Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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

The Church: some insight
into its essence and form
RICHARD C. LAUGHLIN

1) Introduction

What is the church? A fascinating question which has dominated many minds over centuries and yet the answers forthcoming still appear to be inconclusive and seemingly, on occasions, contradictory. Part of the reason for the lack of clarity is to do with the viewpoint from which various analysts look at the church. For instance, a sociologist and a theologian may conclude different things which, on the surface, appear contradictory. But they may not be if we had some machinery to draw the contributions together.

What is required is a common methodological approach to looking at the church so that the varying viewpoints can be combined to bring a unity of understanding. Küng,[1] in the author's opinion, has supplied such an approach through his understanding of the church's 'essence' and 'form':

> In short, the 'essence' of the church is not a matter of metaphysical stasis, but exists only in constantly changing historical 'forms'. If we want to discover this original and permanent 'essence', given that it is something dynamic rather than something static and rigid, we must look at the constantly changing historical 'forms' of the church. It is vital to distinguish permanent and continuing elements from changing and transient features, and to make this distinction we must take into account right from the start the fact that the church's image contains impermanent features conditioned by time.[2]

Thus the church, according to Küng, has a uniform space-time-invariant part (essence) and a diverse and varied part applicable to specific situations (form). However, as Küng goes on to point out, the two *cannot be separated*—they exist together—but equally they are *not identical* and the uniqueness of each needs to be clearly recognized.

Interestingly enough such an approach to a theory about the church has also been advocated in the search for building a theory of language[3] and also advanced as the only feasible approach to building a general theory in the author's discipline of accounting.[4] Such an approach is indeed somewhat different from the 'normal' scientific theories which attempt to derive general laws from particular happenings with little scope for 'freedom of action' at the empirical level; the difference being, of course, that such freedoms are encouraged and *part of the theory* in the former cases whereas classified as failure in the latter.

Such a methodological approach for deriving a 'theory of the church' undoubtedly has a considerable amount of potential for

supplying the unity of insight which is required. But can such an approach be justified? Küng makes no real attempt to substantiate his approach and in many respects we could do the same. However, it seems only right that some attempt should be made. Three possible sources of justification could come:

a) From nature
All of God's nature has the basic characteristics of uniformity and diversity. The church is part of this created order and thus it is to be expected that it will possess the same constituent elements. God is not a God of confusion and is remarkably consistent in all his action in creation, so why expect a precedent of change when confronted with the church?

b) From Scripture
The first reference to the church in the Bible is a description of an empirical outworking. Paul, the major person in Scripture who attempted to discuss the church from a different standpoint, did so in terms of trying to specify the general elements of the church. Consequently, from a biblical perspective such an approach to a theory seems to be entirely satisfactory.

c) From history
In the 2,000 years of its existence the church has constantly been 'reformed' as its 'form' appeared to be less and less what it should be. However, probably this is the weakest justification for the methodological approach since many of the reformations have confused the general elements with the more variable specific aspects, calling for and insisting on change in both. Nevertheless, there are enough pointers to show that historically the *major* concern has been to clarify what must remain in the church (essence in our terminology) and it is upon this more fundamental aspect that change has been advocated.

These three sources undoubtedly seem to support the methodological approach suggested and permit the discussion to progress by building on such insights to actually formulate, or start to formulate, a, or the, theory of the church.

Before explaining the structure of the following, which is addressed to this, perhaps one further major point needs to be made: what the church is (and 'is' in this sense does not mean a present description of what we *see* as the church but of the church as a concept and as reality) is a depiction of Jesus Christ. Küng again:

> Thus the proclaimer of the message has become the proclaimed. He himself is the summary and concrete content of the message of God's kingdom, he is himself the Christian message, he is himself the soul of the church: he and himself and all that comes with him is that which must remain in the church. [5]

Hence, although the church as we know it is both groups of people and an institution, fundamentally it can best be understood by understanding the person of Jesus Christ and applying such insight into a

group-institutional framework. Thus the essence of the church is something to do with the general characteristics of Jesus Christ, whereas the form of the church is basically the expression of Jesus Christ in particular situations.

Thus the search for an answer to what is the church can be discovered by unscrambling and giving meaning to the paragraph above. Such is the pursuit of the following. Before getting to the details of this, however, the second section addresses itself to some basic insights into the explanation of human action, discussing why such an understanding is important for the church along with its application to the church's essence and form. The third section takes the discussion a step further by looking at one important aspect of the essence in some detail.

