

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Baptist Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bq_01.php

TOWARDS A THEOLOGY OF EPISCOPE
AMONGST BAPTISTS (continued*)

If for Baptists the pattern of *episcopate* is both corporate, collegial, personal and diverse, flexible, charismatic, this challenges certain elements in current thought in all three groups mentioned in the introduction to this article. As far as the document *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry* is concerned, Baptists will want to question the stress on the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter and deacon,⁹² and the need to recover the sign of the episcopal succession.⁹³ Within denominational polity there is the need to question at the local level the model of 'the full-time minister' as the norm for *episcopate*,⁹⁴ and at the wider level a uniform pattern of Area Superintendents, which was originally superimposed upon Associations in 1915 for administrative purposes. The question to Baptists involved in the charismatic movement concerns the emphasis placed by some on the apostle and the elders,⁹⁵ thus threatening the balance between the corporate, collegial and personal elements in *episcopate*.

The need for such a balance between the corporate, the collegial and the personal is recognised in the WCC document,⁹⁶ but denominations, including the Baptists, have not found it easy in practice to maintain such a blend. If it is true to say that at the moment the collegial aspect is being rediscovered by Baptists, partly as a result of experiments in team ministry at all levels, and partly as a consequence of the charismatic movement, it is important that this should not be at the expense of the corporate - the ultimate responsibility in *episcopate* being that of the whole body, nor of the personal - the need for individuals to be able to relate to one pastor or to one Superintendent.

The particular Baptist contribution to ecumenical discussions on *episcopate* surely lies in the stress on its diversity, flexibility and charismatic nature. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* in each of its three sections seeks to reach consensus on matters where there has been diversity from the very beginning of the Christian Church. In the section on ministry an attempt is made to defend the traditional threefold order, but the argument for this has to be qualified at so many points that very little of it remains by the end of the section.⁹⁷ A continuity of title does not guarantee a continuity in function, and this can be illustrated by changes over the years in the role of deacons in most denominations. Baptists will want to ask other denominations how much agreement is necessary or desirable for mutual recognition. Because Baptists start with the local church, wider manifestations of the Body for them will differ from place to place. Associations in this country range from 17 to 261 churches, and Unions have different

* Continuation of article in the previous issue (April 1984)

roles in different countries. No two Areas in England are exactly the same *vis-à-vis* Associations (even the three which are co-terminous are different from each other in significant respects),⁹⁸ and therefore the precise role of the General Superintendent is different in each Area. Because there is this flexibility of role, individual personalities have wider scope for action at both local and wider levels, but must be guarded from adopting monarchical powers, alien to Baptist concepts, by collegial and corporate balances.

This flexibility in the Baptist exercise of *episcopate* can be further seen from the answers to question 5 in the questionnaire to ministers. Each was asked to tick whom they had consulted in five different areas of *episcopate* (numbered (a) to (e) in the Appendix), and seven possible individuals or groups were listed (numbered (i) to (vii) in the chart). Some of these were individual - a lay friend, another minister, the College Principal, the General Superintendent or a specific person such as an 'apostle'; others were corporate - deacons or elders, the local fraternal or a specific group which had covenanted for this purpose. The ticks revealed that one individual may go to one person or group for help, say, in personal devotion, and to another for guidance in personal relationships. Moreover ministers varied considerably over the number of ticks they registered, some obviously rarely seek help or support, others need it regularly. In this context it is interesting to note that Dr B. R. White, in an address to the annual conference of 'Mainstream' in January 1983, suggested the appointment of a Spiritual Director to work with a General Superintendent in the *episcopate* of ministers. Baptists have traditionally resisted attempts to limit their diversity and flexibility. The one element in the original 1909 Scheme re Ministerial Settlement, Sustentation and Collegiate Training which had to be dropped entirely was that relating to the Colleges. The role of College Principals, Tutors and Old Students' Fellowships in *episcopate* must be recognised, but cannot be clearly described because it is so diverse!

