition, namely, the consideration of the work of Christ on our behalf as it is worked out in the experience of Christians. What is the heart of the Christian faith? Listen to our ancestors. The scriptures, the historic creeds, the historic liturgies all point to Christ. As Frederick Morley wrote for the World Council of Churches Evanston Assembly in 1954: Though creeds and tongues may differ, they speak, O Christ, of thee; and in thy loving spirit we shall one people be.<sup>17</sup> We listen to our ancestors in the faith.

## B. Listening to Contemporary Wesleyan Communities

We listen to our ancestors to discern our unity in the faith. But we should also pay attention to Wesleyan communities today. That may seem perfectly obvious to you as representatives of Wesleyan denominations, but it presents a very significant problem at least for us in the United States and perhaps for Methodist folks elsewhere. The problem is that denominations and denominational labels like “Methodist” and “Presbyterian” do not engender the warm, fuzzy feelings of loyalty that they once prompted. And it’s not just denominations. Membership in voluntary civic organizations like Rotary and Civitan and Ruritan and Lions Clubs is at an all-time low in the USA. Even the numbers of children participating in scouting and sports leagues have dropped in the last decades in the United States, where there seems to be a widespread suspicion of institutions including such voluntary service organizations as well as traditional religious institutions. My parents’ generation, shaped by the global economic depression of the 1930s and the Second World War in the 1940s, knew intuitively that they needed to work together in organizations for mutual betterment. I am afraid that my generation and subsequent generations of Americans do not feel the urgency of working together in voluntary groups, especially those at the national level or at international levels. When I say that we have to pay attention to “Wesleyan communities,” then, I really mean the World Methodist Conference and the Wesleyan and Methodist denominations that comprise it. But despite this very widespread mistrust of voluntary organizations including traditional churches, we still need to pay attention to what our denominations say today—and what the World Methodist Conference says today—to discern our unity in the faith. No one else but these communities speaks for them as communities. When we pay attention to how Wesleyan denominations themselves express the core of Christian faith that unites us, we find a difference between British and American

patterns of affirmation reflected in churches organized by missions from these churches. The British Methodist Church states that it “rejoices in the inheritance of the apostolic faith and loyally accepts the

fundamental principles of the historic creeds and of the Protestant Reformation,” and states further that the “evangelical doctrines to which the preachers of the Methodist Church are pledged are contained in Wesley’s Notes on the New Testament and the first four volumes of his sermons.”<sup>18</sup> Churches that follow the British pattern, such as the Methodist Church Nigeria, the Methodist Church of Ireland, the Methodist Church in the Caribbean and the Americas, and the Methodist Church of Southern Africa, have similar language. Churches of the American episcopal Methodist pattern, by contrast, have 25 specific Articles of Religion, 24 of which were derived by John Wesley himself from the 39 Articles of the Church of England, and these churches **have historically not** had explicit reference to Wesley’s Sermons and Notes. A reference to these standards was added in the Discipline of The United Methodist Church in 1988, but its constitutional status has been contested. We might say, then, that the British Methodist Church and churches patterned after it have been a bit vague about the inheritance of ancient and Reformation teachings, and considerably more specific about the “evangelical doctrines” contained in Wesley’s Sermons and Notes. American episcopal Methodist churches – African Methodist Episcopal, African Methodist Episcopal Zion, Christian Methodist Episcopal, and United Methodist – have been more specific about the ancient and Reformation doctrines expressed in the Articles of Religion and a bit vaguer about the evangelical teachings distinctive of the Wesleyan movement. Despite the vagaries on either side, there is little doubt about the intent of these historical doctrinal standards. In them, contemporary Wesleyan communities have listened to our ancestors in the faith by defining a small but rather consistent set of teachings inherited from the early Christian church, from the age of the Protestant Reformation, and from the Wesleyan movement. I might state these teachings in a summary form as follows. I’m going to give you a separate document as a hand-out **that** states these teachings in some more detail and gives doctrinal sources, but I would summarize **thirteen** teachings affirmed formally by Wesleyan and Methodist churches as follows.