2) An explanation of human action and its application to the church's essence and form

a) General aspects

The place at which to begin is to ask why such an explanation, even before we know what it is, is important for the church. The reason is quite simply that as the church is the expression of Jesus Christ and since he was a person—God made man, to save making heretical statements—then by understanding human action *per se* we shall have insight into church action as well.

In addition action, broadly defined, encompasses most, if not all, of existence. Therefore if a general explanatory model can be discovered, we are in a position to understand the most important activity of both man and the church.

The two disciplines of philosophy and social psychology have done most to set up models of the explanatory elements of human action; although insights into both these disciplines, which are inclined to be rather isolationist in their views at present, stem from, in the author's opinion, some fundamental multi-disciplinary thinking in the early 1950s.[6] The anthropological insights of Kluckhohn and others[7]—particularly the ideas of means and ends of action, values and value orientations and their connection to action—certainly appear to have set the scene for all later contributions in philosophy and social psychology.

The author has attempted to summarize and synthesize all these insights (plus those coming from sociologists as well) in a recent paper[8] which can be summarized generally as follows:

    i)   All human action can be divided into events, free and unfree action.

    ii)   Free action can be explained in a basic sense in terms of the following syllogism:
        A *desired* to achieve x

       A *believed* that action C would achieve x

       Therefore A did C

iii)   These desires (which can also be called ends) have both a goal element as a goal *per se* and an element which says something about the way to achieve that goal.

iv)   The desires (which can also be called ends) can be explained by an understanding of values which have the same twin characteristics as the desires (called terminal and instrumental values respectively).

v)   Values can be further explained by an understanding of the concept of self.

vi)   The beliefs about the action (C) with regard to certain elements (means) can be explained by an information system which attempts to engender the belief as to what to do with the means in the light of the desires and the particular environment.

These six points cover the main insights coming in this paper. Further research since the time of writing indicates a seventh point:

vii)   There are some general rules on the use of means in particular situations which give partial insight into the content of the information system which creates the belief element.

These seven points, in a general sense, explain individual human action both in a descriptive and prescriptive sense.[9] But what of its application to groups and institutions like the church? Unlike some of my social science colleagues I maintain that an explanation of group and institutional action stems, in a sense, from the explanation given above concerned with individuals. Such a stand cannot be justifiably defended in a paper of this length, and in fact need not be when applied to the church. Unlike other social systems, the essential model of what the church should be is given, rather than being open to formulation, and the model is *always* in terms of an individual— Jesus Christ. Thus we can afford to duck the individual-group-institution connection when applied to the church and simply discover how to apply the individual model to the group-institution of the church as we know it.

b) Ends aspect

Perhaps we can start this search by looking at Adair's[10] three-part classification of the goals of the church, namely:

> *Purpose* is a very large word implying the general *direction* of an organisation; what it is primarily there for. There is a unitive or integrating sense to it. The nearest counterpart in theological language for the word is mission.
>
> *Aims* are purposes broken down into more definite time-and-space categories. A university, for example, might have the promotion of learning as its purpose, and 'to teach' and 'to research' among its more specific aims.
>
> *Objectives* are aims broken down into yet more definite steps—more tangible targets or goals within a close time-and-space range clearly delineated.[11]

In many respects Adair's purpose is correlated with the idea of terminal values as described above, whereas aims are more in line with instrumental values. For instance, using Adair's example, teaching at university has a value but *not* in itself—its value is in its instrumental nature for learning. It is also instrumental in terms of its very close connection to activities undertaken (e.g. teaching aims are fulfilled by teaching activities). Likewise the 'terminal' purpose(s) are dependent on the 'instrumental' aims for their achievement— without them the purposes would probably end up unfulfilled.

Adair's objectives, on the other hand, are quite legitimately the desires (or ends) discussed above. Such objectives are 'closest to the ground', so to speak, and are the immediate explanation of action in each and every specific situation.

