

The BAPTIST QUARTERLY

The Journal of the Baptist Historical Society

VOLUME XXIII

JULY 1970

No. 7

The Free Church Understanding of the Ministry in the Twentieth Century. *

I WANT to begin by explaining the reasons for my choice of subject. They are three in number. In the first place I believe that the Free Church ministry is something worth knowing about; in the second I believe it to be a matter which has received less attention than some other aspects of our history; in the third I choose it because you as Baptists have invited me, a Congregationalist, to address you. It would be inappropriate for me to speak to you on a theme drawn from Congregational history, presumptuous to choose one from Baptist history, and eccentric to deal with one unconnected with either.

Now one of the things which is plainly distinctive about our two churches, along with others who have been associated with us, but over against the larger part of the Christian community, is the form of our ministry.

The Free Church ministry, as it existed at the end of the last century, was an institution hallowed by considerable antiquity, respected by others as well as by Free Churchmen themselves, and it was, as one might put it, in working order. A certain threat was developing to it, the result, in part, of the Oxford Movement.

* An address to the Baptist Historical Society, April 27th, 1970.

The very earliest note sounded by the Tractarians, by Newman in the very first of the Tracts and by Keble's Assize Sermon even before the first of the Tracts, was the note of authority. The problem of authority is one which has increasingly confronted all churches in modern times. The solution proposed by the Oxford Movement was to locate authority in the ministry: in a ministry which was conceived as priestly in some sense of that dangerous word which was not applicable to the unordained Christian, and whose credentials were visibly guaranteed by episcopal Ordination.

The reaction represented by the Oxford Movement produced in turn a counter-reaction, especially among the Free Churches. If the Tractarians magnified the priestly character of the ministry, the Free Churches would deny it: as outward signs they would abandon distinctive clerical dress and the title "Reverend". An unlikely sign of increasing ministerial levity, according to Sylvester Horne, was the growing of beards and moustaches¹. Lay administration of the Sacraments spread, despite protests, and Nonconformists began to assert that the difference between minister and layman was a matter only of convenience. Anything a minister could do a layman could do too—perhaps better, if he had the time. Ordination was not always regarded with the same solemnity as formerly, and sometimes was omitted altogether.

It is interesting to read today the arguments of Anglo-Catholics such as Charles Gore² and Herbert Kelly³, who often pay warm tribute to historic Dissent, but sadly conclude that it has proved to be without survival value: the growth of liberal theology, the diminishing regard for the Sacraments, and the signs that a distinctive ministry was disappearing altogether were held to demonstrate that only credal orthodoxy, a Catholic theology of the Sacraments and a priestly conception of the ministry can guarantee a church a continuing existence.

Yet the record of discussion this century belies the fears (or perhaps the hopes) of such critics. The estimation of the ministry in the eyes of Free Church theologians has risen rather than declined. The historic Protestant position, which gives due authority to the ministerial office without claiming for the ordained a metaphysically different character from the laity, was restated with characteristic vigour by P. T. Forsyth, especially in *The Church and the Sacraments*, published in 1917. Forsyth boldly asserted that all non-Catholics were agreed that the form of Church polity was a matter of indifference and of convenience; if he was indeed too bold in such an assertion, it was largely true of contemporary Baptists and Congregationalists.

He was not of course saying that the ministry itself was a mere matter of convenience, but only that there was no single form of ministry essential at all times. "The ecclesiastical question of the hour," he claimed, "is not that of the laity (as at the Reformation) but that of the ministry."⁴ Nonconformists must learn to honour

the office, not just the man. There is a sense in which the ministry is creative of the Church, rather than vice versa, for it is to the ministry that God entrusts His creative Word.⁵ In fact Forsyth goes a long way towards accepting Anglo-Catholic claims for the episcopate, but he makes them instead for the whole ministry. The Catholic error is not to claim too much authority, but to claim it for too few ministers.

While Forsyth was making theological claims for the ministry, J. H. Shakespeare was advocating a much more connexional, and even quasi-episcopal, form for the Free Churches, and many Anglicans watched such trends with delight; just as many Nonconformists watched them with less delight.

