DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 765 HE 014 486

AUTHOR Hough, Joseph C., Jr.
TITLE The Politics of Theological Education. Occasional Papers No. 37.
INSTITUTION United Methodist Board of Higher Education and Ministry, Nashville, Tenn.
PUB DATE 7 Sep 81
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at a Consultation on Reform in Theological Education (Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, Fall 1979).
AVAILABLE FROM United Methodist Center, Board of Higher Education and Ministry, United Methodist Church, P.O. Box 871, Nashville, TN 37202.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Church Related Colleges; Church Responsibility; *Church Role; College Faculty; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; Global Approach; Higher Education; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Political Influences; *Religious Education; *Social Problems; Teacher Role; Teaching Methods; Team Teaching; *Theological Education; World Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Methodist Church

ABSTRACT

Perspectives on reform in theological education are considered. It is suggested that the lack of coherence in theological education is primarily due to the conflict between certain sociopolitical realities that place antithetical demands on faculty and administrators of theological schools. Conflict between the academic study of religious phenomena and the study of matters that affect the governance of the church, or between theory and practice, is at issue. Reform might involve designing courses focusing on major global issues facing the church and taught by faculty teams, including members of the arts ministry (practical) as well as the systematic and historical (academic) faculty. For example, Christian education might focus on developing the ability to reflect and communicate a theological "on-look" on major world issues within the realm of responsibility for church governance. Additionally, the present emphasis of methodological survey and practice could be altered to include a theological critique of contemporary schools of thought in education, psychology, sociology, and models of management. One major category in the new curriculum would be foundation studies that provide an introduction to historical/systematic studies and arts of ministry studies. Interpretive studies would allow students to elect courses taught in the traditional disciplines, and integrative studies would include the courses covering global issues. Another priority area for revised theological studies would be the spiritual discipline. If this type of reform is implemented, faculty must be allowed greater freedom in the allocation of time, and institutional reward systems must consider the new and more collaborative style of research and teaching. (SW)

ISSUED BY THE UNITED METHODIST BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND MINISTRY

occasional PAPERS

No. 37, September 7, 1981

THE POLITICS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

by Joseph C. Hough, Jr.

All of us are deeply indebted to Ed Farley and Bob Lynn for their basic contributions to the ongoing discussion of reform in theological education. It is, of course, tempting to enter into critical dialogue with both persons, since the most complimentary gesture one can make to an author is to take his or her writing seriously. However, we have been asked to move to our own constructive contributions in our writing; so I shall make only a few preliminary comments about one of the essays already before us before proceeding to my own analyses and proposals.

The Possibility of a Theological Solution

Ed Farley has advanced the thesis that "the reform of theological education can be accomplished only by a theological solution to the problem of the unity and branches of theological study."[1] This clear and simple statement becomes more and more complex as Farley pursues that solution. For example it is really difficult to see how the revival of the highly formal process of theological encyclopedia developed in the nineteenth century is going to lead to a theological solution of the unity of *theologia*. Farley himself notes that the most recent attempts are largely the recounting of present curricular divisions, together with some rationale for their belonging together in one single subject matter. It would seem, therefore, that there is a decidedly conservative caste to encyclopedia, and that hardly augurs well for reform. Or again, Farley would have us pursue a new "theological" paradigm for *theologia*, but the emerging form of this theological solution proves to be very elusive. What is finally presented is the assertion that there must be a unity in *theologia* because *theologia* is about one faith. Like Schleiermacher, Farley sees the character of theological education as *theological* education being derived from its definitive relationship to a "determinate faith."[2] Because it is so related to *a* faith, *theologia* must be unified in some sense. Unlike Schleiermacher, however, Farley does not go so far as to say that the final criterion for determining the unity of *theologia* emerges from the question as to whether or not the whole and all the parts are clearly in the service of the "governance of the church."[3] In the absence of such a clearly defined position, we are left finally with the pursuit of the unity of faith itself as the ground for the unity of

theological studies. But the unity of faith appears only in genuine Christian praxis, an event which occurs in the "mysteries of freedom and grace."[4] In other words, the unity of theologia is finally a proleptic vision which ought to be pursued in some fashion in spite of insuperable difficulties,[5] but there is not much clarity about the kind of theological thinking which might bring us closer to some concrete unity in our perception of the unity (or even the material content) of the subject matter of theologia.[6]

There is little doubt that theological faculties need to be engaged in discussions about the nature of their corporate task and the relationship of their unique and individual agenda to this total corporate one and to the individual agenda of other colleagues. Moreover, this discussion ought to be carried on in the context of serious debate concerning the theological understanding of matters of faith and ministry. However, given the present disarray in the core discipline of systematic theology,[7] and the chaos rampant in more general "theologizing,"[8] the likelihood of any single new emerging theological understanding of the subject matter of theological studies is, to put it mildly, not self-evident.