How do these fit into the essence and form characteristics of the church? In general, the terminal purpose(s) and instrumental aims, along with the church's conception of itself which explains these, are *part* of the essence of the church; whereas the objectives are *part* of the form. Thus the higher elements are fixed over all time and in all situations, whereas the objectives, which are the *interpretation in specific situations*, can vary between one situation and another and one time and another.

c) Means aspect

Before looking at these various elements in some depth—the concern of the following section—it seems appropriate to look into the characteristics of the parts of the essence and form omitted from the above. Basically these centre around the construction of the information system, or more fundamentally with regard to the means (e.g. people, money, material) available, which are the action elements and to which the information system gives direction.

From an essence viewpoint the problem can be posed as follows: are there any general rules with regard to the church's means which are applicable to *all* situations over *all* time? Such insights would also throw some light on the remaining unique aspects which are applicable to the church in specific situations (the church's form).

Justice to such a search cannot be given in the following but perhaps it will at least provide some insight. Based on the understanding coming through the disciplines of systems theory and cybernetics,[12] three major insights for this search are:

   i) The way one organizes and uses the means available in a particular situation is contingent upon the objective to be achieved and the environmental state of the moment in the particular situation.

   ii) There are, in theory, general rules about the organizing and using of means in *particular* environmental situations.

iii) There are, in theory, general rules about the organizing and using of means which are applicable to *any* environmental situation.

The first point has something particularly to say to the form of the church. It says that even though, say, two churches in different situations may wish to achieve the same objectives (a similar interpretation of terminal purposes and instrumental aims) they may not, and possibly should not, organize and use their means in a similar fashion.

Despite this, and passing on to point (ii) above, there are likely to be some general rules on organizing and using means for particular situations. Much work has been done, and is being done, in organizational theory and cybernetics to specify these aspects and generally such insights are as applicable to the church as to any other empirical situation. For instance, take the concept of cybernetic variety![3]This concept, applied into the law of requisite variety, says quite simply that to attain an objective in a turbulent environment (high variety) requires flexibility (high variety) in the organization of means. This is so that the variety in the environment which could prevent achievement of an objective is 'killed' by the variety in the system so that all disturbances are minimized. Such an insight, and others, and their consequent application in specific situations, is vital for all organizations whether it be the church or not.

Rudge[14]has appreciated this particular insight by specifying the importance of the work of Burns & Stalker[15] to the church. Burns and Stalker were particularly concerned about organizational structure and which type, on a continuum mechanistic to organic, is applicable in particular environmental states. Although one could discuss at length the validity of this research and its application to the church, this is not the point. The point is that the idea fits into the area we are presently concerned about and has already been suggested as applicable to the church. Such insights are in essence and form terms applicable to the essence of the church.

Turning now to the third point, concerned with the general rules with regard to means which are independent of particular environments, the following can be said. Management and financial literature has much to contribute to this field but so also has theology. Both areas of insight are part of the essence of the church.

For instance, the author's own work on accounting and financial management[16] from an essence (or equivalent) viewpoint is important on the management side. Such insights are, in fact, being used to view the present financial strategy of the Church of England at the moment.[17] Likewise the growing insight into the importance of leadership in all church situations[18] is important from the theological side.

d) Concluding comments

The above, starting from the basis of an explanatory model of individual human action, attempts to give direction to the application of this to the church, tying relevant aspects to its essence and form. The contents of *both* essence and form contain ends and means aspects, and the above discussion gives some direction as to the characteristics of each.

The next section will address itself to one aspect of this—the 'ends' area from an essence viewpoint—so as to comprehend this part in a little more depth.

3) Some insight into the essence of the church: ends aspect

a) Introduction

The questions to which we are attempting to discover answers in this section, are:

    i)   What should be the church's 'conception of self'?

    ii)   What should be the church's 'terminal' purpose(s)?

    iii)   What should be the church's 'instrumental' aim(s)?

Answers to these questions, if obtainable, are intended, in the framework so presented, to apply to *all* situations over *all* time—a claim of immense magnitude.

Consequently, rather than rush into some suggested solution, it seems appropriate to examine how the following was arrived at and how it should also be assessed. Essentially the church is God's instrument in this world; or, in other words, church members are meant to be instruments only for his action in specific situations and directed by God's wishes, not their own. Such a statement implies a robot-like nature to mankind which is certainly not the case. Equally so, it seems to assume a certain perfect form of communication between God and his church which, in fact, is not always true. But despite these and other problems, the point is that from a conceptual viewpoint what is right for the church can only be tested by an understanding of what God wants for it.

