

MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY IN THE CHRISTIAN
CHURCHES AND CHURCHES OF CHRIST

by

William D. Howden



"PUTTING OUR BEST INTO THE WORK"

The
Crucible

EES Occasional Papers

MINISTERIAL AUTHORITY IN THE CHRISTIAN
CHURCHES AND CHURCHES OF CHRIST



1988

James Gustafson once wrote that the problem of authority, which is common to all voluntary associations, "takes unique form in the churches: the church acknowledges and knows a higher authority -- God; but the voluntary churches are not sure who speaks and acts for him."¹ The Christian Churches and Churches of Christ (also known as the "independent Christian Churches") are currently troubled by the issue of authority. Standard Publishing Company recently sponsored a multi-faceted "Year of the Leader" program. The theme for the 1987 Open Forum on the Mission of the Church was "Church Leadership." Ben Merold, a prominent Christian Church minister, maintains that "the structure of leadership in our churches" is one of the two biggest problems facing independent Christian Churches.²

Much of this concern about leadership focuses on the role of the professional minister. John Mills recently wrote, "No issue is more burning today than the role of the minister and his relationship with the elders and deacons."³ As David Roberts put it several years ago, "One of the biggest questions facing our churches . . . is clarifying the identity and responsibility of the person we call 'the minister.'"⁴

This paper will not attempt to define

the proper ministerial role in the independent Christian Churches. Rather, using sociological studies of Christian ministry, it will identify some of the factors that contribute to uncertainty about the ministerial role in the Christian Churches, and suggest topics that need to be addressed in the ongoing discussion. Sociological studies such as this one cannot define the proper role for the minister. That can be done only through detailed study of the scripture and theological reflection on the nature of the church. Sociological study can, however, describe the present situation and identify questions for which answers are needed.

Much of what is said here is, in all likelihood, also applicable to Churches of Christ and to Disciples of Christ congregations, but my comments are specifically about the independent Christian Churches (referred to hereafter simply as "Christian Churches"). One other note about terminology: Christians of the Campbell-Stone movement have, with good reason, avoided using the terms "clergy" and "laity." However, the sociological studies referred to in this paper consistently use such terms. I have found it impossible to avoid these terms; replacing them would have produced numerous awkward sentences and possibly distorted the meaning of the authors cited. When the terms do appear, they should be understood as technical terms of sociological description, without any endorsement of their theological adequacy.

The Dimensions of Ministerial Authority

The discussion in this paper is based primarily on Jackson W. Carroll's article,

"Some Issues in Clergy Authority." Carroll's work summarizes and synthesizes a number of earlier studies. Leadership, of course, involves more than authority, but authority is a major component of leadership.

Authority, for Carroll, is "legitimate power," the ability to "guide the thought and behavior of persons and groups in ways that are considered legitimate by those persons and/or groups." Such legitimacy may be explicitly granted in written documents, or it may be derived from "widely held social norms, based on shared values." All authority is exercised only in a particular sociocultural matrix: authority, since it is by definition legitimate, must be granted or acknowledged by a group. In addition to the variable aspects of authority about to be discussed, Carroll states that the authority of ministers (like that of other professionals) is granted because "it is presumed that their exercise of power will be for the good of the collectivity and its individual members."

Given that background, Carroll identifies four aspects of clergy authority:

- (1) The bases of clergy authority, as representative of the sacred and/or possessor of expertise; (2) the degree of institutionalization, or whether the clergy's authority is personal authority or office authority; (3) the scope of clergy authority, which refers to the breadth or narrowness of functions for which clergy have authority; and (4) the relational dimension, or the degree of symmetry/asymmetry that exists in the patterning of clergy-lay relations with respect to authority.

Carroll treats each of these dimensions as a continuum between two poles. The exact nature of each continuum will be discussed below. The four dimensions are inter-related. Although these relationships have not been fully clarified, several will be mentioned in the following discussion. When considering the authority of ministers in the Christian Churches, the nature of these inter-relationships makes it preferable to treat the four dimensions in the reverse order from Carroll's presentation.