Doctrines from the Ancient Christian Church:

Doctrine about the divine Trinity.

Doctrine about the complete humanity and complete divinity of Jesus Christ united in one divine Person.

Doctrines from the Protestant Reformation:

Doctrine about the sufficiency and primary authority of sacred scripture.

Doctrine about original righteousness and original sin.

Doctrine about justification by faith alone and by grace alone.

Doctrine about the church.

Doctrine about sacraments.

Doctrine about the practice of baptism.

Doctrine about the practice of the Lord’s Supper.

Doctrines from the Wesleyan Movement:

Doctrine about religious experience.

Doctrine about the universal availability of prevenient grace.

Doctrine about affective faith and the assurance of pardon.

Doctrine about entire sanctification.

I need to make a couple of comments about this list. This list is based on the most formally affirmed teachings of contemporary Wesleyan communities. It doesn’t include something you might expect to find here like the widespread practice of “open communion,” because this teaching emerged organically from Methodist practices in the 1800s, and it is affirmed in our liturgies that do not make denominational or congregational requirements for communion, but to my knowledge it has not yet been formally incorporated into the doctrinal statements of Wesleyan churches. I think it should be, it’s part of the wisdom we have discerned in the last century or so. This list does not really account for teachings specific to particular denominations, like the affirmation of a quadrilateral of authorities (scripture, tradition, experience, and reason) in The United Methodist Church, though I’d have to note that the idea of the

quadrilateral of authorities has gained some adherents beyond The United Methodist Church, and a version of it appears in the World Methodist Conference's statement of "Wesleyan Essentials of Christian Faith." This list reflects commonly affirmed doctrinal sources like the Articles of Religion affirmed by American episcopal Methodist churches and the Wesleyan Sermons and Notes affirmed by the British Methodist Church and churches that follow its pattern of doctrinal affirmation. But these teachings are very consistent with what I have found, in my broader research, to be teachings affirmed not only formally by Wesleyan churches, but also consistently affirmed in Methodist popular literature like denominational newspapers and magazines, in popular hymns and songs favored by Methodists, and in the personal testimonies of Methodist people.<sup>19</sup> We listen to our ancestors, and we listen to contemporary Wesleyan communities, and we find strong resonances between them. We find contemporary Wesleyan communities transmitting the voices of our ancestors.

### C. Listening to Others

We listen to our ancestors, and we listen to contemporary Wesleyan communities. We also need to listen to others. We need to listen to other Christian communities. For one thing, as the Ecumenical Movement has taught us repeatedly, we need to listen to other Christian communities to avoid repeating the misleading stuff about them that we have too often repeated in the past. There's a long litany of ecumenical misunderstandings that are easily put to rest simply by being in the honest presence of other Christians. I mean ideas like these: that Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Christians worship saints, that Catholics believe that we are saved by good works and not by grace and faith, or that Anglicans believe that if you don't maintain an unbroken succession of bishops from the apostles, the ministries and sacraments of your church are invalid. It was illuminating, on this last point, to be in the presence of Rev. Paul Avis, the Chief Ecumenical Officer of the Church of England, and to hear him say to a group of Methodists in 2008 that neither the Church of England nor any other Anglican body has ever passed any judgment on the ministries and sacraments of other churches, and in fact have always treated other churches as "sister churches." The views that Methodists feared, and sometimes presumed were true of all Anglicans, turn out to be the views of a minority of Anglicans and do not in fact reflect the formally expressed teachings of Anglican churches. In many cases, what we have represented other churches as saying does not comport with what they themselves have historically claimed. But we need to listen to other churches not just to learn about them. We need to listen to them because they often have perspectives for us. In the time of John Wesley, for example, it was believed that the so-called Apostles' Creed was a nearly universal Christian creed. We know now that it really was not universal, and the voice of Eastern Orthodox Christian churches in ecumenical gatherings since the early twentieth century have made us aware that the Apostles' Creed has not been used in Eastern Christian churches, and only the Nicene Creed in the later received form that they call the "Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed" can claim to be the most universal of Christian creeds. And they mean, of course, the Nicene Creed without the filioque clause that had been inserted in the creed by medieval popes. John Wesley's revision of the Book of Common Prayer, The Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America (1784), had omitted the Nicene Creed from the service for the Lord's Supper and had omitted the Anglican Article of Religion affirming the "Three Creeds" (the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, and the so-called Athanasian Creed), and this left American Methodists without a liturgical affirmation of the Nicene Creed. Wesley probably thought it wasn't that important. But in the wake of ecumenical insights, it is important now. We need to listen to other churches. Evangelical and Pentecostal churches have insights about us that are sometimes critical and sometimes appreciative, and we can learn from them. The recently deceased Argentinian Methodist theologian José Miguez Bonino became particularly fascinated with Holiness and Pentecostal churches in Central and South America, their historic connections to Methodist churches, and the ways in which they embody a Wesleyan form of ministry among the poor today. We have some things to

