

---

# The Case for a Believers' Church

---

by George A. Turner

What is the Church of Jesus Christ? Is it a building? Is it a group of believers in Jesus as Saviour and Lord? Does it consist of all who prefer to be named as Christians, rather than adherents of another religion or no religion? Is it limited to those, known or unknown, "whose names are in the Lamb's Book of Life"? Often the issue is between the State Church and the Free Churches, i.e., those supported by voluntary association of adherents. In the United States of America free churches are taken for granted. But in these churches there is an increasing recognition of the important distinction between those who claim to have been "born again" and those who are on the membership roll of some denomination. Today even the news media distinguish between Christians and "born-again evangelical Christians." In this essay, focus is on the issue of how important it is that one have the *assurance* of sins forgiven and the witness of the Spirit to one's regeneration in order to qualify for membership. Involved in this discussion historically and theologically are the peripheral questions of participation in the sacraments, separation of Church and State, and individual conscience. Let us consult the Scriptures and then follow the theme through history to the present.

## The Old Testament Witness

The theme of the *individual* participation in the covenant, as distinct from family or tribal membership, is seen in the patriarchs. Both Abel and Cain had the same parents, but one was acceptable to Jahweh and the other not, based upon the individual's worship pattern. In the case of Abraham, he was called, as an individual, to

---

*Dr. George A. Turner is Professor of Biblical Literature Emeritus at Asbury Theological Seminary, where he served for 34 years. He is a graduate of Greenville College, Greenville College School of Religion, Biblical Seminary in New York, and Harvard University.*

leave his tribe and kindred; this called for separation from home and a faith-response to the divine initiative (Genesis 12). Hence Abraham is “father of the faithful.” As with Adam, not all of his children were included in the same covenant relationship. The doctrine of election is prominent here, but it is relevant to service rather than to final salvation. Cain, Ishmael and Esau were not foreordained to perdition, even though not given the same covenant-relationship. In subsequent Old Testament history, God’s plan was carried on through “charismatic leaders,” i.e., those who responded to God’s initiative, rather than “birthright” persons. Thus, Samuel, rather than sons of Eli, fulfilled the divine purpose; David was preferred to Jesse’s first-born. Solomon, rather than David’s firstborn, was God’s choice. Thus the Lord paid little attention to normal protocol and human mores in his operations; he worked through individuals, within the family, more than through the family as a social unit.

During the kingdom period it became increasingly evident that God’s purpose would be achieved, if at all, not through the nation of Israel, among the nations, not through the tribe of Judah, among the twelve tribes, but rather through the righteous Remnant within the tribe. This theme came to the front in Isaiah especially (Isaiah 6:12,13; 11:11-16; 27:12,13; 40:31; 41:8-10; cf., Jeremiah 31:33; Ezekiel 36:25-27; 37:11-14). It was the remnant which survived the destruction of the Kingdom of Judah; and it was the remnant among the Exiles who later decided to return to their homeland. No longer was participation in the covenant relationship a routine manner of parentage. It involved a personal decision to leave the relative security of Babylonia and to face the unseen dangers of a pilgrimage back to the land promised to Abraham. Thus the little group of returnees consisted of those who freely chose that alternative; they were a remnant of the Remnant. Thus, in the Old Testament God did not accommodate himself to local folk-ways and mores, but worked through *responsive individuals* in an unconventional manner, using laymen, minors, and women, instead of the “proper authorities.”