Authority in the Christian Churches

There is, of course, no Book of Order or Book of Discipline that officially defines the authority of ministers in the Christian Churches. The totally congregational form of church government (polity) of the Christian Churches eliminates such a book as a possible source of information. Therefore, one must attempt to identify "the widely held social norms" regarding ministry (to use Carroll's phrase) that exist in the Christian Churches. The discussion in this paper is based on articles in Christian Standard, leaders within the Christian Churches, discussions of the ministry at the North American Christian Convention, and a limited amount of sociological research on the Christian Churches. In addition to my own observations. Because practices may vary from congregation to congregation, one should expect a relatively high margin of error in the following comments.

The Relational Dimension

According to Carroll, the relational

dimension of ministerial authority forms a continuum between, on the one hand, asymmetrical role relationships between ministers and church members and, on the other hand, symmetrical relationships. Asymmetrical authority relationships are ones in which "clergy are viewed as having access to power (spiritual or sacramental grace, special knowledge or expertise, etc.) that is restricted, and generally unavailable to laity." In symmetrical relationships, by contrast,

power within the religious system is in principle available to all members. In the extreme case of symmetrical relationships, no one member has authority over the others. All share equally in power and have the right to exercise it. There are no clergy and laity distinctions. Where relatively symmetrical relations exist, distinctions between clergy and laity are functional rather than substantive or absolute.

The Christian Churches are fairly close to the symmetrical pole of this continuum. The Campbell-Stone movement was distinctly anti-clerical in its early days. Although the Christian Churches soon developed their own professional ministry, they retain what Sam Stone calls an "abhorrence of a clergy/laity distinction."⁸ The justification for a professional ministry is usually functional, not, as it is in many denominations, theological. Ronald Hackler, an elder writing about the ministry, says, "I believe that a minister is necessary [for a congregation] only if he fills a need that would not otherwise be met."⁹ Keep in mind that within the Christian Churches there is no act of the church (including baptism and the Lord's

Supper) that requires the participation, or even the presence of ordained ministers. 10 Again, this is in contrast to many denominations. Thus, it is not self-evident that congregations have needs that would not be met in the absence of a minister.

Marshall Hayden is a minister who echoes Hackler's statement and helps us to understand it. Hayden says that there are members of his congregation who have the ability to do everything that he does as the minister, "but they just don't have the time."¹¹ Knofel Staton says that it makes sense to have paid, full-time ministers in our culture, because other church members cannot expect to have enough time free to carry on all the essential tasks of the church's ministry.¹² When the minister is perceived to be doing nothing that could not, in principle, be done by other members of the church, one approaches the situation that Carroll describes as symmetry.

Episcopal polity has been described as institutionalized management control of workers (clergy), while congregational polity has been described as institutionalized client control.¹³ This term, client control, hints at the limitations of ministerial authority in a near-symmetrical relationship. While the church members do, in such situations, grant a certain functional authority to professional ministers, it is limited. For example, the exact relationship between the ministers and the elders in Christian Churches has been much debated. It is widely assumed that ministers are in some sense co-equal with the elders.¹⁴ In some congregations the minister is considered to be one of the elders. Stone probably represents the majority opinion, however, when he writes.

"The minister, like every other member of the local congregation, is under the oversight of the elders."¹⁵ The emphasized words show that there is no distinction regarding authority between ministers and church members. The relationship is understood to be symmetrical.

Scope of Authority

Carroll writes, "Within the Christian tradition, clergy are typically granted authority in their ordination to proclaim the Word of God, administer the sacraments, and order the life of the congregation." The scope of clergy authority is considered to be narrow when it is limited to these three "charter elements," and broad when the scope extends to other areas where clergy authority is acknowledged informally, although not explicitly granted by a formal document or statement. The scope of clergy authority was generally broader in previous centuries than it is now, although it is still rare for authority to be restricted to only the charter elements.¹⁶

In considering the scope of ministers' authority in the Christian Churches, the first thing to note is that the charter elements themselves are defined more narrowly. Because of their congregational polity, Christian Churches have no set or authorized ordination service for ministers, but one is suggested in a minister's manual that has been widely used for many years. While this service does speak of "the duties of the ministerial office" in the plural, only one such duty is specifically mentioned in the service: the minister is "ordained to preach His [Christ's] gospel." A recent

replacement for this minister's manual follows the same pattern: "preaching the gospel" is the only task specifically mentioned for the minister in the ordination service.