The Politics of Theological Education

It is obvious by now that my understanding of the fundamental problem of theological education is somewhat different from the view presented in Ed Farley's analysis. Though I would not minimize the theological difficulties which we face in our pursuit of some agreement on the subject matter of theological studies, I think that the lack of coherence in theological education today is primarily due to the collision between certain socio-political realities which mediate conflicting claims on the faculty and administration of theological schools. Therefore, proposals for reform in theological education must deal with these realities not as epiphenomena but as primary centers of power which will continue to have a profound impact on theological education during the next decades, regardless of any theological developments which may occur. In other words, my answer to Bob Lynn's query about the terms of the debate over theological education[9] is that the theory/practice distinction is, indeed, fated to be the boundary of the theological curriculum unless we can find concrete ways to modify the impact of the political realities on which that distinction rests and from which it continues to exercise its powerful influence. Even if a strong cadre of theologians could agree on a theology of theologia, that agreement alone would make little difference in the coherence of theological education unless there were developed also some measures calculated to modify or at least mediate the political forces which impinge upon us at every point where reform is attempted. Incidentally, my theory of reform leads me to believe that a theological solution to the unity of theological education might emerge partially as a result of attempts to deal with political realities rather than preceding them in time. This idea will be pursued later.

Theology and the University

According to Farley and Lynn, the problem of theological education arose as Protestantism experienced the loss of the "way of authority" which undergirded the "four-fold pattern." This resulted, at first, in the re-

tention of the four-fold pattern as autonomous specialities without any new paradigm of unity. This was complicated later as increasing specialization together with the knowledge explosion continually added to the "dispersed encyclopedia." To this analysis it must be added that there were political factors which strongly influenced the pattern of these developments.

Theology as a discipline was increasingly under attack from the side of other university specialities for its ecclesiastical bent. This had already begun in the nineteenth century as von Humboldt projected and implemented his idea of the university as a community for lehrfreiheit, the absolute freedom of research specialists to pursue "truth unfettered by outside interference. Thus began the process of specialization in the university as a whole. The conception of the university as a congeries of research specialists conceived at Berlin soon became a very influential model for the university as a whole, and the impact of this model was to provide a very powerful impetus for continued specialization and subspecialization as the most characteristic form of academic development. The central foci of the research in Berlin were scientific and historical matters, both types of which were organized into "scientific" disciplines with a distinct methodology and field coherence.[10]

In this milieu, there emerged increasing pressure upon theology to define itself as a "science" with a coherent pattern of subspecialties conforming methodologically to the dominant historical field paradigms in the German university.

By the time of Schleiermacher's encyclopedic attempt, the attack on theology as "dogmatic" or "ecclesiastical," and hence unscientific, was beginning to become commonplace. Fichte had already objected to including theology in the curriculum of the new university, and Schleiermacher's preparation of his outline of the study of theology has to be seen in that context.[11]

The fascination of the nineteenth century German university with history and historical method is well known.[12] It is therefore not surprising that the solutions to the problem of theology in the university which were suggested during that time consisted of proposals to locate the so-called historical disciplines in the university and to remove the ecclesial branches of knowledge, dogmatics and practical theology, from the university context entirely. Both Heinrici and Bernoulle made such proposals at the close of the century.[13] In both cases the object was to give theology a place in the university by restricting it to the study of history as a scientific enterprise.

These, of course, were partly defensive reactions; and they signified that the understanding of the core of "theologia" was being modified to conform to the temper of the host universities. Similar observations could be made about the contemporary efforts of Pannenberg to insist on the "scientific" character of theology as a systematic discipline and Kaufmann's efforts to argue that there is no necessary "confessional" aspect to the study of theology.[14] After all, systematic theology is the motherless child of the old dogmatics, one of the aspects of theologia which early became insecure in the university setting.

In the United States, the argument about the place of theology in the university has been and continues to be complicated by a further development. For one thing, the First Amendment to the Constitution contained the provision against the establishment of religion. As this establishment clause has been interpreted in subsequent Supreme Court decisions, it has become obvious that the teaching of religion in public institutions is subject to severe limitations. Though there is no definite prohibition against the teaching of religion in any of the Supreme Court decisions, it has been made absolutely clear that anything that is close to dogmatics or ecclesiastical matters has no place in the curriculum of publicly supported educational institutions.[15]

With the rise of the important state universities and the development of the land grant colleges, a curious anomaly emerged, therefore, from the perspective of the history of the university, namely, universities in which legally there can be no teaching of matters which effect the "governance of the church."