Vernon Bartlet, for example, thought that High Anglicans themselves were beginning to realize that in the early Church there were no ministries wider than that of the local congregation⁶; and J. D. Jones attacked Anglo-Catholics for believing they had the Holy Spirit under lock and key. But he conceded that Free Churchmen who belittled the office of the ministry were wrong too: "I take the liberty", he said, with the air of one propounding controversial matter, "of saying that the statement that there is no difference between the minister and the layman is simply not true"⁷. It is striking that so moderate an assertion was felt to be necessary. Yet for another generation many Nonconformists would have hesitated to go so far. While Methodists and Presbyterians allowed lay celebration of Communion only when a minister was not available Baptists and Congregationalists sometimes allowed a layman to preside with a minister, even his own minister, in the congregation. Both the Baptist Union and the Congregational Union refused to admit, after the Lausanne Conference of 1927, that the ministry was essential for the Church, while conceding that it is not altogether useless. T. R. Glover argued, in *The Free Churches and Reunion* (1921) that the authority of the minister is that of experience: it is parallel to that of the scientist or the artist who has shown his mastery of his trade. There is no place for priesthood in the Church; yet, he goes on to argue, all believers are priests. It is remarkable that so great a scholar should see no oddity in dismissing all priestly conceptions on one page, and then applying them to everybody on the next.

It was while such views were widely held that the Lambeth Conference of 1920 issued its famous "Appeal to all Christian People", adopting the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral, with its final point of: "A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body"⁸. The one possible basis for such a unified ministry, it was claimed, was the historic episcopate.

The assumptions involved in this claim were remote from the contemporary thinking of the Free Churches. Some Nonconfor-

mists were not sure whether the ministry itself was essential, so it would be difficult to convince them that a particular form was essential. Others might be puzzled to know why an inward call of the Spirit was not itself to be regarded as a commission from Christ.

The negotiations which followed were complicated, and not likely to be of interest except for those for whom committee reports are meat and drink. The Free Churches faced various difficulties in the Quadrilateral; the use of creeds worried some, and one's impression is that the prospect of reunion with the Church of England was a good deal more daunting to Baptists and Congregationalists than to Presbyterians and the Wesleyan Methodists.

But the great difficulty which loomed larger and larger in subsequent discussions was the understanding of the ministry. The debate is not made any easier by doubts about who had the right to speak for the Free Churches, since the Free Church representatives were appointed rather indirectly by the Free Church Councils, themselves only indirectly responsible to the constituent denominations. A joint conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen, under William Temple, drew up a statement of 28 agreed propositions, of which 10 concerned the ministry. The implication of these was that both sides recognized the need for an ordained ministry; moreover, both accepted that the united church of the future should have an episcopal form, albeit a reformed episcopal form. The signatories hastened to add that no particular theory of episcopacy was to be demanded, but the decision itself gave rise to much misunderstanding. The Free Church representatives, though respected leaders, had no direct mandate from their churches. But many Anglicans persisted thereafter in the illusion that the Free Churches had accepted episcopacy, and when the churches themselves began to enter caveats there was a feeling of being let down. As Sydney Smith commented on the two women shouting at each other across the street, the two parties would never agree because they were arguing from different premises.

The Anglicans were quite prepared to recognize that Free Church ministers exercised a real ministry: the question was how to incorporate them into the official or main ministry of the Church. They thought a reasonable procedure to adopt was Conditional Ordination: "If thou art not already ordained, I ordain thee . . ." Such words recognized on the part of some a doubt about Free Church Ordination, without demanding that everyone should admit that the doubt was justified. The Free Churchmen claimed that they already belonged to the official or main ministry, and saw Conditional Ordination as an evasion.

The discussion of the Lambeth Appeal never really got beyond this point. Free Churchmen in effect claimed: "Our ministry works. What more do you want?" The Anglicans never gave a clear reply, because there was no reply on which all Anglicans

could agree. Some thought Free Church ministries worked, but Anglican worked better; but that would be difficult to prove. Some said: "Our ministry was divinely ordained: yours works only by uncovenanted grace." But many Anglicans denied the claim. Some said: "The episcopate keeps the Church united." But this was plainly untrue.

On the other hand the Free Churches were negative in their approach. The Lambeth fathers had intended to open their arms in welcome; the Nonconformists saw the proffered embrace as a trap. Perhaps one must say that for once the favourite ecclesiastical cliché was true: the time was not yet ripe.