There can be little doubt that preaching is understood as the central task of ministry. The term "parish ministry" is seldom used in Christian Churches: the term "preaching ministry" is used as its equivalent. The subtitle to Stone's The Christian Minister, for example, is A Practical Approach to the Preaching Ministry, even though only one of the twenty-one chapters is specifically about preaching. Avery Dulles has identified five different models of the church that are common in Christian thinking. One of them is "The Church as Herald." In this model, says Dulles, "The ordained minister will be seen especially as preacher."¹⁸ Mills says that the Christian Churches "fit this model like a hand in a glove."¹⁹ That claim may be slightly exaggerated, but there is no doubt about the priority given to preaching. Rod Huron writes, "The minister's most important task will be that of teaching the Word of God, whether in the pulpit or in someone's living room."²⁰

As with other ministers, however, the authority of the minister in the Christian Churches is not limited to only the charter functions. Stone discusses the minister's "job" in seven chapters: preaching, counseling, administration, motivation, calling, conducting services, and implementing the program. Even within these areas, however, the scope of the minister's authority is usually limited. For example, consider the other two charter functions identified by Carroll: administering the sacraments and

ordering the life of the church. Christian church ministers usually perform baptisms (although this is not the case in all churches), but the elders normally conduct the Lord's Supper.²¹ As to ordering church life, Stone says that the minister is to "organize and implement the program that the elders have directed for the local church." However, the minister is to accomplish this without chairing or overseeing any committee or board: the minister is only to "offer suggestions and comments."²² The scope of responsibility here is quite broad, but the degree of authority does not match the range of responsibility. (More about this situation follows.) One can begin to see in these examples the way in which a symmetrical pattern of authority also tends to limit the scope of the minister's authority.

In short, the scope of the minister's authority in the Christian Churches is vaguely defined. Larry Ingram says such vagueness is characteristic of congregational politics: the minister's role is "loosely articulated, being defined more in terms of goals than of means."²³ In the Christian Churches, it is evangelistic goals which often define the minister's role. As noted earlier, ministers are seen to be needed only when they help the church to function better. In accord with the herald model of the church, functioning better is usually measured by the evangelistic success of the church. Schuller and his associates, in a study sponsored by the Association of Theological Schools, found that church members in Christian Churches place higher importance on the minister's evangelistic activities and goals than do members of any of the sixteen other "denominational families" studied.²⁴

While this emphasis on goals rather than means leaves a cloudy picture about the scope of ministerial authority in the Christian Churches, it can be said that the scope (particularly of charter functions) is generally closer to the narrow end of the continuum. The next section should prove to further clarify the scope of ministerial authority in the Christian Churches.

Degree of Institutionalization

The poles of this continuum are authority of person and authority of office. To quote Carroll,

Does the clergy person's authority derive from his or her person, that is from some ascribed or achieved attribute which he or she possesses or demonstrates and which is socially acknowledged? Or does it derive from the formal office of priest or minister which he or she enters at ordination, and which also presupposes social acknowledgment?²⁵

As one might expect, ministers in the Christian Churches have personal authority much more than office authority. This is typical of congregational polities. Stone says that ordination in the Christian Churches "does not impart any special powers to a minister."²⁷ Many prominent Christian Church ministers in earlier years were never ordained, and this is still the case for some ministers today. Clarence Lemmon, writing for the Disciples of Christ, could just as well have been speaking for the Christian Churches when he wrote that the minister should be evaluated primarily as a person and only secondarily as a minister: "A man in

the ministry should earn respect by the quality of his preparation, the firmness of his dedication, and the stability of his character, and not primarily by the nature of his office."²⁸

I am reminded of a conversation several years ago, while I was minister of a church in Indiana. At an interdenominational ministers meeting, a Wesleyan minister addressed me and the minister of the nearby Disciples of Christ congregation with the question, "How much authority does the minister have in the Christian Church?" Before I could think how to respond, my colleague (older and wiser) answered, "As much as he can get." Carroll Cotten puts the same idea a little less graphically. Noting the relative lack of office authority for clergy in the Disciples of Christ, Cotten says that effective leadership by Disciples ministers depends on the "political skills" of building a "constituency of support and trust among the members of the congregation in addition to shaping and reshaping consensus among the membership."³⁰ This is probably even more true for the Christian Churches than it is for the Disciples of Christ.