### **The New Testament Profile**

Most of the citizens of Judea and Galilee, at the time of John the Baptist, assumed that if they could trace their lineage to Abraham, they were, for that reason, children of the Kingdom. John preached otherwise. Said he, “Do not presume to tell yourselves, ‘We have Abraham for our father,’ because, I tell you, God will raise children

## *The Case for a Believers' Church*

for Abraham from these stones” (Matthew 3:9 JB). Repentance, faith and obedience were the conditions for participation in the Kingdom of God; a personal response was demanded. Jesus preached the same message as reported in John (1:12,13; 3:3-8; 8:33-44; I John 3:9). The true children of Abraham are not necessarily those of Abrahamic ancestry, but rather those who respond to God’s messenger-messiah, in trust and obedience. Jesus went even farther. To indicate that membership in a Christian family is not enough, Jesus went so far as to say that being a Christian involves a personal decision, independent of family ties. Said Jesus to those who called attention to his own mother and brothers, “Anyone who does the will of God, that person is my brother and sister and mother” (Mark 3:31-35 JB). Often discipleship involves separation from kindred (Matthew 10:34-39). To those who based their hope of eternal life on their descent from Abraham, Jesus said that some non-Israelites who have no connection with Abraham would fare better than many who do: “ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob, . . . in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out. And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God” (Luke 13:28,29 KJV). The same idea is implicit in Jesus’ statement to disobedient descendants of Abraham: “Tax collectors and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you” (Matthew 21:31 RSV).

The new covenant stresses even more than the old covenant that salvation is given on the basis of individual repentance and faith — the “new birth” — rather than from an inheritance from one’s ancestors or an act on the part of one’s parents (John 1:13); one becomes a Christian as a result of a faith-response to an act of God through Christ. This change of emphasis was anticipated in Jeremiah (31:31) and in Ezekiel (18:5-24).

How is the Christian church described in the New Testament? Christians are described as “those of the Way” (Acts 9:2; 10:17; 18:26; 19:9; 19:23; 24:14). Another metaphor likens them to pilgrims in search of a better country (Hebrews 11:8,10,13,14,16; 12:1 cf. I Peter 2:11). Elsewhere Christians are seen as “lights” in the world (Matthew 5:14; Luke 16:8; Philippians 2:14; Ephesians 5:8; Philippians 2:14). Christians constitute “the household of God” (Matthew 10:25; Mark 3:34,35; Galatians 6:10; Ephesians 2:19 cf. Romans 16:10; I Corinthians 1:16; Philippians 4:22; 2 Timothy 4:19). The church is viewed as a new creation (2 Corinthians 5:17; James

1:18) of God. The church is also likened to salt (Matthew 5:13), leaven (Matthew 13:33), sheep (John 10:3-16,26; 21:15-17; cf. I Peter 5:2-4), a tree (Romans 11:16-24), fish (Matthew 13:48), a building (Ephesians 2:21; I Peter 2:5), a vine (John 15:1-8), and a body (I Corinthians 12:12-27) — images designed to show both the nature of the church and also its relationship to the environment. Instead of describing the church in abstract terms, a series of analogies is provided — word pictures designed to show the essential and unique nature of the church of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

How can it be formulated in language which defines the essential nature and being of the church? This is not so simple as it might seem, as is proven by the attempts through the centuries to do so. These designations include, “the soul of the universe (Epistle to Diognetus), the “ark” (Bishop Cyprian), a “third race” (Adolph Harnack), a congregation “where the word of God is faithfully preached and the sacraments duly administered” (the Reformers).

### **The “Radical Reformers”**

The Anabaptists’ view of the Church differed as much from the Reformers’ view as the latter did from the Roman Catholics’ view. For those of the “radical Reformation”, the church was viewed as a fellowship of those whose lives had been transformed by the Spirit of Christ as a result of repentance, faith and obedience.<sup>2</sup> Both the Catholics and the Reformers (Zwingli, Luther and Calvin) believed in the state-church and infant baptism. The Anabaptists, and those who shared their views, believed in a free church, separate from the state, each congregation of believers being a part of Christ’s “body” or church. Consistent with this view they reserved baptism to those candidates who were sufficiently mature to repent and believe. But the main thrust was the nature of the church; their view of baptism as a subordinate issue despite the label by which they were recognized.