How do we know what God wants for his church? The general answer is by revelation of his wishes. Such revelation is part static (the essence) and part dynamic (the form) but always it is revelation—and even on occasions revelation concerning the interpretation of revelation!

Thus the following is put forward as the revelation of God concerning one area of the essence of the church. Its truth content depends solely on whether or not it *is* revelation. An answer to such a question also brings into play a questioning of the criteria to be used to assess such insight.

Whether or not the following is revelation, therefore, will depend

on the affirmation or refutation by others in the future and also the process by which such decisions are reached.

b) The church's conception of itself

Küng, in an interesting section entitled 'The Fundamental Structure of the Church', discusses the church as the 'people of God', as the 'creation of the Spirit' and as the 'body of Christ'[19] However, fundamentally he sees the church as the people of God; since to be such implies being the creation of Spirit and also the body of Christ, both of which are basically more descriptive of the *concept* of being the people of God.

Such indeed is a concept: it is the church's conception of its inner self. But is it correct? And if it is not, does it matter anyway? The answer to this second question must be that it does matter, since everything that is done or thought about is meant to either maintain or enhance the church's concept of itself. Such a view is difficult to substantiate from an institutional viewpoint but can certainly be supported from an individual stance from which, it will be recalled, the postulated model of the church is based. Perhaps the following quote from Rokeach,[20] who of all social psychologists has done most in unscrambling the explanatory elements of individual human action, will suffice to justify this point:

> . . . the functions served by a person's values are to provide him with a comprehensive set of standards to guide actions, justifications, judgements, and comparisons of self and others and to serve needs for adjustment, ego defence and self-actualization. All these diverse functions converge into a *single overriding master function, namely to help maintain and enhance one's total conception of oneself.*[21][*italics added*]

Thus it is vital to get the church's conception of itself correct, since such a conception is the underpinning base of the instrumental and terminal values which are, in turn, the base for *all* desire (or objective) functions. If the conception is wrong, then undoubtedly all interpretations of this will be incorrect.

Consequently, is Küng's conception of the church as the people of God correct? Fundamentally, as pointed out above, an answer to this question is dependent on whether or not such insight is revelation or not. An answer to this is dependent on many factors but perhaps the following quotation from a recent book by Cundy[22] gives the author more confidence in accepting that such insight is indeed revelation:

> Recent theological writing has also seen an appreciation of the significance of the common definition of the church *as the community of God's people*.[23]

The word community, meaning the sharing of a common life, is, in fact, redundant in this definition since this word, like the phrases 'body of Christ' and 'creation of Spirit', are descriptions *only* of being the people of God. Such descriptions are not needed in settling the church's conception of itself and only come into the debate at other stages in the understanding process.

Thus it is contended that God wants the church to be conceptualized as the people of God. But what does this mean specifically with regard to 'terminal purposes' and 'instrumental aims'? The following sub-sections are addressed to these problems.

c) Key Insights into the church's purpose and aims

Perhaps we can start this search by looking at a few verses in Ephesians 4, not necessarily because the whole truth is encapsulated in these but because it is contended that the 'bones' are there:[24]

> It was he who 'gave gifts to mankind'; he appointed some to be apostles, others to be prophets, others to be evangelists, others to be pastors and teachers. He did this to prepare all God's people for the work of Christian service, in order to build up the body of Christ. And so we shall all come together to that oneness in our faith and in our knowledge of the Son of God; we shall become mature people, reaching to the very height of Christ's full stature.[25]

It is contended that this passage contains a basic understanding of the church's purposes and aims. The former, it is suggested, can be discovered by unscrambling the phrase 'mature people' in connection with the immediately previous insights in the quotation. The latter—the aims—it is contended are basically the five ministry areas listed in the earlier part of the quotation.

The following two sections are addressed to each of these in turn.

d) The church's purpose

The claim, then, is that the church's ultimate or terminal purpose is to produce 'mature people reaching to the very height of Christ's full stature.' But what does that mean?