The comment that ministers have as much authority as they can get cuts two ways. On the one hand, it indicates insecurity about being able to gain and maintain any authority. As Carroll says, "Authority based on personal attributes must constantly prove itself to the immediate religious group that grants legitimation."³¹ This insecurity may be manifested in several ways. One study found that ministers in denominations with congregational polity were far less likely to preach on controversial issues in society than were ministers in denominations with a

hierarchical structure. Another study has shown that ministers who lack office authority feel greater pressure to exhibit exemplary behavior than those who possess office authority (and, therefore, are more hesitant to develop friendships with members of their churches).³² The Christian Church ministers who participated in the study reported by Schuller fit this latter pattern; they indicated that they thought high standards of behavior were quite important for the minister.³³

On the other hand, the lack of clearly defined office authority has another effect. While it does not secure a minimum amount of authority for the minister, neither does it impose a maximum limit for authority. As seen earlier, ministers in the Christian Churches are considered responsible for the achievement of goals (especially evangelistic) without being given explicit authority as to means. In such a situation, according to Paul Harrison,

A leadership divested of authority will necessarily seek and gain power in order to meet its responsibilities. Ironically, since this power is undefined and covert, it often exceeds that which ordinarily accrues to leaders of authoritarian and hierarchical institutions.

When this power is perceived to be exercised for the good of the group as a whole, the group tacitly assents to this power, thus legitimizing it as authority. Harrison calls this type of authority "rational-pragmatic."³⁴

One must remember, however, that such authority is not so secure as office

authority. Lay apathy may tacitly legitimate clergy authority in certain areas until the minister takes a controversial action, at which point the legitimacy can be withdrawn.³⁵ Thus, there is always the temptation for ministers to resort to power instead of legitimate authority, both to secure their position, and to achieve the sought-after goals.³⁶

Ingram presents an impressive list of ways in which ministers can, and do, gain power within a congregational polity. Some of the things he mentions can be considered as office authority. For example, the vote of the congregation to call a minister is often understood as an expression of God's will: the body of Christ expressing its judgment after prayer for divine guidance. This certainly lends office authority to the minister. In many ways, however, it is more accurate to say that the office presents the minister only with the opportunity to gain power, rather than the office itself giving the minister authority.

Ingram gives the following examples: Through preaching, the church members become accustomed to having the minister "define issues and instruct them in their proper resolution." Preaching also gives the minister a regular forum in which he or she may proclaim the necessity of church harmony in support of its leaders, thus dissuading potential dissidents. As the worship leader, the minister may choose people to lead parts of the worship (to give a prayer, for example) and has the opportunity to publicly commend people who have done good things for the church. As Ingram puts it, "By the use of such psychological stroking, members may be encouraged or disciplined as occasion

demands."

When the invitation is extended, those who respond confess their faith to the minister, are received by the minister in the church's name, and are presented by the minister to the congregation. (In the Christian Churches, the minister will also usually baptize the new members who have not previously been baptized). The minister is thus the symbolic "doorway to church membership," and new members from the start become accustomed to following the minister's direction. Often the final decision to accept Christ or to join the church will be the result of one or more evangelistic calls made by the minister. Those who respond to such calls may well feel some "spiritual indebtedness to the minister."

Ingram points out that there are others who may feel indebted to the minister. Effective pastoral care during periods of illness or bereavement often produces a sense of gratitude toward the minister. The minister's performance of weddings and funerals may also lead the families involved to be grateful. As Ingram says, such gratitude "is easily translated into obligatory support for pastoral initiatives."

Ingram based his comments on observation of Southern Baptist Churches, but the same factors are also at work in Christian Churches. (Before publication, Ingram asked for comments on his article from a colleague who was a former Church of Christ minister. The colleague agreed that Ingram's comments would apply to many Churches of Christ.) These factors do not produce an acknowledgment of the authority of the ministerial office. Instead, these factors lead to a

sense of allegiance to a particular minister. This is personal authority, not office authority.