The Reformers sought a *reformatio*, the Anabaptists a *restitutio*.<sup>3</sup> The “new birth” in Christ differed from the Roman Catholic work-righteousness and from the Lutheran *sola fides* (*Ibid.*, p. 77).

“The real issue was the restitution of a vigorous congregational life as it was thought to have been lived in apostolic times.” Baptism limited to mature candidates was a means to that end.<sup>4</sup>

In their efforts to defend infant baptism the Reformers turned to I Corinthians 10:2: “they were all baptized into Moses”. The

## *The Case for a Believers' Church*

Anabaptists appealed to Luke 18:16: "Let the little children come to me . . . of such is the kingdom of God". They believed that Christ's sacrifice effaced the effects of Original Sin until they were old enough to tell right from wrong, hence baptism had no relevance to Original Sin.

The Anabaptists insisted that only a candidate who can make a personal moral decision can give baptism its proper significance. They also linked it with the Great Commission (Matthew 28:18-20). Those who are baptized are commissioned to go and evangelize others. This the early "radical reformers" of those of the "restitution" did. They scattered, as did the early Christians, partly as a result of persecution, and partly because of evangelistic zeal. As they went they bore witness to their faith with such dedication and earnestness that multitudes were converted.

The assumption that baptism of infants in the new dispensation is continuous with circumcision under the old covenant is based upon only one verse in the New Testament: "You were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, . . . and you were buried with him in baptism. . . . And you, who were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God has made alive together with him . . ." (Colossians 2:11-13 RSV).

To argue from this metaphorical language that since infants were incorporated into the old covenant by circumcision (without their consent) baptism of infants is the new covenant equivalent, seems strained exegesis (or eisegesis) indeed. It seems equally tendentious to interpret "buried in baptism" (Romans 6) as indicating the only proper mode of water baptism.

Like many other situations in history, when a restitution of primitive Christianity occurred, the early Anabaptist vision faded. In northern Europe, the descendants of the early Anabaptists became affluent, proud, and complacent; they became "worldly." In the south, most migrated to rural areas in North and South America and became "enclaves of technological and cultural as well as religious primitivism." Both movements "lost in a large degree the creative tension, the eager expectancy, the catalytic effect upon Church and society which was the original genius of Anabaptism."<sup>5</sup>

What is a "Free Church"? As mentioned earlier, it is a church not supported by public taxation, as in north Europe, Russia, and the British Isles where church and state are linked. In the 16th century, the idea of a church separate from the state was anathema to both

Catholics and most Protestants. Among Lutherans, the state and church were linked in "Territorial Protestantism." The same was true among the Calvinists in Swiss Cantons, in Scotland, and in New England. It is still true in modern England. In the American Colonies, separation of church and state were the accepted policy only in Baptist Rhode Island and among the Quakers in Pennsylvania.<sup>6</sup> The result was "cultural Christianity" in which nominal Christianity prevailed rather than churches consisting of evangelical Christians, personally transformed by Christ. "The Church of England . . . enjoyed a reformation which penetrated the homes of individual members only with the generation of John Wesley."<sup>7</sup> The tension between the "people of the Lord" and "the world," so conspicuous in pages of the New Testament, is also present between church and state, and even between evangelical "born-again" Christians and those who are Christians in name only.

### **The "True Church"**

The Pietists on the Continent and the Puritans in England and English colonies considered themselves members of the true Church. This involved personal relationship to Christ, separation from the world, and cohesion among themselves. As stated by the Separatists of England and Holland:

The church is present where "Two or three faithful people do arise separating themselves from the world into the fellowship of the gospel, and to the covenant of Abraham. They are a church truly gathered . . . a house and temple of God rightly founded upon the doctrine of . . . Christ himself."<sup>8</sup>

This concept of a free church is quite distinct from the contemporary idea of self-styled "churches of a free spirit" which have no creed or discipline. The historical free churches were under the discipline of the Scriptures, the Holy Spirit, and the brotherhood, hence "the ban" among both Anabaptists and the early Methodists. In the societies of early Methodism, membership cards had only a six-month duration and the class leader served to discipline each member as to doctrine and life-style. Francis Asbury emphasized the importance of removing from the fellowship those members who departed from Christ and refused several entreaties to repent.<sup>9</sup>

## *The Case for a Believers' Church*

Evangelism and discipline are equally important in establishing and maintaining the true Church of Christ. The letters of Paul (I Corinthians 5) and John (2 John 6-11) confirm this judgment.