There are, of course, departments of religion in many of the publicly supported state universities, but great care has to be given so that the academic study of religion is clearly distinguished from theological education. Thus, the most easily justified approaches are historical, psychological, sociological, and phenomenological, preferably done in a comparative mode.

This peculiarly American phenomenon has but exacerbated the insecurity of the disciplines of theology which had already begun to develop under the questioning of the validity of theology as a mode of scientific inquiry in the context of the universities in Europe. The constitutional provisions against the propagation of religion also gave support to the already present elevation of the traditional historical disciplines to the position of theologia par excellence.

The practical consequences of these developments are far-reaching. Any hint of confessionalism, even the use of "Christian" as an adjective before ethics and theology (unless it is historical), is subject to serious question in the university. Moreover, what the scholar in religion needs to know in order to achieve recognition in the various academic guilds is determined without any attention to the needs of the church. Finally, any advocacy, spiritual exercise, or practical training for ministry which is seen to be part of the overall understanding of the proper subject matter of theological education is suspect.[16]

Those who are taught to teach religion, therefore, are socialized in a professional system related to the church only historically and the ministry not at all. There is no inherent reason to expect that such teachers of religion would be any more responsive to the needs of the ministry and the church than any other professor except that historically most of the great graduate departments of religion have been given the responsibility for the divinity school in the university in addition to their departmental responsibilities.

I do not mean to imply any lack of commitment to the needs of the church on the part of many who teach religion. What I am arguing is that there

is usually little reward for the exercise of that commitment intrinsic to the system of socialization which is controlled by the university. In fact, I think that the existence of a large Christian group in the university's total constituency (alumni, trustees, and the general public) is the one factor which continues to enable the divinity schools to do their job well in spite of the general antipathy to dogmatic and ecclesiastical concerns which has become part of the internal self-understanding of the modern academy.

The impact of the situation is felt also in theological schools not related directly to universities. Even though these schools are not subject to the immediate pressures of the university reward system, the faculty, as Farley has noted, are still subject to the pressures of the guilds which are completely dominated by university-based faculty who apply university-oriented criteria for excellence in scholarship to the systems for ascribing status.

On the one hand, this has proved to be an impetus toward improvement in the quality and seriousness of disciplinary research in the theological schools, an important achievement in itself. On the other hand, it has created a tremendous internal conflict within individual teachers in theological schools. The same pressures against the unity of theologia are experienced by them as they attempt to relate to the demands of the guilds and the requirements of the church constituencies to whom their schools are responsible.

Professionalization in Ministry

The requirements of church constituencies are hardly distinguishable from the demands of the ministers, and from the clergy has come the most severe criticism of the subjugation of theologia to the criteria of the university guilds. Charges of irrelevance and academicism have been noted by Farley and Lynn, who also concede the justification of some of the criticism. The source of this criticism is not, however, merely reactive. Part of it derives from a rather autonomous movement, the growing professionalization of ministry which itself had already begun in the nineteenth century.[17] Like the other professions, the ministry began to develop its own standards for reward, and those standards were related to job effectiveness rather than personal effectiveness in one's own living praxis.[18] As the movement toward professionalization in ministry mounted its strength, increasing demand for "practical" training led to the addition of faculty members in pastoral counseling, preaching, Christian (religious) education and church administration. Then, as new situations arose in the worldly experiences of the clergy, and the churches sought new avenues of service and expansion, schools added professors of missions, evangelism, urban ministry and others.

The "culture of professionalism" sought its legitimacy in the schools. If one were a "professional," then there must be "professional studies." As each new functional aspect of ministerial professionalism emerged, the representatives of the profession agitated for a course and then an "area" of studies to hone the necessary functional skills.[19] Subsequently, each of the functional aspects of the new professional studies in ministry begin to move toward professionalism as well. So the teachers

of pastoral counseling, religious education, homiletics, and last year, professors of church management, have organized national professional associations which promote research and dispense rewards in each of the subspeciality fields of ministry studies. They have and will function in ways similar to the professional societies related to the systematic and historical fields.