Obviously to answer such a matter adequately constitutes much of the work in the last 2,000 years in theology and much research in the future. Thus to give the whole idea any degree of justice in a few paragraphs can only be an insult to the problem. Nevertheless, perhaps we can get over this difficulty by pointing out that purpose is indeed meant to be somewhat vague and general. Adair points out:

> In discussing purpose in any large corporate body, it is inevitable that the language will be general and abstract. We should not expect some sacrosanct formula or arrangement of words, still less a precise academic definition.[26]

This is because—in the structure we are presenting—the conception of self is given meaning in the purposes, which are given meaning in the aims, which are then further interpreted into objectives. Thus to get a complete picture would require an understanding of the entire taxonomy. Therefore a somewhat general comprehension on the level of purposes is entirely in order.

Thus our search is to comprehend in general terms what constitutes 'Christ's full stature', since maturity and Christ are equated in the quotation from Ephesians. Obviously, to do this we must observe Jesus Christ as seen in all the records of his behaviour and apply such insights to the collectivities called the church.

The following are some carefully selected observations which are,

145

it is contended, relevant to the church:

    i) The full stature of Christ was and is a moving, developing concept. The stature of Christ appears full during his life, even fuller in his death, and fuller still in his actions and life after death. Such a picture indicates that we shall never be able to say this is the full stature of Christ—it is constantly moving forward.

    ii) He was very concerned about his relationship with his heavenly Father, giving time and energy to permit this to grow and develop.

    iii) He had a very special relationship with a small group of believing people, although the group was far from being closed to further membership.[27]

    iv) He was constantly outgoing to outsiders, expressing his concern either in terms of healing from physical diseases, or in terms of judgement, or in terms of messages of hope and challenge.

Using these four major observations and applying them to the church gives the following three purposes:

    i) That all members of the church should grow in their relationship and understanding of God the Father, Son and Spirit.

    ii) That all members of the church should grow in their relationship and ministry to one another, both being directed and empowered by God's Holy Spirit.

    iii) That all members of the church should be constantly outgoing in ministry to those outside the church and welcoming of all new members, both being directed and empowered by God's Holy Spirit.

Such three purposes—caricatured as upward, inward and outward—have a dynamic growth quality attached to them, since the target is forever moving onwards.

e) The church's aims

The Church's aims are the instruments by which the purposes are achieved. In this sense they are means to certain ends (the purposes) rather than ends in themselves.[28] But yet, they are ends in their own right for which means are required to achieve them.

The list of five in Ephesians dominates Harper's[29] discussion on ministry. In fact, interestingly he draws the very important distinction between ministry and ministers who perform such ministries. This is a most perceptive insight and highlights the point being made here that we may need ministers in these areas (the means) to achieve the aims of the area (the ends) but we should not confuse the two.

According to Harper, the apostolic aim is to 'represent', to travel,

to pass on insight to other fellowships. The prophetic aim is to listen to God and declare insight for the moment and for the situation. The pastoral aim is to care for the people of God and to bring them into health and maturity in a particular situation. The teaching aim is concerned with propounding and explaining the Word of God to the people of God. The evangelistic aim is concerned with passing on the good news of Jesus Christ with a view to increasing the family of God.

In a neat summary he describes these ministries in terms of the slogans:

> Let my people go: the apostolic function of the church
> Let my people hear: the prophetic function of the church
> Let my people care: the pastoral function of the church
> Let my people know: the teaching function of the church
> Let my people grow: the evangelistic function of the church [30]

Or in terms of commands from God:

> Go to my people - Speak to my people - Care for my people -
> Teach my people - Reach my people [31]

Küng likewise talks about ministries or vocations and draws them out by discovering the qualities possessed by Jesus Christ—which Harper does as well, incidentally: [32]

> It is God himself who creates and arouses a vocation through the Holy Spirit: each vocation is a manifestation, individuation and concretization of the one charism of Jesus Christ, who is himself *the* apostle, prophet, teacher, evangelist, pastor and deacon. [33]

Adair, in another attempt to define the aims (or ministries) of the church, lists seven:

> *Worship*: to offer to God worship of the highest standard possible in a given situation and worthy of the church's knowledge of his nature.
> *Pastoral*: to care for individuals both within and without formal church membership, especially those in 'sickness, sorrow, or adversity'.
> *Evangelistic*: to invite and attract nominal Christians and those untouched by Christianity to share in the Christian faith and life.
> *Social*: to serve society in its gradual movement forwards in the pursuit of its own legitimate ends, and to relate them to the kingdom of God.
> *Ecumenical*: to promote the unity of the church in prayer and action.
> *Financial & Administrative*: to make fullest use of all the resources of people, money and materials . . . not only in the cause of efficiency, but also to the glory of God.
> *Educational*: to equip each member of the church with the knowledge and skills appropriate for his or her Christian responsibility. [34]