In this they followed the practice of the earliest Christians, the Waldensians of northern Italy, the Franciscans, the Lollards of England and the Hussites in Bohemia. The 16th century brethren made the Great Commission binding upon all believers. They anticipated the modern missionary movement by one hundred years. (The United Brethren [Moravians] launched their foreign missions about 1727 A.D.).

In their zeal they encountered persecution by those established churches who felt threatened by these “wandering” unordained, unlicensed lay witnesses. Anabaptist craftsmen often made more effective witnesses than those more educated and sophisticated; the common man often communicates more effectively to other common people. For the Anabaptists the church was a “voluntary association of committed pilgrims.” (Littell, *Anabaptist View*, p. 98.) These zealous brethren found themselves in the same situation as the primitive church of the New Testament. They appealed to Mark 16:15,16 (an abbreviated Great Commission), hence the sequence of (1) preaching, (2) faith, and (3) baptism. For them the true church was a fellowship of Christian pilgrims, missionaries, and martyrs. They were convinced that “many are called but few are chosen” (Matthew 22:14), that the way that leads to life is narrow (Matthew 7:14), and that only those who *do God's will* will enter the kingdom (Matthew 7:21-23). This zeal of the early Brethren “survived most vigorously” in those congregations where missionary activity was most stressed (*Ibid.*, p. 106).

### **The Nature of the Church in the Wesleyan Tradition**

An example of the tension between the national church and the free churches is seen in the ministry of John Wesley. Wesley never fully resolved this tension in his own thinking.

Like the Anabaptists in the 16th century and the Pietists in the 17th the Wesleys were convinced that the Evangelical revival they promoted was a *restitution* of primitive Christianity.<sup>10</sup> John Wesley was a conservative by tradition and inclination, but an innovative evangelical by divine grace.

For Wesley, as for many others, the church is both (1) any institution which originated with the apostles and is continued by an

ordained clergy who expound the Scriptures and administer the sacraments to “all who were made members by baptism,” and (2) “a fellowship of believers who shared both the apostolic experience of God’s living presence and also a desire to bring others into this same personal experience . . .”<sup>11</sup>

The Wesleyan strategy was to reform the Church from within, rather than initiate a rival denomination. His hand was forced by his rejection by his Church. But Wesley was not a “separatist” by choice; instead, “every inch of institutional loyalty reluctantly yielded at [as] the challenge of providential openings led to the demand for another yard” (Baker, p. 138). This led, for example, to field preaching, in which, to use his language, he made himself “more vile.” He learned that people are more important than buildings. Said he, “I did far more good . . . by preaching three days on my father’s tomb than I did by preaching three years in his pulpit” (*Letters*, II, 96).

That John Wesley in his early years was not only an Anglican but a High Churchman as well is the conclusion Wesley scholars are agreed upon. This is seen especially during his ministry in Georgia where he meticulously followed the rubrics of the Church of England. As chaplain in Georgia, he refused baptism to an infant unless the parents agreed to the “triune immersion” as specified in the Prayer Book of Edward VI (*Journal*, I, 167). The colonists suspected that he was a Roman Catholic at heart. Also he refused the validity of Baptism unless administered by “an episcopally ordained priest.” He refused to serve Communion to the Dissenter Richard Turner until Turner submitted to rebaptism at the hands of Wesley.<sup>12</sup> He also refused to serve Communion to the Moravian pastor Boltzius because the latter had not been baptized by a priest.<sup>13</sup>