Bases of Ministerial Authority

One pole of this continuum is expertise, "including both knowledge and skills important for the life of the religious group and its members." At the other pole, the minister is granted authority because the minister is perceived as a "participant in the power of the sacred." Where ministerial authority is of office authority, this second pole refers to the sacramental nature of the office. "In less sacramentally oriented traditions, the possession or demonstration of spiritual qualities, signaling a close personal relationship with the Holy Spirit, is stressed."³⁸

Ministerial authority in the Christian Churches falls somewhere in the middle of this continuum. Recall that when Lemmon rejected the notion of office authority, he stressed both personal expertise -- "the quality of his preparation" -- and more spiritual concerns -- "the firmness of his dedication, and the stability of his character."³⁹ Hackler mentions both spiritual qualities and expertise when he describes what he expects in a minister, but he seems to think the spiritual qualities are most basic: "The first thing I would insist on in a minister is that he know Jesus Christ in a personal and vital way. . . . As to the minister's life, it is taken for granted. I trust, that he will be a person of high moral and personal standards."⁴⁰

We have already seen that ministers in

The Christian Churches are quite concerned about exhibiting exemplary behavior. Stone notes that "people demand a higher standard from the minister than from others," and suggests that since "he is the representative of Christ and His church, the minister should look, speak, act, and live the part."⁴¹ Obviously, ministerial authority is based in part on the possession of personal attributes that are deemed to be spiritual.

Expertise, however, is also important. To once again quote Carroll, "The emphasis on preaching and teaching (within what Dulles calls the 'herald' model of the church) makes special knowledge of the scriptures and their application to life the distinctive basis of the clergy's authority."⁴² Such expertise is certainly desired by the Christian Churches. They have long advocated an educated ministry. For most of this century the preferred means of ministerial education has been the Bible college. These schools, of course, emphasize expertise in the Bible.

The research reported by Schuller confirms that the expertise that matters most for Christian Church ministers is expertise in scripture. In that study, church members (and ministers) in the Christian Churches ascribe great importance to the minister's knowledge and study of scripture. The members, however, were far less concerned about the minister's "clarity of thought and communication," ability as a counselor, "theological reflection," use of "broad knowledge," or administrative ability. (In contrast, Christian church ministers rated the importance of expertise in nearly all of the areas just mentioned as being considerably more important than did the church members).⁴³

There can be little doubt that expertise in the knowledge of scripture is an important factor contributing to ministerial authority in the Christian Churches. When ministerial authority is based on expertise, however, this alters the situation on the symmetry/asymmetry continuum. As Carroll says, "The stress on professional expertise, acquired through lengthy socialization (i.e., ministerial training) and generally unavailable to the laity, makes the professional-lay role relatively asymmetric with respect to authority."⁴⁴ If the minister is recognized as the congregation's expert on scripture and Christian doctrine -- or on church-growth strategies and Sunday-school curricula -- this expertise will inevitably give the minister greater authority than church members.

This is true, of course, only when the expertise is recognized by the church members as valuable for the congregation. If ministers attempt to exercise authority based on their expertise in fields that the church members do not see as important for the ministerial role, the congregation is not likely to acknowledge that authority. Therefore, differing conceptions of what counts as significant expertise for the minister, such as those reported by Schuller, can be a recurring point of tension between the minister and the church.

In summary, the authority of ministers in the Christian Churches is based both on professional expertise, particularly in the knowledge of scripture, and on personal qualities indicative of Christian character. To the degree that ministerial authority is based on expertise unavailable to church members, the relational dimension of

authority will move toward asymmetry.

Conclusion

Using the four aspects of ministerial authority identified by Carroll, we have identified a number of important issues regarding the authority of ministers in the Christian Churches. To be sure, Carroll's scheme is not perfect. One weakness is that it does not take into account the special role played by elders in a Christian Church. In a Christian Church, authority is not simply divided between the minister on the one hand and the members on the other. The elders form a third group with their own authority. Nevertheless, I believe that using Carroll's model does provide us with some important insights into the nature of ministerial authority in the Christian Churches:

When viewed through the lens of Carroll's four aspects, this is how the authority of Christian Church ministers appears: (a) The relational dimension approaches the pole of symmetry. Although it is clear that symmetry or near-symmetry is expected to be the norm, various circumstances produce a noticeable degree of asymmetry. (b) The scope of ministerial authority is vaguely defined, but generally limited. Preaching is the only task for which the minister is unambiguously granted authority. (c) The minister's authority is largely personal authority. The office provides the minister with opportunities to exercise personal authority, but the office itself carries very little authority. (d) This personal authority is based on both professional expertise, especially the

understanding and use of scripture, and personal characteristics indicative of a righteous life.