Most concretely, the result of this growing professionalism is an increasingly heavy emphasis on the functional excellence of the minister by the churches themselves. Thus, even though the constituents of major denominations give lip service to a "holistic" view of ministry which includes spirituality, scholarship, integrity of faith, and other elements of what might be called a genuine ministerial praxis, it is clear that the highest marks are given to those who exhibit competence in the functions of ministry or those who exhibit a particular professional style.[20]

This is hardly more than a contemporary confirmation of the emergence of the "pastoral director" as the controlling model of ministry.[21] If anything, however, my perception is that the emphasis on "saleable" skills in the maintenance related functions of ministry as opposed to traditional ideational factors, is even stronger now than in the 1950s.[22] It is not surprising, therefore, that the most common suggestion coming from our graduates during the last ten years is that more practical (read functional) training is needed during the seminary years;[23] moreover, the requests for continuing education by pastors are grouped close to the functional needs of the profession. I think that this is true in spite of a rather heavy demand for biblical courses which are most often seen as "resources" for preaching.

The professionalization of ministry has resulted in the development of an understanding of the theological school as an institution providing resources to enable persons to function effectively as professionals in the ministry. Heavy emphasis on the so-called academic subjects is called into question because it is difficult to see how some subjects could enhance the acquired skills which increasingly provide the new professionals with authority as well as upward professional mobility.[24]

The convergence of the two professional movements in the academy and the ministry on the theological school creates a pedagogical nightmare. Faculty members must attend to (1) basic research which may or may not relate to teaching or the ministry in any direct or observable way; (2) the teaching of a full load in the ministerial studies curriculum in which she or he must deal with the history of her or his field, the methodology and the major issues of the field, and the relation of the field to ministry in the church (personal encyclopedia?); and (3) some version of continuing education, often both for ministers and laity. In the schools with graduate programs, the teaching of graduate students and the advisement of dissertations are additional responsibilities. This is complicated by the fact that in one graduate program, the teacher is expected to teach those who will do research, teach in college or university departments of religion, or teach in theological schools. Many will do all three at once, following the model of their professors. Given this constellation of pedagogical functions, there is

little wonder that there is professional isolation. And it should not be too surprising that many of our colleagues opt for some pedagogical specialization.[25] This is often as serious a problem as the more commonly identified problem of field specialization.

Toward Reform: A Modest Proposal

The continuing tension between the claims of conflicting and powerful professional groups on faculty members and theological schools as a whole constitutes the political boundary for the present discussion of reform in theological education. Although this boundary is not absolute, it is a serious limiting factor on any attempt at concrete implementation of proposals for reform. Those of us who have experimented with models for reform on very limited scales have already experienced the enormous difficulties caused when one comes up against the entrenched value systems which constitute the material substance of the boundary. Even when, in a fit of collegial warmth and enthusiasm, faculties agree to experiment with new models of education founded on some partial revision of a theological understanding of ministry in a global setting, the level of cooperation diminishes decidedly when the reality factors of guild pressures and institutional reward systems emerge once again to the forefront of consciousness.[26] The reason for this is that individually and institutionally most of us have developed uneasy truce with the pressures upon us; and posing experimentally the possibility of a new paradigm of theological education creates not a hope that all things can be made new, but rather the specter of another intrusion into an already overcrowded agenda. In fits and starts we work at theological apologia or tinker with curriculum, but basically we all do the same things with slightly different emphases.

I have concluded, therefore, that at present, and in the foreseeable future, the impetus for reform in theological education will be generated by what Amitai Etzioni has called "bit decisions" rather than "contextuating decisions." Although Etzioni writes with reference to social policy, his distinctions might help us in thinking about our task as well. Bit decisions, according to Etzioni, are incremental decisions that are made on a continuing basis and usually result in relatively small-scale adjustments of larger policies which have been decided upon previously and are in the process of being implemented concretely. Over an extended period of time a series of bit decisions may result in such a radical change in the original policy decision that the combined impact of the whole set of decisions really constitutes a new contextuating vision. In contrast, the "contextuating decisions" have to do with projecting a broad encompassing vision of totally new directions in social policy.[27]

The danger in making bit decisions is that they may prove to be ad hoc and incoherent, causing confusion in the minds of policy makers and the clientele of social policy. They need not be without some direction, however, for one may address serious difficulties in any present system without having a complete vision of a totally new and different one.