Wesley’s view of Baptism is not easy to ascertain, but trends in his thinking can be discerned from an extreme High Church position, that baptism is essential to salvation, to a more moderate evangelical perspective. To what extent did his Aldersgate experience modify his view? In spite of the emphasis he placed upon this sacrament, it is strange that he never fully explained his view. In general, he was content to affirm the Anglican position. His *Treatise on Baptism*, published in 1756, gives little help because it was essentially a reprint of his father’s treatise of 1700 in which baptismal regeneration was taught. However John Wesley omitted from his father’s treatise the words “baptismal regeneration.” The benefits of this sacrament as seen by the Wesleys are several. (1) It is the means of entering into a

## *The Case for a Believers' Church*

covenant with God “as the Jews were admitted into the old covenant by circumcision.” The three Scripture references to support this conclusion (Psalms 111:9; Genesis 17:7,8; Ezekiel 36:26) are allusions only, with no attempt at proof, making it clear that it is tradition more than Scripture that led them to this linkage. (2) “By baptism we are admitted into the Church” said the Wesleys and cited St. Paul as evidence: “as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ” (Galatians 3:17).

(3) Baptism washes away “the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ’s death.” Here they appeal to the Ninth Article of the Anglican creed: “We are all born under the guilt of Adam’s sin, . . .” asserted by “the unanimous sense of the ancient Church.” Here Wesley alludes to Augustine over against Pelagious so it was hardly “unanimous.” He continues, “This plainly includes infants; for they too die; therefore have sinned: But not by actual sin; *therefore* by original.”<sup>14</sup> Again, by an appeal to “all the ancient Fathers” he continues, “It is certain, by God’s word, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin are saved” (*Works*, X, 191).

This view of the Wesleys’ is subject to criticism on two points: Original sin is viewed as including *guilt* (with Augustine and Roman Catholics) rather than propensity alone. Contrary to Augustine and the fathers, infants are *affected* by Adam’s sin but did not *participate* in Adam’s acts and hence are not *guilty*. Another question: did the Wesleys believe that the billions of infants who die without being baptized are without the benefits of Christ’s death? Apparently they did not face that question; they say only that such are the “extraordinary cases” (p.193).

(4) “By baptism we . . . are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our Church . . . ascribes to baptism . . . by water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is also called by the Apostle, the ‘washing of regeneration’ . . . Herein a principle of grace is infused, which will not be wholly taken away, unless we quench the Holy Spirit of God by long continued wickedness” (*Works*, X, 191,192).

Obviously the Wesleys believed, with Catholics and the Reformers, that the sacrament of baptism, *administered by clergymen*, coincided with the time when the Holy Spirit infused the infant and made him a member of the church of Christ; otherwise the child would not be saved. Thus baptism was in their view far more

than “the outward sign of an inward work of grace;” it was also the indispensable vehicle by which that grace was conveyed. This view is similar to that of Baptist groups, many of whom teach baptismal regeneration, except that the Anglicans and followers of Wesley administered it to infants as the condition of their salvation.

Wesley was most evangelical (closest to the New Testament) in the major areas: evangelism, spiritual life, discipline, and service. He was nearer the Anglo-Catholics in the area of ordination and the sacraments.

To unordained preachers who administered baptism Wesley chided (*Letters*, VII, 203,213), “I shall shortly be obliged to drop all the preachers who do not drop this. Christ has sent them not to baptize but to preach the gospel.” (thus quoting Paul out of context and ignoring the Great Commission of Jesus). About 1783 he wrote to John Hampson, “Whoever among us undertakes to baptize a child is *ipso facto* excluded from our connection.”<sup>15</sup> Meanwhile Francis Asbury reported that in his parishes, thousands of Methodists had unbaptized children and had not taken of the Lord’s Supper for many years. This situation obtained until after the War when Wesley was constrained to ordain Coke as “Superintendent” of Methodists in America. (Wesley objected to the use of the term “bishop”).<sup>16</sup>