Unity in the midst of this diversity and flexibility is provided by the charismatic origin of all *episcopate* in Christ, the Head of the Body. He has given gifts to different members, but these have to be recognised and confirmed by the Body. In the New Testament ordination is described as a *charisma*.⁹⁹ For Baptists if every local church is a manifestation of the universal church, then an essential element in *episcopate* is some visible and permanent focus of this, and this is the ordained minister.¹⁰⁰ The 1957 statement on *The Meaning and Practice of Ordination and Baptists* defined it thus:

Ordination is the act, wherein the Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, publicly recognises and confirms that a Christian believer has been gifted, called and set apart by God for the work of the ministry and in the name of Christ commissions him for this work.¹⁰¹

Does not this raise a question about the term 'lay pastor'¹⁰²

and the stress laid on this role in the report *Half the Denomination?*¹⁰³ If a local church calls a lay person to be its minister (because of the gift given to that person by God), should not that person after a due period of testing and training (as was common amongst Baptists in earlier centuries)¹⁰⁴ be recognised by the wider church and ordained? Otherwise there will be in effect three tiers of Baptist ministers - full-time, supplementary and lay.

THE NATURE OF EPISCOPE - the shepherd caring for the sheep.

In the New Testament¹⁰⁵ and throughout church history the main model for *episcopa* has been the shepherd. The crook is the symbol of the bishop. In I Peter Christ himself is described as 'the shepherd and *episcopos* of your souls' and later on as the 'Head Shepherd'.¹⁰⁶ The use of this model may be partly due to the Qumran community, if as some scholars suggest,¹⁰⁷ the term *episcopa* came into the church from this source. The nature of *episcopa* is the shepherd caring for the flock. Not only is Christ the source of all *episcopa* as the Head of the Body, he is also the one model for it.

This means that service and sacrifice are its hallmarks. In the New Testament the shepherd has shown his love for the flock by dying for them.¹⁰⁸ The under-shepherds are specifically warned not to tyrannise the flock.¹⁰⁹ In Mark 10. 42-45 Jesus warns his disciples against copying the world:

where their great men make them feel the weight of authority. That is not the way with you; among you, whoever wants to be great must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be the willing slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve, and to give up his life as a ransom for many.

In verse 44 the word used is *diakonos*, showing the intimate connection between *episcopa* and *diakonia*. One is exercised through the other. To make too rigid a distinction between them can quickly lead to the wrong kind of authority.¹¹⁰

At this point the relationship between *episcopa* and authority must be faced, and the nature of that authority defined. The model of the shepherd must remain the guide. In John 10 Jesus shows the difference between the good shepherd and the hireling. The authority of the good shepherd has to be earned, recognised and accepted, not imposed. It has to be earned - he is the door, he is prepared to give his life for the sheep.¹¹¹ The passage contains echoes of Ezekiel 34 where God himself is the shepherd:

I myself will tend my flock, I myself will pen them in their fold, says the Lord God. I will search for the lost, recover the straggler, bandage the hurt, strengthen the sick, leave the healthy and strong to play, and give them their proper food.¹¹²

Authority has to be recognised - the sheep hear his voice and know their shepherd, but a stranger they will not follow, because they do not recognise his voice. The good shepherd calls his sheep by name and leads them, and they follow. He does not drive them, he leads them.¹¹³ Thus the shepherd's authority is 'earned' in the sense that it is based upon his pastoral care for the sheep.

P. T. Forsyth in his book *The Principle of Authority* links authority with freedom and claims that the supreme authority is the Gospel which sets us free:

the last authority is not demonstrable, it is only realisable as the religious experience of the conscience. It is the moral imperative of holy love acting upon our moral experience in holy grace.¹¹⁴

That is what Paul was saying to the Galatians - in submitting to the Law they were in danger of losing their freedom in Christ.¹¹⁵ Markus Barth in his commentary on Ephesians 4.16 makes the important point that:

the distinct personality of each church member is not wiped out but rather established by Christ's rulership and the church's community.¹¹⁶