In light of Etzioni's distinctions, one might well understand theological reform in a way quite different from Farley. It is possible that a carefully conceived set of alterations in our institutional procedures and

pedagogical habits might create a political context that would be more conducive to the emergence of a theological solution of the unity of theological studies. A well-designed incremental approach to concrete change may function as proleptic action. That is, we may so alter the concrete living style of our theological schools that in the absence of any foreseeable unified theological understanding, we may still "live toward" the unity we seek. In our teaching we might live as if there were a unity, even if there is no unity. To use Farley's image, we might begin in limited ways to function as "ecclesial communities" with anticipatory actions pointing toward the overcoming of the theory/practice distinction.[28]

I am proposing, therefore, a set of bit decisions which might prove to function proleptically as a theological solution to reform in theological education. These suggestions rest on three theological assumptions. The first is that the unity of theologia rests on its definitive relationship to the Christian faith. Second, the concrete form of that unity is its focus on the governance of the church. Finally, the problems of the governance of the church lie basically in the inadequacy of the theological "on-look"[29] characteristic of the community of faith in the United States. That inadequacy is due to the fact that generally that "on-look" does not take account of the emerging consciousness of oppressed people and our own growing disillusionment with the dominant economic and political models in the Western world. Therefore, any new theological paradigms which might emerge must include attention to both the ecclesiological ground and the new global setting of theologia.

Pedagogical Style

As I indicated earlier, one of the impacts of the pressures of academic and ministerial professionalization has been the creation of a pedagogical nightmare. Therefore, the first priority for reform in theological education is attention to pedagogical style.[30] Here, the most pressing question is: how can the style of our pedagogy become a sign of the unity of our corporate task? Put in the terms of the previous discussion, are there modes for organizing our pedagogy which might convey concretely our hope for the unity of theologia? If such modes exist, what form might they take?

1. A faculty might adopt a pattern of teaching which could overcome the rigid theory/practice distinction by designing courses which are focused on the major global issues facing the church in the world. The definition of the issues should be evolved in consultation with those responsible for the governance of the church, particularly those whose experience includes roots in the realities of the new global paradigms of the understanding of world.

2. These courses should be taught by teams of faculty persons who participate in the research and discussion leading to the formulation of the issues.

This, of course, is not a new idea. Team teaching is at once the most talked about and the least successfully implemented of any of the so-called "bridging mechanisms."[31] It is probably the most difficult kind of teaching to do. If it can be successfully done, however, it might model pedagogically

the unity of theologia by overcoming in the praxis of theological teaching and research the disciplinary and personal isolation which plague the faculty now. That, in turn, might yield some unity of theological understanding of the corporate task. Short of that, there would possibly emerge at least some mutual understanding of the particular theological "on-looks" out of which the individuals on the team were operating. That alone would provide some basis for overcoming professional isolation.

Moreover, since the issues evolved as topics are to be global in scope, it might be that some of the parochialism and charlatanism of Western theological education could be overcome. In other words, if these issues are properly addressed, not only will an understanding of Christian praxis come into view, but the basis for a genuine social and ecclesiological criticism will be formed at the heart of the curriculum rather than at the periphery in "social action" courses. Such a central shift might prove to have prophetic impact on the students and faculty alike, in turn, enabling our institutions to relate more creatively to our colleagues in the Third World churches and theological schools.

3. If this pedagogical pattern proved to be workable, it might be feasible to cluster courses around selected thematic centers. The sense of collaborative unity could then be extended beyond the small teaching and research teams and involve students as well as faculty.

4. If the constitution of the teaching teams included members of the arts of ministry (practical) faculty as well as the systematic and historical (academic) faculty, a new context for teaching the arts of ministry might emerge.[32] For example, Christian education could be taught by modeling the educational process necessary to develop the ability to reflect and communicate a theological "on-look" on major world issues which constitute the horizon of responsibility for church governance. The teaching of pastoral counseling could be done in relation to developing theological criticism of the emerging modes of family organization and the psychological impact of the radical changes which are transpiring. Similar possibilities might emerge for other arts of ministry disciplines.

None of this is meant to imply that "skills" courses could be dispensed with entirely, but if they were taught at least partly in the context of theologizing about major issues, the students could have the possibility of understanding the "skills" not simply as autonomous ministerial specialities, but rather as modes of vocational praxis in which responsiveness to church and world are united.

5. The teaching of the arts of ministry could be further enriched by altering the present focus of methodological survey and practice to include major attention to a theological critique of contemporary schools of thought in education, psychology, sociology, and models of management. This would enlarge the purpose of arts of ministry courses to include not only a survey of options in the fields related to ministerial functions, but rather to develop a theological self-understanding which would inform the choice of options.