In the essay which Wesley prepared for the Conference of 1755, entitled, “Ought We to Separate from the Church of England?”, he justified the refusal to let unordained persons administer the sacraments:

“None but the president or ruling presbyter ever administered the Lord’s Supper. Nor is there now any one Christian church under heaven, Greek, Latin, Lutheran, Calvinist, or any other, that affirms or allows every preacher as such to have the right of administering it.”<sup>17</sup>

Was Wesley unaware of Swiss brethren performing these functions two hundred years before? Did he think these groups were not the “true church”?

After careful examination of the evidence, Howard Snyder has concluded that Wesley stands firmly in the tradition of the “believers’ church” with some qualifications.<sup>18</sup> The areas in which he stands most unequivocally in this tradition are experience, evangelistic strategy, and the care of souls. He is with the sacerdotal tradition

## *The Case for a Believers' Church*

with reference to the pastoral ministry and the two sacraments of Protestantism.<sup>19</sup> Much of this is explained by the fact that he lived in the 18th rather than in the 16th century, and by the fact that he was not expelled from the Church of England. With reference to the ministry, he believed in two levels of ministry and based it upon the New Testament: the two being evangelists and teachers as the lower order, and elders and “superintendents” on the higher; only the latter could serve the sacraments, especially the Lord’s Supper. This principle compelled Wesley to insist that Methodists take the sacraments only in the Anglican Church. His preachers could not serve Communion because they were not ordained. This attitude he maintained in spite of the protest from his preachers and their congregations. Because the Methodists in America had no connection with the Anglican Church, he felt justified in ordaining “superintendents” for America and permitting them to serve the sacraments. He appealed constantly to the New Testament, but in the area of the sacraments he was influenced more by High Church Anglicanism than he was ready to acknowledge or, perhaps, even be aware.

What is the New Testament evidence for the belief that baptized infants join the covenant by choice, that their “guilt” is thereby removed, that they receive therein an infusion of divine grace and become “new creatures”? Does baptism do for them more than Christ’s atonement has already done?

Where is the New Testament evidence that the Lord’s Supper is invalid unless administered by those (men and women) who have been set apart by ordination? The real reason for Wesley’s view, other than church tradition, seems to have been the Old Testament insistence that only priests in the succession of Aaron could offer sacrifices, something that kings and prophets were not permitted to do. In this he ignored the New Testament teaching that all believers are a “kingdom of priests,” (I Peter 2:5,9; Revelation 1:6, 5:10), and also the Protestant principle of a “priesthood of all believers.”

### **Summary**

The “true church,” as seen in the Bible, consists of those whom God brings into a covenant-relation with himself by virtue of their response to his initiative. The trend is from an emphasis on the group (ethnic entity) in the Old Testament and to an emphasis on the individual in the New Testament. In the latter, the “church” consists

of those “holy ones” called out of their “worldly” associations of kindred and community into a new *ecclesia* created by Jesus Christ. Throughout history a tension has existed between those who are thus “called out” and “gathered”, and those whose claim to be Christians is based on only human associations.

For the two sacraments to have their greatest significance, the focus should be upon the New Testament. Baptism should be administered to those who repent and believe by evangelists as well as by “elders.”

The Eucharist is a feast of fellowship for believers, not (as with Wesley) an avenue for sinners to approach the throne of grace; it is also a memorial of Jesus’ death and an expression of confidence in his return (Mark 14:24,25; I Corinthians 11:24-26). The efficacy of the feast, as Wesley insisted, is dependent on one’s faith. Both sacraments are public testimonies to the participant’s relation to Christ as personal saviour and one’s separation from “the world.” Church members are “holy ones,” in the New Testament sense (Romans 1:7; I Corinthians 1:2), and membership in contemporary churches should reflect this distinction.