learn. Ancient Christian churches have a wealth of wisdom on how church cultures can be transmitted across generations, across languages and cultures, and across remarkably long stretches of human history. We have some things to learn. And then we may have some things to learn from those who have only recently navigated their way between other churches and Wesleyan churches. It occurs to me that they might have really interesting insights for us. If you grow up as a Methodist, as I did, and you remain a Methodist, as I did, you really can develop a kind of Methodist myopia, a nearsightedness that can blind us to some of the wonderful things about the Wesleyan way of being Christian. As a Wesleyan scholar, I am aware of a very large number of scholars who grew up in other Christian traditions and have decided to become Methodists—in The United Methodist Church and in the African Methodist Episcopal Church and in other groups. Wouldn't it be interesting to put them in a hotel meeting room, mix and stir, and see what comes out? I mean to ask them what they see, what attracted them, when many of us see a stale vision of political infighting, of seemingly hopeless conflict. I saw a Canadian video report a few years ago about a group of young Baptists in Colombia who somehow found a book of John Wesley's writings, read this together, and decided to form a Methodist church all on their own. Wouldn't it be interesting to ask them what they see in the Wesleyan way of being Christian? Wouldn't it be interesting to ask them what gift of insight they bring to us?

Conclusion: A Call for Help

We listen to our ancestors, we listen to contemporary Wesleyan communities, and we listen to others. And through our listening, we ought to be able to discern our unity in the faith: "one Lord, one faith, one baptism" (Ephesians 4:5). We can discern, I believe, a core of historic teaching that have characterized Wesleyan communities from the time of the Wesleyan movement to now. I wish that could solve our problems now, but problems remain. It really does have to do with this matter of what is, in the words of Rupertus Meldeniun, "essential" and "non-essential" for our unity, what John Wesley described as "the main branches of Christian doctrine" on which we need to be "fixed as the sun in the heavens," and those "opinions" and "modes of worship" on which disagreement can be allowed. Another historic way of framing this is to ask what is strictly status confessionis, that is, what teachings and practices are utterly necessary for our unity in a Christian community, and those teachings and practices that do not have this status. These problems are not hypothetical. They take the form of real human beings. So let me tell you about a real human being, born in Louisiana, raised as a Methodist, very well educated, who became a successful attorney in Texas, participated actively in every Methodist church where he lived, eagerly participated in spiritual retreats, studied the scriptures, and prayed with a regularity that shames me and most of my fellow clergy. He felt a call to ministry, he came to our School of Theology, and he was our star student. Until he left, I didn't know he was homosexual. He never said anything about it and wouldn't have. He was not an outspoken advocate on the matter; his priorities were consistently spiritual and ministerial. He is as theologically orthodox and as spiritually committed as any Christian I know. He is not willing to hide his sexuality as Methodist leaders have done in the past. He's a very honest man and I think willing to be publicly accountable. I suppose he could be ordained in the British Methodist Church, and perhaps in the European Central Conferences of The United Methodist Church. But not here, and he realized finally that we don't have a place for him in the church he loves, The United Methodist Church in the United States. We don't. That's where we are as a church, and that is as humanly specific as I can be in describing the problem. Whether you like it or not, this matter of sexuality is now status confessionis. It is not a matter of "opinion" on which we are willing to allow debate, and when I say "we," I mean about a two-thirds consistent majority of people who represent us in United Methodist general conferences. So this matter now has the functional status of an "essential" or "necessary" teaching alongside the teachings of the ancient church and the Reformation and the Wesleyan movement as something that unites and divides us. It is not enough to affirm together the teachings we have consistently held up in the past as our fundamental or essential beliefs. I remember a story from 1986 about an international conference on nuclear power at which a group of very worried Soviet nuclear scientists interrupted the proceedings with what they called a "hypothetical"