This is the context for any discussion of submission to authority. Barth emphasises the place of verse 21 as a bridge verse between the results of being filled with the Spirit narrated in verses 18-20, and the code for social relationships between wives and husbands, children and parents, slaves and masters which follow. He claims that the words 'be subject to one another out of reverence to Christ' constitute 'a challenge to the conservative and patriarchal concepts of social order which have often been attributed to Paul or derived from his teaching'.¹¹⁷ He argues that whereas the active mood of the verb is used when the object is principalities and powers, it is the middle or passive mood when Christians are exhorted to submit to one another, for this mutual subordination follows from the freedom given by Christ.¹¹⁸ It has already been pointed out that the debate about authority and submission today is as much within the charismatic movement as between it and others.¹¹⁹ Paul Fiddes comments on this subject:

While we are dependent upon God, this is not the same thing as being dominated by him: he allows us to be truly ourselves. Any charismatic theology which lays stress upon simple submission to God so that our personalities are manipulated by a power from outside us lacks in its views of both God and man. The Spirit enables us to take responsibility for our situation and our world.¹²⁰

How do the sheep hear and recognise the voice of the shepherd? The answer of the New Testament and of the history of the Church is through the preaching of the Word. According to Acts, Paul says to the Ephesian elders:

I commend you to God and to his gracious word, which has power to build you up.¹²¹

Timothy is told:

Until I arrive devote your attention to the public reading of the scriptures, to exhortation and to teaching,^{1 2 2}

Elders who do well as leaders should be reckoned worthy of a double stipend, in particular those who labour at preaching and teaching^{1 2 3}

and:

Proclaim the message, press it home on all occasions, convenient or inconvenient, use argument, reproof and appeal, with all the patience that the work of teaching requires.^{1 2 4}

Markus Barth points out that all of the ministries listed in Ephesians 4.11 involve speaking: 'they are Ministers of the Word'.^{1 2 5}

Baptists in particular have seen this as the prime task of 'episcopate', the pastoral care of the church through the preaching of the Word. That is why until quite recently the sermon was the climax of the service in most Baptist churches, and why people still say 'I'm going to hear so-and-so preach today'. That is why again until quite recently the two main subjects at Baptist theological colleges have been the study of the scriptures and the practice of preaching. So Neville Clark writes:

But because such *episcopate* is always to be comprehended in terms of word and sacraments and therefore of the Gospel, the minister is necessarily to be understood as pivotal for the apostolicity of the Church of God. In a special and unique way he is charged with the guardianship of the apostles' doctrine, responsible for the preservation of its purity, burdened with commission for the integrity and relevance of its proclamation.^{1 2 6}

This point is clearly understood and practised as far as local *episcopate* is concerned. But what about the wider exercise of it? Here the picture is different. Certainly General Superintendents and Association Secretaries or Ministers preach the Word most Sundays in local churches, but how often do they preach it to those who corporately are under their care when they meet together in Assembly? Should not the General Superintendent preach at an Association Assembly once a year, and the General Secretary of the Baptist Union at its Annual Assembly? It is interesting to note that throughout the nineteenth and well into the twentieth century it was the custom at the annual assembly of the Lancashire and Cheshire Association to have three or four preachers and these were chosen by ballot the previous year in the same way as the Moderator, and the same names appear regularly as formed the Council of Reference. Ironically the advent of a General Superintendent appears to have affected not only the exercise of collegial *episcopate* but also the regular preaching of the Word by those exercising it. Perhaps a

lesson can be learned from the charismatic movement where a number of churches gather for a monthly celebration, preceded by a meeting of ministers. This used to be the practice earlier this century in a number of Districts of the Lancashire and Cheshire Association. Whilst it is naturally easier to hold together the elements of preaching and pastoral care in *episcopate* at the local level, it is important to seek to include both of them in any wider experience of *episcopate*.

CONCLUSIONS

In this concluding part of the study an attempt will be made to apply the points made earlier to the current situation of Baptists at the level of the local church, of the Association, and of ecumenical relationships at both those levels. The results of the questionnaire to ministers show that at the level of the local church the majority think that the predominant role in *episcopate* is exercised by the minister and that a better balance is needed between the personal, the collegial and the corporate as represented by the minister, the deacons or elders, and the church meeting. This questionnaire was only completed by ministers able to attend a three day ministers' conference. An analysis of leadership patterns in the 168 churches of the Association in 1982 shows that 70 had one full-time minister, 46 had one part-time leader (a student, supplementary or retired minister or a lay pastor), 25 had some form of collegial leadership (in most cases including a full-time minister) either within one local church or between a group of churches, and 27, as far as could be discerned from the Yearbook, had no definite form of leadership. As far as size is concerned, 87 churches have less than 50 members, 55 between 50 and 100, 21 in the 100s, 4 in the 200s, and 1 over 300.