### Footnotes

<sup>1</sup>For an excellent survey see Paul S. Minear, *Images of the Church in the New Testament* (Westminster, 1960).

<sup>2</sup>Likewise John Wesley explaining Ephesians 4:3-6 in “Of the Church,” *Works*, VI, 392-401.

<sup>3</sup>F.H. Littell, *The Anabaptist View of the Church* (American Society of Church History, 1952) p. 74.

<sup>4</sup>Littell, *Ibid.*, p. 77.

<sup>5</sup>F.H. Littell, *Anabaptist View*, p. 112.

<sup>6</sup>In Roman Catholic Maryland toleration prevailed because the Catholics were not a majority.

<sup>7</sup>F.H. Littell, *The Free Church* (Boston: Starr King Press, 1957), p. 21. (Until 1880 no one could graduate from Oxford or Cambridge unless a member of the Church of England, p. 22).

<sup>8</sup>John Robinson, “A Justification of Separation from the Church of England” (1610), cited in Littell, *The Free Church*, p. 41.

<sup>9</sup>“We had collected twenty-seven persons in our little society when I first came, but I have been obliged to reduce them to fourteen . . . Unless the discipline of the church is enforced what sincere person would ever join a society, among whom they saw ungodliness connived at?” H.K. Carroll, ed., *The Francis Asbury Centenary Volume* (NY 1916), p. 61.

<sup>10</sup>See John Wesley, “The Character of a Methodist,” *Works* (London, 1872), VIII, pp. 339-347.

## *The Case for a Believers' Church*

- <sup>11</sup>Frank Baker, *John Wesley and the Church of England* (Abingdon, 1770), p. 137.
- <sup>12</sup>*A True and Historical Narrative of the Colony of Georgia* (1741) cited in L. Tyerman, *Life and Times of John Wesley* (London, 1876) I, 148.
- <sup>13</sup>John R. Parris, *John Wesley's Doctrine of the Sacraments* (London: Epworth, 1963), p. 26.
- <sup>14</sup>"Treatise on Baptism," *Works*, X, 190.
- <sup>15</sup>Cited in F. Baker, *John Wesley*, p. 257 (from an unpublished letter).
- <sup>16</sup>J. Duane Beals, "John Wesley's Concept of the Church," *W.T.J.* (Spring, 1974), p. 33.
- <sup>17</sup>F. Baker, *John Wesley*, p. 333.
- <sup>18</sup>Howard A. Snyder, "John Wesley and the Radical Protestant Tradition," *The Asbury Seminarian* (July, 1978), XXXIII, No. 3, pp. 32-34.
- <sup>19</sup>For an excellent analysis of Wesley's "unique" (if equivocal) position see J.R. Rigg, *The Churchmanship of John Wesley*, pp. 58-78.

## **Bibliography**

- Asbury Theological Seminary. *The New Testament Church*, Chapel messages by R.W. Lyon, W. T. Dayton, G.A. Turner and R.A. Traina. Wilmore, Kentucky: Seminary Press, 1969.
- Autton, Norman. *The Pastoral Care of the Dying*. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.
- Baker, Edwin. *The Responsible Church*. London: S.P.C.K., 1966.
- Bea, Cardinal A. *The Church and Mankind*, trans. James Brand. London: G. Chapman, 1967.
- Belgum, David R. *The Church and its Ministry*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
- Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *The Communion of Saints*. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Brow, Robert. *The Church: An Organic Picture of its Life and Mission*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Press, 1968.
- Bruce, F.F. "New Wine in Old Wine Skins: Part III. The Corner Stone," *Expository Times*, LXXXIV (May, 1973), 231-235.
- Brunner, Emil. *The Misunderstanding of the Church*, trans. Harold Knight. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951.
- Butler, Basil C. *The Idea of the Church*. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1962.
- Byrne, J.W. *Christian Education for the Local Church*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1963.
- Calver, Jean Y. *The Church and Social Justice*, trans. J.R. Kirwin. Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1961.
- Craig, Clarence T. *The One Church*. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1951.
- De Waal, Victor. *What is the Church?* London: S.C.M. Press, 1969.
- Diffendorfer, Ralph E. *The Church and the Community*. New York: Council of Women for Home Missions and Interchurch World Movement of North America, 1920.
- Fuerst, Wesley J. "Church Structure for the People of God," *Lutheran Quarterly*, XXIV (1972), 116-123.
- Gardner, Edward C. *The Church as a Prophetic Community*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.
- Girard, Robert. *Brethren, Hang Loose*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1972.