disaster scenario on which they sought the conference's advice. That of course was the Chernobyl disaster. And they needed help. Well here we are. If I am here to tell you what I can about historic doctrine that has been the core of our unity in the faith, I am also here to ask if the World Methodist Conference and the World Methodist Council can help. And as I have suggested, this is not a hypothetical scenario. The question at this point, I believe, is not whether we divide or not. That, I think, is a given now. Optimists think that the division will simply be into two church bodies and the very optimistic ones think that their group will be the larger and dominant group and the other group will be a small minority. But I'm not sure it's going to be two groups. Why should it be? If we're going to divide, why not find the group with which you really want to identify yourself? And I hope it's not two, because I can't envision a scenario of two in which I myself would have a place, at least, where I would have a comfortable place. The question now seems not to be whether we divide; when an Annual Conference declares that it will not follow the law of the church, I think that's a division. It may not be on the level of Chernobyl, but it's a heartbreaking scenario for those who love our church and remain deeply committed to its unity within the body of Christ. "Come over to Macedonia," or at least to Houston, "and help us" (Acts 16:9). Can the World Methodist Conference and the World Methodist Council help us? I hate to put it like this, but the question now might be whether we can divide well, or as well as possible. Are there ways for Methodist church bodies to divide that will minimize the distractions to mission that so often accompany divisions? That will allow more easily for future unities? That will perhaps create new unities even at the points of division? Can we divide in ways that keep us somehow responsible to our Wesleyan and ecumenical partners? Our past, at least in the United States, is not entirely reassuring on this matter of whether we could divide well. The World Methodist Conference would likely prefer to say, "Don't divide." You may say so. But my sense—and it is my very fallible sense—is that the divisions are already happening here. And so, although no one in my church has authorized me to ask you, I ask for your prayers, for your counsel, and for your help. But for my part I also pray, sisters and brothers, that you enjoy this Conference, this city (despite the ants—and the Methodists!), and this time of renewal. "Meanwhile the church throughout Judea, Galilee, and Samaria had peace and was built up" (Acts 9:31). May almighty God make it so in our time, even if for a lovely, fleeting moment.