Courses with this kind of focus could be taught in conjunction with a teaching minister. Such an arrangement would provide the opportunity for

students, early in their educational experience, to observe competent and gifted ministers in all phases of their work. These courses would perhaps include colloquia jointly led by the teaching ministers and faculty. It is important to note that I envision these courses being taught not only by arts of ministry faculty but also by systematic-historical faculty.

I am not at all sanguine about the prospects for implementing these pedagogical measures. In the absence of some attack on the political realities which face us, these experiments will be short-lived. The critical problem is time. Our pedagogical nightmare is really the tyranny of time as well. Therefore, if theological schools are to take seriously the need for this type of reform, administrators must be willing to allow faculty some greater freedom in the allocation of time. The main point at which there are possibilities for re-allocating time is the determination of course load. Since I share Lynn's conviction that the present fallout of specialization, namely, the explosion of the number and types of courses, is really overdone, I would see the reduction of faculty course load as an option for creative re-allocation of time to allow the new kind of research necessary for the reform I have envisioned.

It will also be necessary to adjust the institutional reward systems to take account of the new and more collaborative style of research and teaching. This poses the possibility of serious modifications of institutional expectations of faculty, and it might also necessitate the substitution of other requirements of students for the conventional course-hour requirements. For example we might place at least equal weight on this pedagogically related research to that placed on conventional disciplinary research, even though they yield a different "product." Students might be asked to rely more on independent study and guided research in relation to the preparatory work of teaching teams.

Curriculum Organization

The new style of teaching would obviously yield courses which do not fit at all into any of the currently defined curriculum divisions. If these courses are to be anything more than peripheral experiments, some new assumptions about curriculum-building must replace the present assumption that disciplinary divisions are the givens of any curriculum construction.

Here I might be fairly close to what Farley is calling for when he suggests that our short-range task is "pedagogical encyclopedia." However, even here, he continues to betray his bias for the chronological and conceptual priority of "theory" by suggesting, at least by implication, that such reconstruction must await some unanimity on a formulation of philosophical perspective on "structures of understanding."[33]

There is no one terminology or organizational pattern which will be accepted by everyone, but any new curriculum structure must take some account of the strong entrenchment of disciplinary interests, even though they will not determine the heart of the curriculum itself.

Therefore, one major category in the new curriculum will be "Foundation

Studies" in which the faculty introduces the students to the content and the methodological issues in the historical/systematic studies as well as the arts of ministry studies. I am thoroughly convinced that there is much overlap in both areas and the number of foundational courses required should be about half of the usual eight or ten introductions to each discipline. Following upon the Foundation Studies will be "Interpretive Studies." Here students would elect courses taught in the traditional disciplines. The elective system could be completely free or a more circumscribed elective model. (These types of courses will be necessary as long as theological schools have joint responsibility for graduate programs, or until the shape of graduate programs is redesigned. The latter is not likely to occur soon, and if it did, the direction of the reform would probably be toward earlier specialization.)

The heart of the curriculum will be "Integrative Studies." This division would include all of the types of courses I have described in the previous section. The educational process in the schools would culminate with the collaborative effort by faculty and students to model the unity of theologia by attending to reflection on the praxis of ministry and of faith.

Spiritual Discipline

One of the most serious deficiencies in Protestant theological education in the United States has been the lack of attention to the whole area of spiritual discipline. This is partly due, I think, to the triumph of individualism in American culture, the religious counterpart of which was individualistic pietism. Moreover, the continental reaction against the pietistic movement put theological education in Germany on the defensive against any kind of "spiritualism." Since, as Lynn points out, the most influential model for Protestant theological education in the United States has been the German university department of theology,[34] it is hardly surprising that attention to any corporate understanding of spiritual formation has been almost absent from Protestant discussions of theologia.

In recent years, there have been a few sporadic attempts at introducing some notions of spiritual discipline into Protestant seminaries, but none that I know about have emerged as promising models.

If, as Farley has argued, theologia is really ministerial formation, it appears that some discussion of corporate exercises in the practice of the "holy life" might be entertained as a necessary part of theological educational reform. This again could be a unifying experience for the whole community and it could generate serious reflection about the relationship of ministry and worship, a necessary correlate to the discussion about ministry and faith as the ground for the unity of theologia. What form this discussion would take and how any proposal would be implemented, I am not at this point prepared to suggest, but I do believe it must be a priority item on the agenda for reform.

I do not believe that these proposals constitute the only movement which can be made toward theological educational reform, nor do I believe that they will be easy to implement, particularly in the schools directly related to universities. Nonetheless, something like this must come eventually

if there is to be restored any coherence in the process of theological education, and if there is to emerge subsequently some new theological paradigm which will give expression to the unity of theologia.