All four aspects deserve attention in the current discussion regarding leadership in the Christian Churches, but it may well be that the issue of symmetry and asymmetry is most crucial. Although the more-or-less "official" position of the Christian Churches favors symmetry between ministers and church members regarding authority, there are many factors at work in the Christian Churches today that tend to produce asymmetrical authority relationships, giving more authority to ministers than to church members. One factor is the increasingly high level of professional expertise which ministers now possess. Another factor is the "rational-pragmatic" authority that ministers acquire in order to fulfill their responsibility for meeting goals. When asymmetry exists in a context where symmetry is supposed to be the norm, there is bound to be tension.

Of course, in many congregations the minister is tacitly granted a great deal of authority, even though lip-service is still given to the norm of symmetry. Surprisingly, Schuller found that Christian Church members placed less importance on the minister sharing congregational leadership with church members than did the lay people of any other denominational group! ⁴⁵ I am somewhat skeptical about the accuracy of this finding, because it is not consistent with my experience. ⁴⁶ Nevertheless, it does at least suggest that church members are willing to grant more authority to Christian Church ministers than the traditional stance of the churches would indicate.

However that may be, when there is a discrepancy between common practice and acknowledged norms, the situation is inherently unstable. Many Christian Church ministers find themselves in a classic double-bind, or "catch-22" situation: If they do not take initiative and exercise leadership -- i.e., practice authority as Carroll defines it, guiding "the thought and behavior of persons and groups" -- the congregation is unlikely to reach its goals and the minister will be held responsible. If they do exercise authority -- offering more than the "suggestions and comments" Stone proposes -- they may be accused of violating the symmetry that ought to exist between minister and congregation. For the health of the churches, and the ministers themselves, this unstable situation must be changed.

Within the church, the issue of authority is always theological, never simply an issue of management theory. To return once again to the statement from Gustafson, "The church acknowledges and knows a higher authority -- God; but the voluntary churches are not sure who speaks and acts for him." Christian churches have always maintained that it is no one individual who speaks for God, but the common mind of the church as a whole, guided by the scripture. This position should not be abandoned. Nevertheless, this position does not necessarily imply a symmetrical authority relationship within the church in regard to every decision. Christian Churches now almost universally assume that a "normal" church will have a paid minister. The church appears to be of a common mind that there should be ministers who are set apart, in some way, from the rest of the body.

It is this "in some way" that needs to be clarified. Christian Churches, quite simply, need a better-articulated theological understanding of the professional ministry. Currently our theology of the ministry is primarily negative; it says what the minister should not do. The minister should not "lord it over" the congregation. The minister should not take the ministry away from the people. True and good. But what should the minister do? For what is the minister responsible? What is the scope of the minister's authority? The basis of that authority? To what degree is this authority institutionalized? The Christian Churches need answers to these questions, answers that are based on scripture, theologically sound, and agreed upon by ministers and church members alike.

Notes

¹James M. Gustafson, "The Voluntary Church: A Moral Appraisal," in Voluntary Associations: A Study of Groups in Free Societies, ed. D. B. Robertson (Richmond: John Knox, 1966), pp. 303-304.

²"An Interview with Ben Merold," Christian Standard, Sept. 21, 1986, p. 9.

³John Mills, "Putting Move in the Movement!" Christian Standard, Aug. 3, 1986, p. 4.

⁴R. David Roberts, "The Role of the Minister," Christian Standard, Nov. 12, 1978, p. 8.

⁵Jackson W. Carroll, "Some Issues in Clergy Authority," Review of Religious

Research 23 (Dec. 1981) : 99-101.

⁶Ibid., pp. 111-12.

⁷Stone and the Christians were not so anti-clerical as Alexander Campbell and the Disciples, but Campbell's views were dominant after the merger of the two groups. (D. Newell Williams, "Historical Development of Ministry among Disciples," Mid-Stream 24 [July 1985] : 293-315; H. Eugene Johnson, Daily and Scripturally Qualified: A Study of the Ministry of the Christian Church Movement [Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1975], pp. 21-30.

⁸Sam E. Stone, The Christian Ministry: A Practical Approach to the Preaching Ministry (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1980), p. 113.

⁹Ronald Hackler, "What I Expect in a Minister," Christian Standard, June 2, 1974, p. 6.

¹⁰Johnson, pp. 26-30. Of course, only ministers may perform weddings, but that restriction is imposed by the state, not by the church. Even then, formal ordination may not be required.