In the years which followed Free Church theologians moved a good way back towards the orthodox Reformed doctrine of the ministry. The best-known spokesmen for this return were Congregationalists. Bernard Manning—like some other Congregationalists—often finds it necessary to be highly polemical in style, as when he referred to bishops as "attorneys in episcopal robes" trying to "manipulate the sluice gates of grace"⁹. But when one penetrates the manner the matter is less controversial. "It is with salvation by bishops, not with government by bishops, that we quarrel", he declares; and certainly he is indignant with those for whom the ministry as a whole is of minor importance. Nathaniel Micklem, in *What is the Faith?* follows similar lines with more academic caution. The authority of the ministry rests on the Word, not on particular forms of Church order, and episcopacy cannot be essential. But it witnesses valuably to unity and continuity. After Archbishop Fisher's Cambridge sermon of 1946, inviting the Free Churches to take episcopacy into their system, Micklem wrote earnestly and persuasively in favour of experiment along these lines¹⁰.

A third representative of this trend is John Whale, who proclaimed: "As sons of Geneva, Congregationalists hold the catholic, apostolic and evangelical faith of Christendom"¹¹. It is very far from certain that this claim would have been substantiated, or even welcomed, by all Congregationalists of the period. Again, Whale goes on to assure the world that Congregationalists never ordain a minister without a representative of the wider Church being present and taking part. This is another "never" which under pressure would probably be reduced to "Well, hardly ever".

Yet another Congregationalist concerned to reassert historic Protestant views of the ministry is Daniel Jenkins. He has written voluminously on this topic, but his main position has remained what it was in *The Nature of Catholicity*, published in 1942. Jenkins restates the fundamental Protestant position: where Christ is, there is the Church: "That," he says, "is the beginning and end of our argument"¹². What is the bearing of this on our understanding of the ministry? The ministry is essential to the Church, because to the ministry is entrusted the proclamation of Christ by

Word and Sacrament. Nothing particular seems to follow about the *form* of the ministry. Jenkins' book is avowedly an answer to Ramsey's *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, but he hardly comes to grips with the future archbishop's attempt to derive Catholic order from the nature of the Gospel.

While men like Manning and Whale were emphasizing the relation of Congregationalism to the Reformed tradition, the Baptists were continuing to follow a very different line. The large composite volume entitled *The Ministry and the Sacraments*, published in 1937, contained a Baptist contribution, a paper by I. G. Matthews of the U.S.A., which deals rather with practice than theory: "Pastors are set apart, or ordained, by representatives from local churches, assembled in conference, or occasionally by members of an individual congregation. That is, in theory, though rarely in practice, any individual church may ordain any man whom it chooses to lead it in its religious activities and functions. Should such a man prove to be a competent leader, such Ordination would probably never be called in question by any individual or group in the Denomination at large."¹³

This clearly reflects an American rather than an English situation, and it must be said that to make validity of Ordination depend on competence of leadership poses daunting questions for many of us.

An English conception of the ministry was put forward by Arthur Dakin in *The Baptist View of the Church and the Ministry* in 1944, arguing that a Baptist minister is one who is in full-time pastoral work and, in Dakin's more than questionable phrase, the "head of a Baptist Church". It is unusual for an ordained scholar thus to have framed a doctrine of the ministry which excludes himself along with other college teachers and all denominational servants. Dr. Ernest Payne replied to Dakin in the same year in *The Fellowship of Believers*, refuting his claim to speak for normal Baptist practice.

The Gathered Community (1946), written by R. C. Walton on behalf of a group of Baptist ministers, solved the problem raised by Dakin by regarding Baptist ministers as ministers not of a local church but of "the whole Baptist community", so that teachers and administrators could be included. Another collective work was *The Pattern of the Church* (1963), edited by A. Gilmore, which sets out to correct the impression that the priesthood of all believers means that anyone can do anything. It brings out usefully the fact that the New Testament nowhere lays down a single and unvariable pattern for the ministry.

A fairly high proportion of the authors I have mentioned, and the many others who might be added to the list, have been men engaged in an academic or administrative ministry. While this is hardly surprising, and while it may reasonably be held that writing books is one of the jobs for which academics are paid, a

possible consequence is the development of a gap between theory and practice. This is the dilemma of historians: the records on which they rely are provided by the literate if not the literary, and for much of the history of the Church the ordinary believer and even the ordinary minister has left no records of his belief and life behind him.

The significant changes in Church order and activities have probably often, perhaps nearly always, occurred in response to circumstances, and the theologians have come in later to applaud or deplore them. Let me take a striking example from the history of our two churches this century. While the scholars have discussed the nature of the ministry in their customary leisurely way, our ministry has been changing its nature under their eyes. Most notably, both our churches have acquired a quasi-episcopal form of ministry: the General Superintendency among the Baptists and the Provincial Moderators among the Congregationalists. A break so considerable with past tradition would seem to require long and serious theological debate in advance. But it is obvious that in both denominations the motivation was largely practical and even financial.