Other theological texts could have been cited but would add little to the above, either in terms of commonalities or differences. There is, from a basic viewpoint, a considerable amount of agreement between the three cited authorities. However, there are a few notable differences which can be highlighted in terms of the following questions:

i) Is 'worship' an aim of the church? Why does it not feature in Harper's and Küng's lists?

ii) Is 'social' an aim of the church? Why does it not feature in Harper's and Küng's lists?

iii) Is 'ecumenical' an aim of the church? Why does it not feature in Harper's and Küng's lists?

iv) Is 'financial & administrative' an aim of the church? Is it the same as Küng's 'deacon' aim?

v) Why does the 'deacon' aim fail to appear in Harper's list?

Such differences need to be reconciled, and in fact can be. Space in this paper does not permit a fully argued case for this viewpoint but perhaps the following can be said:

i) Worship does not feature explicitly in Harper's and Küng's lists, because they would probably maintain it is *implicit* in all the other aims. Notwithstanding this, they would probably agree that there is a separate aim as such which is concerned with worship as an activity separate from the worship components in other aims.

ii) Social concern does not feature at all strongly in Harper and Küng. Yet the church's social concern has an interesting history. Firstly, there was the separation between 'social gospel' and 'the gospel of truth'. Secondly came the fusing of social aims and evangelistic aims.[35] Thirdly and finally came the agreement on the close connection between evangelism and social concern, the separation between the two but the legitimacy of the church to be concerned about both areas.[36] Thus, it is contended, Harper and Küng have not delved deeply enough into the evangelism aim to discover the social aim contained therein, and therefore the latter is a legitimate aim.

iii) The ecumenical aim does not feature in Harper and Küng because the basis for their insight comes from Scripture and the problems of a divided church had not arisen when the New Testament was being written. Nevertheless, Küng spends a considerable section of his book propounding the need to bringing the separate denominations together.[37] So this is an aim instituted by need: once achieved, it becomes more an implicit one to maintain rather than achieve.

iv) Deacons (those who fulfilled the 'deacon' aim) according to Küng in an interesting historical survey: '. . . became something like a manager of the community'.[38] Now to be a manager is to effectively fulfil what Adair considers to be the financial and administrative aim. Thus the two are one.

v) Harper's non-recognition of this area of ministry stems not so much from rejection of the function but rather from the label 'deacon' (meaning servant) and its present interpretation in the Church of England. However, the danger of this approach is that, to use a colloquial phrase, 'you may throw the baby out with the bathwater.' Surely there has always been, and always will be, a management need which

can be classified as separate from the other needs. But it has to be stressed that, as an aim, it is a servant to the other aims. Therefore, if the other aims are instrumental to achieving the terminal purposes, the management-financial-administrative aim is instrumental to achieving all the other aims.

Thus in conclusion the instrumental aims are, it is contended, nine in number:

Worship	Pastoral	Social
Prophetic	Teaching	Ecumenical
Apostolic	Evangelistic	Financial and Administrative

Full interpretation of these, maybe into numerical language—the most precise form of language—must remain for future work.

4) Conclusion

The above has attempted a number of things:
   a) To delve into Küng's approach to looking at the church in terms of essence and form.
   b) To apply a social scientific explanation of individual human action to such a framework, on the grounds that the church is a depiction of an individual (Jesus Christ) in this world.
   c) To look in some depth at three aspects of this model as applied to the church: the concept of self, terminal values, and instrumental values—which are all *part* of the 'essence'.

Obviously the next stage is to fill the gaps in the 'essence' by developing what has been said, both in terms of expanding and checking its contents, and adding the other half concerning generalizations on the organization and use of means. From such a basis it should then be possible to explore the rich variety in the form of the church to appreciate the essence content, variety and commonality of interpretation, etc.

However, such studies are for the future. In the meantime this paper is put forward as a way of looking at the church which, although highly analytical, has distinct possibilities of supplying some most important insights. Whether it does so depends on many factors.