The alternative to this and similar proposals, it seems to me, is the final triumph of the theory/practice distinction as the pressures of the university and the church force the institutional separation of the academic study of religious phenomena from the study of matters that affect the governance of the church. In my view this would result in a serious loss to the university and to the church.[35]

NOTES

1. Edward Farley, "The Reform of Theological Education as a Theological Task," a paper delivered at a consultation on reform in theological education held at Vanderbilt University, fall, 1979, p. 1. Portions of the Farley paper will appear sometime this year in Theological Education, the journal of the Association of Theological Schools, along with the Hough essay.
2. Friedrich Schleiermacher, Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, trans. William Farrer (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1850; American Library Edition, 1963), p. 91.
3. Ibid., pp. 91-97. (At points Farley seems to be close to this view, e.g. pp. 33-34.)
4. Farley, p. 23.
5. Farley, pp. 33-37.
6. Farley's suggestion of pedagogical encyclopedia is an important possibility which ought to be discussed; however, as will become obvious in the final section, I see this in terms of concrete pedagogical style rather than as theoretical structure of unity. See Farley, p. 29.
7. Gordon Kaufmann, An Essay on Theological Method (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975), p. ix.
8. By "theologizing" I refer to the activity of developing what Donald Evans has called theological and ethical "on-looks." This activity goes on throughout the community of faith as we live and organize the complex relationship of intentional and attitudinal responses in which judgments about what is true and commitments to act on those judgments are harmonized into an ordered whole. Each serious person in the community of faith is engaged in either formal or informal "theologizing." Moreover, I believe that formal development of such "on-looks" about one's calling is the prima facie professional obligation of all of us engaged in theological education today. (See Donald Evans, The Logic of Self-Involvement (London: SCM Press, 1963), pp. 125 ff.)
9. Robert Lynn, "Notes toward a History: Theological Encyclopedia and the Evolution of American Seminary Curriculum, 1808-1968," an unpublished paper delivered at Vanderbilt University in fall, 1979, p. 47.
10. Burton P. Bledstein, The Culture of Professionalism (New York: Norton 1976), pp. 312-17; 327-28. See also Walter H. Moberly, The Crisis in the University (London: SCM Press, 1949), and Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957).
11. Gerhard Ebeling, The Study of Theology, trans. Duane Priebe (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 85.

12. Bledstein, p. 317. Speaking of German universities in the nineteenth century, he says, "The historical approach to knowledge reflected both the academic habit of caution and the intellectual reverence for rational form . . . the idealistic purity of the historial methodology transcended the irreconcilable conflicts of the profane world."
13. Wolfhart Pannenberg, Theology and the Philosophy of Science, trans. Francis McDonagh (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1976), pp. 17, 18. See also p. 257.
14. Ibid., pp. 295 ff., and Kaufmann, pp. 3-9.
15. See Joseph Tussman, The Supreme Court on Church and State (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962).
16. Even Farley, with his heavy emphasis on formation, nowhere attends to spiritual discipline as, perhaps, part of the task of encyclopedic reform. That might come as part of any constructive proposal he would have offered, but it would seem odd in light of the way the tasks are framed in his essay.
17. Bledstein, especially pp. 173-76.
18. See Joseph Fichter, Religion as an Occupation (Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame Press, 1961); especially pp. 162 ff. and 213 ff. For a Protestant perspective based on Fichter's work see James Glasse, Profession: Ministry (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968).
19. Bledstein, pp. 121 ff. For more general views on the development and consequences of professionalism see Magali Sarfatti Larson, The Rise of Professionalism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), and Ivan Illich, Toward a History of Needs (New York: Pantheon, 1978). Ed.: A critical review of the Larson book appears in Quarterly Review, fall, 1981.
20. See for example, David Schuller, Milo Brekke, Merton Strommen, Readiness for Ministry, vol. 1 (Vandalia, Ohio: Association of Theological Schools, 1975), especially pp. 90-99. Even the definition of ministry used as a basis for the study has a bias toward functional skills. See p. 103.
21. H. Richard Niebuhr, The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry (New York: Harper, 1956).
22. The distinction between maintenance functions and ideal mission was utilized by Ernest Campbell and Thomas Pettigrew in their study, Christians in Racial Crisis (Washington: Public Affiars Press, 1959).
23. This statement is based on a recent random survey of 200 alumni of the School of Theology at Claremont now serving as pastors. The overwhelmingly dominant critical comments focused on the lack of practical training. There was little discussion of the problem of integration; however, the student survey at the time did elicit common complaints about the lack of integration.