This survey suggests therefore that at least three models of *episcopate* for the local church should be seriously considered - and each regarded as equally legitimate, none as second-best. At present the norm is still seen as one full-time minister - and yet over half the churches in the Association don't conform to this! The first model therefore is that of 'a minister'. Whether (s)he is full-time or part-time is not the important point, although that fact will naturally affect the balance between the personal, collegial and corporate expressions of *episcopate*. In this first model the collegial aspect of *episcopate* will be expressed through deacons, elders, house-group leaders, pastoral visitors, or leaders of groups concerned with evangelism, nurture, counselling.¹²⁷ Whilst in a large church, it may be helpful to have elders as well as deacons, in small churches one body (called by either name) may have to exercise both functions.¹²⁸ The title is not as important as the role performed, and flexibility has been noted as a Baptist characteristic!

The second model of *episcopate* for a local church is a team within that church. Here probably the term 'team ministry' or 'elders' should be used to distinguish them from the deacons, but it is important that there are good lines of communication

between the two groups to prevent overlapping or confusion of function. Whether or not there should be one leader of such a team is a question constantly discussed by those engaged in team ministry.¹²⁹ The important point, however, is that leadership is given to the church, and that all members know who on the team is responsible for what function. For the reasons stated above, it is important that at least one member of the team should be ordained to represent the wider church in the local congregation. Within such a team there will be the opportunities for those with different gifts to exercise them, instead of one person being expected to perform all aspects of *episcopate*. No attempt has been made so far in this study to analyse the different aspects within that term, but it may be helpful at this point to take the gifts mentioned in Ephesians 4.11 as a guide to the various functions within *episcopate* - the apostolic (which includes the link between the local and the universal referred to above), the prophetic, the evangelistic, the teaching and the pastoral. Each of these is an essential part of *episcopate* and therefore team ministry may provide a better opportunity for all these gifts to be exercised than solo ministry.

The third model is that of a group of local churches with a team ministry between them. This team may be similar to that in model two, but, more likely, it will consist of an ordained minister (probably full-time) and a local leader (elder) or leaders in each church. Joint pastorates have been a feature of Baptist life for many years, but if they operate simply in the same way as a Methodist circuit or a pastorate of the United Reformed Church (where churches are linked to secure a minimum number of members for each minister), they run the risk of abandoning the particular Baptist insights on *episcopate* as they relate to the local church. A joint pastorate which is not part of a team ministry should be seen very much as a temporary expedient.¹³⁰ Such a group provides the best context for the ministry of lay preachers and lay pastors emphasised in *Half the Denomination*.¹³¹ Ideally such a group should have one church meeting and as many united services as possible, but if geographical reasons prevent this, care needs to be taken to ensure that each church knows to whom to go for pastoral care and that decision making does not bypass the church meetings.

In all these three models there remains the corporate aspect of *episcopate* as part of the church power possessed by the church meeting. Paul Fiddes has defended this¹³² against those who would give the power to the minister and/or elders.¹³³ The 1961 *Doctrine of the Ministry* statement carefully defined this authority:

Thus in regard to authority the New Testament teaches that both ministers and church have obligations, and only as the obligations are accepted is the authority properly exercised and recognised. The minister is under obligation to discern humbly and carefully what is the mind of the Lord and the guiding of the Spirit, so that in all his leadership he will guide the church in its total ministry. The church is under obligation

to test the leadership according to the pattern of Christ, to receive it and thus to engage more fully in its task of ministry.¹³⁴