RICHARD C. LAUGHLIN has recently taken up a lectureship in accounting and financial management at the University of Sheffield. For the last two years he has been a parish administrator based at St Thomas Church, Crookes, Sheffield, working on administrative structures for parishes.

NOTES

1   H. Küng, *The Church* (Search Press : 1968).
2   ibid. pp 4 and 5.
3   See J. J. Katz, *The Philosophy of Language* (Harper and Row : 1966).
4   See R. Mattessich, *Accounting and Analytical Methods* (Irwin : 1964).
5   H. Küng, *What must Remain in the Church* (Fontana : 1977) p22.
6   See T. Parsons and E. A. Shils (eds.), *Towards a General Theory of Action* (Harvard University Press : 1951).
7   C. Kluckhohn and others. 'Values and Value Orientations in the Theory of Action', in Parsons and Shils, op. cit. pp388-433.
8   R. C. Laughlin 'Models of the Explanatory Elements of Individual Human Action' (unpublished paper, November 1975).
9   Although the conclusions were discovered by description yet it also must of necessity be prescriptive as well as due to the very nature of the phenomenon being investigated.
10 See particularly J. Adair, *Training for Decisions* (MacDonald : 1971) and *The Becoming Church* (SPCK : 1977).
11 J. Adair, 'Formulating Strategy in the Church of England; *Journal of Business Policy* Vol. 3:4, 1973, pp4 and 5.
12 See for instance G. J. Klir, *An Approach to General Systems Theory,* (van Nostrand Reinhold Co. : 1969) and W. R. Ashby, *An Introduction to Cybernetics* (Chapman and Hall Ltd. : 1964).
13 See Ashby, op. cit., and many other good cybernetic textbooks, e.g. S. Beer, *Cybernetics and Management* (Unibooks : 1967).
14 P. F. Rudge, *Management in the Church* (McGraw-Hill : 1976).
15 T. Burns and G, M. Stalker, *The Management of Innovation* (Tavistock : 1961).
16 See particularly R. C. Laughlin 'A Framework of Financial Strategy' (discussion paper October 1977).
17 R. C. Laughlin, 'Financial Strategy in the Church with Special Reference to the Church of England' (unpublished paper, June 1978).
18 See for instance M. Harper, *Let my People Grow* (Hodder & Stoughton : 1977).
19 Küng, op. cit. pp107-260.
20 See particularly, M. Rokeach, *The Nature of Human Values* (The Free Press : 1977).
21 ibid. p216.
22 I.P.M. Cundy (ed.), *Obeying Christ in a Changing World Vol. 2: The People of God* (Collins : 1977).
23 ibid. p12.
24 Interestingly enough as Harper, op. cit., points out more and more Christians, at this time, are being drawn to this passage in Ephesians particularly, but far from exclusively, with regard to definitive insights into ministry in the Church.
25 Ephesians 4:11-13, *Good News Bible* (Collins/Fontana : 1976).
26 Adair, *The Becoming Church* p152.
27 See Luke 10:1 concerning the appointing of 70 and Acts 1:15 concerning the 120 'assembled brotherhood'.
28 Such a viewpoint is a slight departure from the social psychology model on which this argument is based. The instrumental values in such a model are more concerned with models of conduct (e.g. honesty, courage) attached to action sets which are undertaken to achieve certain terminal values—suitably interpreted into objectives—(e.g. a world at peace). In the adapted model such instrumental values (aims) are the *sole* way to achieve the terminal purposes.
29 Harper, op. cit.
30 ibid. p44 and 45.
31 ibid. p45.

32   ibid. pp61 - 5.
33   Küng, op. cit. p395.
34   Adair, *The Becoming Church* op. cit.p153.
35   See the Lausanne Covenant Clause 5 from the Lausanne Congress on World
     Evangelization, and the papers by Stott and Kaye in the National Evangelical
     Alliance Congress books *Obeying Christ in a Changing World Vols. 1 and 3.*
     (Collins : 1977).
36   See proposition A4 and A5 and Declaration of Intent Nos. 8 and 9 in the NEAC
     Executive Committee, *The Nottingham Statement* (Falcon : 1977) and also J. R.
     W. Stott, 'World Evangelization : Signs of Convergence and Divergence in
     Christian Understanding' *Third Way*, Vol. 1:23, December 1977, pp3-9.
37   See particularly Küng, op. cit. pp263 - 312.
38   ibid. p413.