#### ENDNOTES

- 1 Abbé Emmanuel-Henri-Dieudonné Domenech, *Journal d'un missionnaire au Texas et au Mexique* (Paris: Gaume Frères, 1857), 28; English translation in *Missionary Adventures in Texas and Mexico: A Personal Narrative of Six Years' Sojourn in Those Regions* (London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1858), 25.)
- 2 The attribution to Meldenius and various forms of the text are given in an extended note in Philip Schaff's *History of the Christian Church* (7 vols.; New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1882-1910), 6:650-653; the English is my own translation.
- 3 John XXIII, encyclical letter *Ad Petri Cathedram*, the conclusion of section III; in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 51:10 (22 July 1959), 513.)
- 4 Ted A. Campbell, *Wesleyan Beliefs: Formal and Popular Expressions of the Core Beliefs of Wesleyan Communities* (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 2010), 7.
- 5 John Wesley, sermon on a "Catholic Spirit," III:1; in Albert C. Outler, ed., *Sermons* (4 vols.; Bicentennial Edition of the Works of John Wesley; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1984-197), 2:93.
- 6 This restriction was added in 1789 in *The Doctrines and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*; see the discussion in Rupert E. Davies, ed., *The Methodist Societies: History, Nature and Design* (Bicentennial Edition of the Works of John Wesley, volume 9; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1989), 70- 71, note 11.)
- 7 David H. Kelsey, *To Understand God Truly: What's Theological about a Theological School* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), p. 33: "There is no one 'core' or 'basic' or 'essential' material theme or doctrine, nor any one pattern of them, that is the Christian thing. The generally accepted conclusion of historical studies is that there never has been. There is not even a past, perhaps originating, 'essential' or

'core' construal of the Christian thing from which Christians have departed in different ways and to which they might return."

8 John Wesley, "Farther Thoughts on Separation from the Church," in Jackson, ed., *Works*, 13:272.

9 Ted A. Campbell, *The Gospel in Christian Traditions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 14-19.

10 Martin Luther, *Ninety-Five Theses on Indulgences*; in *D. Martin Luthers Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1926), 1:236. English language translation in Helmut T. Lehman, general editor, *Luther's Works* (55 vols.; Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1960), 19:31.

11 Campbell, *Gospel in Christian Traditions*, 19-24, 32-39, 46-49.

12 *Ibid.*, 24-28.

13 John Wesley, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*, comment on Romans 12:6 (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, and London: Epworth Press, 1950), 569-70.

14 Campbell, *Wesleyan Beliefs*, 73-84.

15 The Reformed theologian Guillaume du Buc (Bucanus) of Lausanne asserted that the analogy of faith meant "the constant and unchanging sense of Scripture expounded in open [or "clear," *apertis*] passages of Scripture and agreeing with the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer." In Guillaume du Buc (Bucanus), *Institutiones Theologicae seu Locorum Communium Christianae Religionis ex Dei Verbo et Praestantissimum Theologorum Orthodoxo Consensu Expositorum Analysis* (Geneva, 1609), 4:21-24; cited in Heinrich Heppe, *Reformierte Dogmatik* (Kreis Moers: Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins, 1935), 30 (in footnote); English translation as given in Ernst Bizer, ed., and G. T. Thompson, tr., *Reformed Dogmatics: Set Out and Illustrated from the Sources* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1950), 35. In the English translation the material from du Buc has been moved to the main text. Cf. Scott J. Jones, *John Wesley's Conception and Use of Scripture* (Nashville: Kingswood Books, 1998), 45-46.

16 The distinction is similar to that which Karl Barth drew between *fides quae creditur*, "the faith that is believed," and *fides quā creditur*, "the faith by which [something] is believed"; in *Dogmatics in Outline* (tr. G. T. Thompson; New York: Harper and Row, 1956), chapter 2, 15-21.

17 Hymn by Frederick B. Morley commissioned by the Hymn Society of America for the 1954 Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Evanston, Illinois; in *United Methodist Hymnal*, no. 547.

18 *Constitutional Practice and Discipline of the Methodist Church* (2013), *The Deed of Union*, Section 2, "Purposes and Doctrine," 213; on the interpretation of the constitution of the Methodist Church in the UK, cf. A. Raymond George, "Foundational Documents of the Faith: IX. Methodist Statements" in *Expository Times* 91 (June 1980), 260.

19 Campbell, *Wesleyan Beliefs*, *passim* and especially chapter 7, "Fourteen Core Beliefs of Wesleyan Communities," 203-247.