Take first the Baptists¹⁴. In Dr. Underwood's *History of the English Baptists* the appointment of the Superintendents is treated, quite rightly, as an aspect of the setting up of a Sustentation Fund, under the inspiration of J. H. Shakespeare. Underwood puts it like this: "With the Sustentation Fund Shakespeare coupled a far-reaching scheme for the re-organization of the Baptist ministry, insisting that financial support of the ministry by the Baptist Union carried with it responsibility for its efficiency. Only ministers recognized by the Union were allowed to participate in the benefits of the Sustentation Fund. This led to lists of accredited ministers being drawn up¹⁵ and to the adoption of a scheme to make sure that after leaving college they continued their studies. England and Wales were divided into ten districts, each in charge of a General Superintendent whose business it was to watch the interests of the denomination throughout his area."¹⁶ Then follows a quotation from Wheeler Robinson to the effect that the Superintendents are not to be thought of as bishops. They are, he says, "encouragers and advisers, and are at the service of the Churches and ministers for all spiritual purposes." It is interesting that Robinson did not think of this as a fair description of the office of a bishop.

The Sustentation Fund had been launched in 1912, and a rally in the Albert Hall on 27th April 1914 marked its completion. On 16th November 1915 the first Superintendents were appointed, "amid a scene of deep solemnity", as the *Baptist Times* put it. That it was not intended to create a new and superior order of ministry is evident from the fact that the Superintendents simply entered into their new responsibilities and set to work without any

special service of setting apart.

It was financial need which provided the immediate stimulus to the creation of the new office, but the scope of the Superintendent's work was from the start much wider than merely financial. The *Baptist Times* of 3rd March, 1916 commented: "The activities of the General Superintendents—not simply on the financial side, but in settling disputes, arranging the removal and settlement of ministers, visiting, encouraging and advising rural churches, exercising a sympathetic supervision and linking the whole denomination together—will prove the best and most fruitful effort we have ever made."

At the spring assembly of 1916 the Superintendent of the Southern Area, Thomas Woodhouse, spoke under the title of "The Present Position and Requirements of the Sustentation Fund", justifying the appointment of the Superintendents, and alleging that before the scheme was created the denomination was "drifting towards chaos". He even ventured to attribute an episcopal character to his office. The Council Report for 1916 stated that out of 1,616 churches 1,265 had joined the scheme, and went on: "The removal and re-settlement of ministers, which hitherto seemed an insoluble problem, is working smoothly and happily; indeed, the 'settlement' part of the scheme has worked beyond the hopes of its framers for the good of the Denomination".

The scheme for Superintendents, as approved by the Assembly on 27th April, 1915, prescribed that nominations were to be made by the Executive Committee of the Union and submitted for approval to the Area Committee in each case. Where an area already had a full-time secretary the Area Committee would be allowed to nominate its own choice for Area Superintendent, but final appointment would rest with the Executive Committee. It was hoped that the Superintendent would not be "unduly absorbed in business and financial cares", but would "exercise a spiritual ministry in the churches of the Area and promote their closer union and more effective co-operation". It was specifically laid down that he was responsible for dealing with all matters relating to ministerial settlement in his area and for the working there of the Sustentation Fund. His salary was to be paid by the Baptist Union and his appointment was to be limited to five years.

The development of the moderatorial system in the Congregational Union was similar to the Baptist experience. Three typical problems which arose were the definition of ministerial lists—a necessary consequence of the recognition that the denomination was gradually assuming a measure of responsibility, financial and other, for its ministers; the procedure of dealing with settlements and removals; and the delicate situation where minister and church quarrelled.

A committee of the Congregational Union was set up in 1900

to bring recommendations on how to deal with such problems¹⁷. Central to its recommendations was a system of consultative committees in the counties, to be co-ordinated by a central committee in London. From this report sprang a system of training and examination for non-collegiate candidates for the ministry, and a set of rules for the recognition of ministers and of churches by the Congregational Union. But these proposals were found inadequate for dealing with all the problems which arose, and the new suggestion was made that the country should be divided into provinces, each with a moderator. After what Dr. Tudur Jones calls a lively and sometimes acrimonious debate¹⁸ the proposal was approved in 1919. Two things are particularly interesting about this tentative excursion into a form of episcopacy. Firstly, the duties envisaged for the Moderators:

(a) To stimulate and encourage the work of the Denomination within their own provinces, and to act as friends and counsellors of ministers and churches.