¹¹Marshall Hayden, "The Minister's Support and Ordination," unpublished paper presented at "The Forum," North American Christian Convention, St. Louis, Missouri, July 25, 1979.

¹²Knofel Staton, "The Church's Ministries," in Christian Doctrine: The Faith . . . Once Delivered, ed. William J. Richardson (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1983), p. 443.

¹³Luke M. Smith, "The Clergy: Authority Structure, Ideology, Migration," American Sociological Review 18 (1953) : 242-48

¹⁴Johnson, p. 60.

¹⁵Stone, p. 98; emphasis added.

¹⁶Carroll, pp. 99, 108-110.

¹⁷James DeForest Murch, Christian Minister's Manual (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1965), pp. 151-61; Roderick E. Huron, Christian Minister's Manual (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1984), pp. 211-16.

¹⁸Avery Dulles, Models of the Church (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), pp. 81-93, 175.

¹⁹John Mills, "Equipping and Doing," unpublished paper presented at "The Forum," North American Christian Convention, St. Louis, Missouri, July, 1979.

²⁰Huron, p. 14.

²¹Johnson, pp. 29-30.

²²Stone, pp. 102-103, 158.

²³Larry C. Ingram, "Notes on Pastoral Power in the Congregational Tradition," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion 19 (1980) : 44.

²⁴David S. Schuller, Merton P. Strommen, and Milo L. Breke, eds., Ministry in America (New York: Harper & Row, 1980), pp. 127, 131. It should be noted that this

study found the independent Christian Churches to have a distinctly different view of ministry than the Disciples of Christ (p. 56).

25 Carroll, p. 101.

26 Ibid., p. 105.

27 Stone, p. 67.

28 Johnson, pp. 86-91.

29 Clarence E. Lemmon. "An Evaluation of Our Ministry, In the Light of Our History," in The Reformation of Tradition, ed. Ronald E. Osborn, vol. 1 of The Renewal of the Church, ed. W. B. Blakemore (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1963), p. 213.

30 Carroll C. Cotten, The Imperative is Leadership: A Report on Ministerial Development in the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1973), pp. 39-40.

31 Carroll, p. 105.

32 James R. Wood, "Authority and Controversial Policy: The Churches and Civil Rights," American Sociological Review 35 (1970): 1057-1069; Phillip E. Hammond et al., "Clergy Authority and Friendship with Parishioners," Pacific Sociological Review 15 (1972): 185-201.

33 Schuller et al., pp. 163, 195.

34 Paul M. Harrison, "Weber's Categories of Authority and Voluntary Associations," American Sociological Review 25 (1960): 232-37.

35 Wood, p. 1058.

36 Harrison, pp. 234-35.

37 Ingram, pp. 42, 44-45.

38 Carroll, p. 102.

39 Lemmon, p. 213.

40 Hackler, pp. 6, 8.

41 Stone, p. 130.

42 Carroll, p. 113.

43 Schuller et al., pp. 134-37, 148-55, 210-1

44 Carroll, p. 114.

45 Schuller et al., pp. 208-209.

46 It is important to note that the degree of difference is not statistically significant (i.e., it could have occurred through chance). Also, of the nine questionnaire items measuring support for sharing leadership with church members, one specifically measured support for sharing leadership with church members regardless of sex. A low rating for this particular item (which I would expect from Christian Churches) may well have distorted the overall rating of the importance of sharing leadership.

47 See A. T. Degroot, Disciple Thought: A History (Fort Worth: By the author, Texas Christian University, 1965), pp. 55-66; William Robinson, The Biblical Doctrine of the Church, rev. ed. (St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1955), pp. 139-59; Frederick W.

Norris, "Apostolic, Catholic, and Sensible:
The Consensus Fidelium," in Essays on New
Testament Christianity, ed. C. Robert Wetzel
(Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1978), pp.
15-29; Robert O. Fife, "The Worshipping
Congregation: Particularity and Univer-
sality," in Essays on New Testament
Christianity, ed. C. Robert Wetzel
(Cincinnati: Standard Publishing, 1978), pp.
30-41.

MAILING ADDRESS:

EUROPEAN EVANGELISTIC SOCIETY
James L. Evans, Executive Director
P.O. Drawer E
Atlanta, GA 30364