Turning now to the level of the Associations, the results of the questionnaire referred to above showed both a plea for smaller Areas and that ministers find support from a variety of sources, some personal, some corporate. The 1978 *Report on the Superintendency* provides a comprehensive picture of wider *episcopate* in terms of mission strategy for the churches, the pastoral care of local churches including ministerial settlement, and administration which includes representing Baptists in ecumenical situations. The report rejected the plea for many more Areas on the grounds that this would divert more resources into central organisation and would detract from the personal trust and understanding among a relatively small group of people concerned with ministerial settlements. Conversation with the Superintendents reveals a diversity in their experience and expectations of Area Pastoral Committees. Yet size is a key factor in any exercise of *episcopate*. Peter Moore, the editor of a series of essays with the title *Bishops: but what kind?*, writes in his conclusion:

there must be, if any renewal of the Church is really to come to pass, an acceptance of what it is humanly possible for bishop or priest to do. Many are unable to serve a parish of fifteen thousand and seem to have given up the attempt to minister to any of them. The same seems true of the episcopate; for them the problem is relieved by suffragans and retired bishops - rather than by resorting to a radical restoration of a workable system.¹³⁵

What does this have to teach Baptists? Any proposed structures for *episcopate* beyond the local church must bear in mind both the principles already outlined (that is why the Association as originating from below is taken as the key unit rather than the Area which originated from above) and the concerns expressed in the 1978 Report. The three models which follow do not propose a great increase in the number of General Superintendents, but rather three different ways in which their ministry could be exercised. They correspond to the three models already suggested for the local church. Is a uniform structure necessary? Could the denomination not experiment with various patterns of *episcopate* at the Association level by inviting Associations to do so?

The first model is of a Superintendent having the pastoral care of not more than a hundred churches, preferably within one Association, or at the most two. For the Area to be co-terminous with the Association (as is the case at present in three places, but with many more than a hundred churches in each) removes one layer of committees and brings the Superintendent nearer to the churches. With around a hundred to care for he would be able to fulfil more of the functions outlined in the 1978 Report, whereas at present he cannot be expected to deal properly with more than ministerial settlements and

crisis situations. On this model he would be able to meet regularly with the Association officers as a collegial expression of *episcopate*.

The second model is based on the present Areas and consists of a team ministry in *episcopate*. The Superintendent does what he has time for, and others are appointed to fulfil those roles he has not time to perform. This is already happening with the appointment of full-time Association Secretaries, Ministers and Missioners. This team model naturally works best where there is but one Association, it is not impossible where there are several, but would be more time consuming. It requires a regular team meeting - in Lancashire and Cheshire the General Superintendent, the Association Secretary, the Association Minister,¹³⁶ the Youth Officer and the BMS Area Representative meet together once a month from 10.00 a.m. to 3.00 p.m. The disadvantages of this model are that the others can be regarded as the Superintendent's Suffragans (note Peter Moore's strong criticism of the suffragan system),¹³⁷ and each (in a large Association) covers as wide an area as the Superintendent, so that churches and ministers still do not feel that they have personal *episcopate*.

The third model is based upon the Area Bishop analogy rather than the Suffragan, and provides for a team with the Superintendent as the leader (and only representative on the Superintendents' Board) and a number of Association Ministers, each responsible for an Association or District (in the case of a large Association). The Superintendent would be one of those in the sense that he would only have direct care of part of his Area, and his overall responsibility would be exercised through the team. Depending on the size of their spheres of responsibility all the Association Ministers need not be full-time, and an experiment along these lines could include varying sizes. Each church and minister would, however, have an *episcopos* close at hand. There would be the opportunity for this person to think through with each local church the most appropriate pattern of ministry at the local level, and also to discuss with it its strategy of mission.

Each of these models contains a different pattern of personal/collegial *episcopate*. There remains the corporate aspect relating to the Association itself (or its Districts). As far as churches are concerned, would there not be value in reviving the idea of an annual visit by messengers of the wider fellowship? With regard to ministers, the local fraternal should fulfil this corporate role, but in practice does not always. A key issue in some areas is how far such corporate fellowship requires theological compatibility. Baptists have traditionally prized tolerance, and a team, whether at the local or Association level, can be all the richer for diversity in theological outlook. It can minister to those who differ theologically better than any one individual can.