(b) To act as superintendents of Church Aid and Central Fund Committee Administration.

(c) To assist churches and ministers in all matters connected with ministerial settlements and removals by personal action and by constant and regular conference with one another¹⁹

The first and third of these objects clearly fall within the traditional scope of the work of bishops, though equally obviously they form only a part of that traditional work. Even the financial responsibilities have many parallels in the history of episcopacy, and one famous scholar, Edwin Hatch, maintained the theory that the bishops had started out as church treasurers²⁰. In this sense Congregationalism was becoming episcopal, almost without noticing.

The other striking thing is that the Congregational Union carefully reserved to itself the right of appointing Moderators. The report on the moderatorial system, accepted by the Assembly in 1919, laid down:

The appointment of moderators shall rest with the Assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales—acting, for purposes of nomination, through a Central Committee of Nine, to be appointed ad hoc by the Council on the nomination of the General Purposes Committee.

This is not a statement whose meaning is self-evident at a glance. On the contrary it is a very complex and highly centralized system of appointment which is laid down, and one can imagine the outcry Congregationalists would have raised if it had been proposed that they should enter a united church with bishops appointed exclusively by a central committee. Appointment by the Assembly, which included, at least in theory, all ministers and representatives of every church in the Union, was clearly a rubber stamp. The Central Committee of Nine, printed with

capital letters and so given a somewhat sinister flavour, as if it were a sort of Committee of Public Safety, was in effect to be selected by the General Purposes Committee. There were qualifications. The Provinces were to send representatives to "act with" the Central Committee in making the first appointments, and in subsequent appointments the Central Committee was to "act in co-operation with" the committee which each Province would by then have established, this provincial committee being representative of the county unions comprising the Province. Nevertheless the surprising fact remains that when the Congregationalists, with their long tradition of the autonomy of the local church, set up an embryo form of episcopacy, the "bishops" were not to be elected by the local churches, nor even by the county unions, nor even by the Provinces over which they were to preside: they were to be chosen by a Central Committee of Nine responsible only at two or three removes to the constituency.

In his address at the service of induction of the new Moderators (19th November, 1919) Arnold Thomas began with a phrase perhaps only half ironical: "I stand here this morning at the request of those authorities whose wish is always law to us . . ." ²¹ He welcomed the new officers as bishops:

We are here to appoint, and to commend to the wise guidance of God, certain honoured brethren who are to be in a sense—in a very real sense—bishops—the word is out. I know it is not the accepted name. But I fear that in common parlance we shall be caught speaking of them as bishops. Lazy people, such as many of us are, will not use a word of four syllables when they have one handy with two syllables which will serve the purpose. Let them be bishops for the moment at any rate. Why should someone else have all the best words? ²²

Thomas goes on to claim that Congregationalism has always had bishops; but as he defines bishops as persons having wide influence because of outstanding qualities of character he is able to insist that the Quakers and the Brethren also have bishops.

But he also sees a need for a new kind of bishop in Congregationalism, consisting of the "wise and gracious brethren" who should be "set altogether free for the service of the Churches", and this is the act in which he believes himself to be sharing. These men are to be bishops, "and yet not exactly bishops, not bishops bearing much outward resemblance to those honoured dignitaries who have usually been called by that name in this country . . . Our bishops will be more and dearer to us because they will be on our own level . . ."

It would be unfair to look for theological precision in addresses to ecclesiastical assemblies, but Thomas's address, though eloquent, is more than usually confusing. He uses the word "bishop" in at least three different ways, which is why in the end he is reduced to speaking of bishops who are not exactly bishops. He uses it

to mean any Christian, ordained or lay, who by qualities of character exerts a wide and beneficent influence; to mean an ordinary Congregational (or other) minister; and again to mean a minister set apart to exercise a more than local responsibility, especially as *pastor pastorum*. He thus missed an opportunity to reassert a doctrine traditionally shared by the Free Churches, that the true successor of the primitive bishop is the local minister. On the other hand he might have tried to demonstrate that episcopacy as known to history, shorn of its admitted distortions, could be adopted with a clear conscience by twentieth-century Congregationalists. It is clear enough to the reader that this last was roughly his own position, but he obscured it by his other uses of the episcopal terminology.