*The Asbury Seminarian*

- Greely, Andrew M. *The Church and the Suburbs*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959.
- Guardini, Romano. *The Church of the Lord*. Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1967.
- Gustafson, James M. *Treasure in Earthen Vessels*. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Hanson, James H. *What is the Church?* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961.
- Horn, Henry E. "The Future of Church Structures," *Lutheran Quarterly*, XXIV (1972), 124-133.
- Huss, John. *The Church*, trans. David S. Schoff D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915.
- Kinlaw, Dennis C. "The Human Future in the Church," *Religion in Life*, XLI (1972), 384-389.
- Kuen, Alfred. *I Will Build My Church*, trans. Ruby Lindblad. Chicago: Moody Press, 1971.
- Kuiper, Rienk B. *The Glorious Body of Christ*. London: The Banner of Truth, 1967.
- Kung, Hans. *The Church*, trans. Ray and Rosaleen Ockenden. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1968.
- MacGregor, Geddes. *Corpus Christi*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1958.
- McKelvey, R.J. *The New Temple*. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Miller, Donald G. *The Nature and Mission of the Church*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1957.
- Miller, R.C. *The Church and Organized Movements*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.
- Nee, Watchman. *The Normal Christian Church Life*. Washington, D.C.: International Student Library, 1962.
- Nelson, Carl Ellis. *Conscience, Theological and Psychological Perspectives*. Paramus, New Jersey: Paulist, 1973.
- Newbigin, James E. *The Household of God: Lectures on the Nature of the Church*. New York: Friendship Press, 1954.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.
- Nygren, Anders. *Christ and His Church*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.
- Obenhaus, Victor. *The Responsible Christian*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Palmer, William. *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*. London: J.G. and F. Rivington, 1838.
- Rismiller, Arthur P. *Older Members in the Congregation*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.
- Rogness, Michael. *The Church Nobody Knows*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1971.
- Schaller, Lyle E. *The Change Agent*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.
- Scott, Ernest F. *The Nature of the Early Church*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1941.
- Smyth, Charles H. *Church and Parish*. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- Stedman, Ray C. *Body Life*. Glendale, California: Regal, 1972.
- Thornton, Lionel S. *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*. London: Dacre Press, 1942.
- Trueblood, David E. *The Incendiary Fellowship*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

## *The Case for a Believers' Church*

- Trueblood, David E. *The Validity of the Christian Mission*. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Universal Christian Council for Life and Work. *The Nature and Function of the Church*. New York: Universal Christian Council, 194-?.
- Visser't Hooft, Willem A. *The Church and its Function in Society*. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Co., 1937.
- Wand, John W. *The Church, Its Nature, Structure and Function*. New York: Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1948.
- Warner, Daniel. *The Church of God: Or What is the Church, What is Not*. Moundsville, West Virginia: Gospel Trumpet Publishing Co., n.d.
- Webber, George W. *God's Colony in Man's World*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Whale, John S. *What is a Living Church?* London: Livingstone Press, 1937.
- Wood, Leland F. *What the American Family Faces*. Chicago: The Eugene Hugh Publishers, 1943.
- Younger, George D. *The Church and Urban Power Structure*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Zorn, Raymond O. *Church and Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1962.