Turning to the ecumenical scene, CCLEPE has currently a working party looking for areas 'where the denominations concerned would commit themselves to strategic planning for

mission'.¹³⁸ Here again three models at least would seem to be possible, each stressing one of the aspects of *episcopate*. The first is the personal, such as was envisaged in 'A Bishop for all Churches in Swindon'. This proposal is shelved at the moment, primarily because of Anglican legal difficulties¹³⁹ (although the other denominations might not have found it any easier in practice!). The proposal was that this bishop should be elected by and responsible to a missionary council, and the stress in his role was as a focus of unity for mission.

A second model builds upon the collegial nature of present meetings of church leaders at a diocesan level and upon county sponsoring bodies for LEPs. In such places as Milton Keynes, Greater Manchester and Merseyside, the church leaders meet regularly together with a full-time ecumenical officer. Such groups need someone with the time to prepare an agenda and to execute recommendations, and suffer from the point already made that a Free Church leader, because of the size of his area, will have to attend more than one of these.

A third model tries to take seriously the corporate nature of *episcopate* and starts from the bottom instead of the top with the members of local congregations. The difficulties of this can be illustrated from any Local Ecumenical Project or Council of Churches.¹⁴⁰ An interesting radical approach to this model is currently being attempted in Salford.¹⁴¹ Local people were invited to air their views on the quality of life in Salford. Members of local churches then shared what they had learned and examined these conclusions in the light of the Gospel, identifying certain issues for combined church action. Baptists hope to share in this approach through the project in urban mission recently adopted by the Baptist Union.

APPENDIX

Answers to the questionnaire to ministers of the Lancashire and Cheshire Association 33

1 *What do you understand by the word episcopate?*

leadership	22	guidance	11
advice	8	supporting care	3
authority to rule	10	oversight	7
earned authority	1	expressing the faith	1

2 *Who in your local church (i) does exercise episcopate? (ii) should exercise it?*

a) the minister	28	20
b) deacons	16	13
c) elders	8	12
d) the church meeting	8	16

3 *What improvements in episcopes would you like to see in your local church?*

a greater stress on the church meeting	7
" elders	8
" deacons	3
" the minister	2
" authority	1
a better balance between the various agents of <i>episcopes</i>	3
fellowship groups	2
room for the Holy Spirit	2
no answer	6

4 *What improvements in episcopes would you like to see in the Association and Union?*

smaller areas	6
sense of mutual responsibility	4
more authority for Superintendents	2
annual visit from District	2
more authoritative structure	1
apostles	1
centralised stipend	1
stronger lead from Union	1
more ecumenical co-operation	1
specialised ministries	1
more room for Holy Spirit	1
a pastor for the Superintendent	1
no answer	7

5 *In what areas have you personally consulted others and whom did you consult?*

- (i) a lay friend
(ii) your deacons/elders
(iii) another minister
(iv) the local fraternal
(v) your college principal
(vi) the General Superintendent
(vii) a specific person or group chosen for that purpose
(viii) (2 wrote in 'wife')

	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(vi)	(vii)	(viii)
a) your own devotional life	4	1	13	4	3	1	4	1
b) your own relationships within the church	7	12	17	5	2	11	3	1
c) your own pastoral problems	8	9	14	4	3	9	4	1
d) the pastoral problems of others	4	11	15	7	1	5	6	1
e) questions regarding the worship, renewal or mission of the local church	4	17	13	10	2	6	8	
Total	27	50	72	30	11	32	25	4

Number of ticks appearing on each paper in answer to this question:

1-5	6-10	11-15	over 16
15	10	4	4

NOTES

- 91 A. C. Underwood, *A History of the English Baptists*, London, 1947, p.224.
- 92 Op.cit., p.24, esp. the statement: 'the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter and deacon may serve today as an expression of the unity we seek and also as a means for achieving it'.
- 93 Ibid., p.32.
- 94 Nicholson, *The Ministry*, esp. 'The Pattern of Ministry', pp.21-2, 'Who is a Baptist Minister?', pp.22-8, 'Team Ministry', pp.30-1.
- 95 Jim Graham, *The Giant Awakes: the Renewal of the Church in our Day*, London, 1982, pp.123f. writes: 'From all of this, leadership, quite clearly is God-selected, congregationally accepted, and authoritatively implemented. The true leader is not responsible to the congregation, but he is responsible for the congregation to God'.
- 96 Op.cit., pp.25f.
- 97 Ibid., pp.24f. Section IIIA.
- 98 Lancashire and Cheshire has 6 Districts, East Midlands has 4 County Unions, and London 13 Groups.
- 99 I Timothy 4.14, II Timothy 1.6, and Griffiths, op.cit., pp.69ff.
- 100 Neville Clark, op.cit., p.107 and Paul Fiddes, op.cit., p.23.
- 101 In *Baptist Union Documents*, Baptist Historical Society, 1980, p.74.
- 102 Nicholson, *The Ministry*, p.24.
- 103 p.28f.
- 104 *Baptist Union Documents*, pp.37, 70.
- 105 The NEB translates *episcopos* as shepherd in Acts 20.28 and I Peter 5.2.
- 106 I Peter 2.25 and 5.4.
- 107 See for example J. N. D. Kelly, *The Pastoral Epistles*, London, 1963, pp.73f. and Arnold Bittlinger, op.cit., pp.31f.
- 108 John 10.11, Acts 20.28, I Peter 2.25.
- 109 I Peter 10.3 (NEB).
- 110 As Paul Fiddes does, op.cit., pp.22ff.
- 111 John 10.9,11.
- 112 Verses 15-16.
- 113 John 10.3-5, 14.
- 114 London, 1913, p.365.
- 115 Galatians, 3.1, 5.1.
- 116 Op.cit., Vol.2, p.446.
- 117 Ibid., p.610.
- 118 Ibid., pp.708ff.
- 119 Ron Trudinger, *Built to Last: Biblical Principles for Church Restoration*, Eastbourne, 1982, pp.122-8 argues for the authority of husbands over wives and children, house-group leaders over members, elders with a head over the wider fellowship 'every man needs another man with delegated authority as a shepherd over his personal life'. Gerald Coates, *What on earth is this kingdom?*, Eastbourne, 1983, p.102, criticises this view of authority.

- 120 Op.cit., p.30.
- 121 Acts 20.32.
- 122 I Timothy 4.13.
- 123 I Timothy 5.17.
- 124 II Timothy 4.2.
- 125 Op.cit., Vol.2, p.436.
- 126 Op.cit., pp.107f.
- 127 See, for example, the pattern at Altrincham Baptist Church described in P. Beasley-Murray and A. Wilkinson, *Turning the Tide*, London 1981.
- 128 Paul Fiddes, op.cit., p.23, seems to be too rigid in his distinction between the two.
- 129 *Team Ministry among Baptists*, ed. L. Nevard, London, 1976, has a helpful section on this subject, pp.32f.
- 130 *Working Together*, 1973, a report of the Baptist Union Strategy Committee, makes this point strongly in *BU Documents*, p.153.
- 131 pp.26-8.
- 132 Op.cit., pp.27f.
- 133 See, for example, Jim Graham, op.cit., pp.119f.
- 134 *BU Documents*, pp.22f.
- 135 London, 1982, p.171.
- 136 The terms of reference for the Lancashire and Cheshire Association Minister state: 'The Association Minister is appointed to work with churches, groups of churches, or districts as seems appropriate, within the life of the Association. With them, he will:
(a) prepare a strategy for the ongoing work of mission
(b) seek out and develop patterns of training for local leadership
(c) work out patterns of ministry which will help the churches to fulfil their calling'.
- 137 Op.cit., pp.171f.
- 138 *Fourth Report*, p.6, para.23.
- 139 *Ibid.*, para.22.
- 140 J. F. V. Nicholson, *Moving into Unity*, London, 1978, pp.6-9.
- 141 See *Salford Churches Pastoral Planning Group: Discussion Papers* obtainable from Board for Social Responsibility, 27 Blackfriars Road, Salford, M3 7AQ.

J. F. V. NICHOLSON