A few years after it came into operation the moderatorial system was discussed in the *Congregational Quarterly*²³ by the editor, Albert Peel. Although Peel stood on the Independent wing of Congregationalism, and tended to look with suspicion on centralizing tendencies, he was very willing to admit the value of the Moderators, praising them for the "wise counsel" and the "encouragement and inspiration" they had brought to many churches and ministers, especially in the rural areas. But he also noted widespread fears that their powers would inevitably grow with use, and that the future of ministers, except for a few of the best-known, was effectively in their hands. It is interesting to note that some of the provinces had not yet set up provincial committees—in other words, having adopted a quasi-episcopal system, they were content to neglect the one important check on its abuse which the system itself provided. Peel's article reveals that the Moderators had not been welcomed everywhere: "Born before their time, they have often had to face criticism and indifference, sometimes expressed in terms forcible rather than courteous, sometimes heard only as the rumblings of a neighbouring Fraternal."²⁴ But Peel was sure that there could be no going back to the old system.

It seems rather curious that Congregationalists have given so little attention to the theological implications of the moderatorial system, adopted as it was for practical reasons. The *Congregational Quarterly*, for example, in its 36 years of existence (1923 to 1958 inclusive) had only one article on episcopacy, an article in which A. E. Garvie argued that the episcopal system is not necessarily un-Protestant, citing the example of those Lutheran churches which have bishops.²⁵ In this way episcopacy was discussed, if only occasionally, as a matter of theoretical interest, while the moderatorial system grew up as a purely pragmatic development.

I want to suggest that this dichotomy of theory and practice was no new thing in Church History, but that in fact a great deal of the history of the Church is precisely a record of expedients adopted to meet pressing needs, expedients to which theologians

some time later give a meaning and a significance and even a pedigree which are largely of their own invention. The advocates of the Area Superintendents in the Baptist Union and of the Moderators in Congregationalism, faced the criticism that they were following the example of the early Church and allowing prelacy to creep in; and they replied that what they were creating was a quite down-to-earth and practical form of ministry designed to meet quite down-to-earth and practical needs. I suspect that this is just how monarchical episcopacy itself originated, and perhaps even the Papacy. My argument could be used either as additional ammunition for those who oppose these forms of ministry, reinforcing their suspicion that they constitute the thin end of a formidable wedge; or as useful for those who, like many liberal and evangelical Anglicans and many members of the Church of South India, argue that episcopacy would be better commended as useful than as theologically essential. After all, they might say, your own introduction of Moderators and Superintendents shows that you have felt the need of such ministers; why not recognize that they are in many ways just what bishops have tried to be, when the mists of medieval obscurantism are blown away from their activities?

NOTES

- 1 J. W. Grant, *Free Churchmanship in England 1870-1940*, (no date), p. 79.
- 2 Charles Gore, *Orders and Unity*, 1909.
- 3 Herbert Kelly, *The Church and Religious Unity*, 1913.
- 4 *Op.cit.*, p. 130.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 132.
- 6 *The Validity of the Congregational Ministry* (1916) (by Forsyth, Bartlet and J. D. Jones), p. 4.
- 7 *Ibid.*, p. 25.
- 8 G. K. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity* (First series) p. 3.
- 9 *Essays in Orthodox Dissent* (1939), p. 142.
- 10 In *Congregationalism and Episcopacy* (no date).
- 11 In *The Ministry and the Sacraments* (ed. R. Dunkerley, 1937), p. 211.
- 12 *Op.cit.*, p. 19f.
- 13 *Op.cit.*, p. 220.
- 14 What is said here about the General Superintendents is wholly dependent on material kindly supplied to me by Rev. E. F. Clipsham from his own researches; he is of course not responsible for any of the opinions expressed.
- 15 Dr. Ernest Payne calls my attention to the fact that Underwood is mistaken in supposing that this was the origin of the ministerial lists, which date back to earlier years.
- 16 *Op.cit.*, p. 249.
- 17 R. Tudur Jones, *Congregationalism in England 1662-1962* (1962), pp. 378f.
- 18 *Ibid.*, p. 380
- 19 *Congregational Year Book* (1920), p. 8.
- 20 In *The Organization of the Christian Churches* (1881), Lecture 2.
- 21 *Congregational Year Book* (1920), p. 80.
- 22 *Ibid.*, p. 84.
- 23 *Congregational Quarterly*, ii (1924), pp. 3f.
- 24 *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- 25 *Ibid.*, xvii (1939), pp. 37-43.