    One of the reasons for the persistence of the theory/practice problem in contemporary encyclopedia in the United States is that practical theology in the old encyclopedias did not encompass the kind of skills training now being demanded by the profession and the churches. Schleiermacher did not think that "skills" could be taught at all. They had to be learned by actual practice, with some natural capacities being a necessary prerequisite. With all his emphasis on the "governance of the church," Schleiermacher does not give much guidance on the role of "skills training" in theologia. (See Schleiermacher, p. 98.)

24. It was the possession of specifically needed skills which gave authority and status to the professions during the early years of their development. (See Bledstein, pp. 80 ff.)
25. By pedagogical specialization I simply mean the concentration of teaching in courses for graduate students or ministry students, on the one hand, and concentration of the content of one's courses on specific aspects of one's discipline, on the other hand.
26. I could illustrate [redacted] concretely if necessary with reference to particular experiments in both curriculum design and individual program design.
27. Amitai Etzioni, The Active Society (New York: Free Press, 1971), pp. 120 ff.
28. See Edward Farley, Ecclesial Man (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 85-205.
29. See note 8. The reference here is again to Evans's discussion.
30. At this point, I am not so concerned about the methods we use in teaching as I am the way in which the teaching task as a whole is organized. No curriculum poorly taught is worth the effort at building it, and most of us who teach were never taught how to teach. In light of this, it would not seem to be too unthinkable to suggest that some help on methodology could improve communication in the classroom considerably. Emerson thought that poor teaching was the chief problem for education in his day. "A college professor should be elected by setting all the candidates loose on a miscellaneous gang of young men taken at large from the street. He who got the ear of these youths after a certain number of hours, or of the greatest number of these youths, should be the professor." (Quoted in Bledstein, p. 265.)
31. I do not share Farley's disdain for "techniques." Furthermore, I believe that his position rests on a logical mistake. To say that techniques cannot "make" bridging happen does not entail the further specification that bridging techniques are irrelevant to the event of bridging. As was evident earlier, I believe that the proper deployment of bridging techniques can effectively move us in the direction of the conceptual unity in theologia. Farley's mistake is compounded by the uncritical assumption that theory precedes practice in reform.
32. I am substituting the terms arts of ministry and systematic-historical for practical and academic to designate the division of the theological faculty. I do this because I reject the implication that the theory/practice distinction is identical to academic/practical. Arts of ministry courses and systematic-historical courses are part of the academic preparation for ministry. On the basis of my stated theological assumptions all academic preparation for ministry must be practical although not all courses must be relevant to a maintenance function.
33. Farley, "The Reform of Theological Education," p. 29. Farley refers to Bernard Lonergren's reformulation of curricular divisions as found in Lonergren, Method in Theology (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972). While I believe that Lonergren's divisions are at least suggestive, the content of the divisions turns out to be very different from those I am proposing. That is partly because I believe that most of the movements of understanding are present simultaneously and Lonergren's construction of a sequential curriculum based on these movements is bound to create distortions in the teaching-learning process. This is another discussion in itself, and I cannot pursue it here.

To be sure, we need to have some notion about what sort of studies are prerequisite to others and what we hope the total impact of the curriculum will be on the students. It seems to me, however, that the prospects for agreement on curriculum organization might be greater if the process begins with a discussion of a pattern of competencies which the faculty hopes will be the outcome of the educational experience of students in their institutional setting. These seen as a whole and not simply as distinct features should constitute an outline of the faculty's working agreement on the type of ministerial formation the faculty wishes to promote. Care should be taken not to confuse competencies with functional skills, although functional skills will be included in any definition of ministerial competence.

34. Lynn, pp. 14 ff.

35. Gerhard Ebeling has suggested institutional disassociation of theological schools from the university. He believes that such a move would lead to greater possibilities for cooperation. He does insist that the university is properly a part of the environment of theological education, but he also argues that the pressures on the university-affiliated theological school from the university restrict the freedom of the theological faculty to pursue theologia (Ebeling, pp. 83 ff.) In contrast, Pannenberg seems to think that ecclesiastical matters could be addressed in a separate context from the more academic studies in history and systematic theology which could and should remain in the university. (See Pannenberg, 252 ff.; 365 ff.; and 423 ff.) Because of the peculiar history of church-state relations in the United States, Ebeling's argument may be more compelling. It may be that in some cases, apart from institutional separation, theologia's unity in relation to a determinate faith concretely manifested in a common interest in the governance of the church will prove to be even more elusive than it now seems to be. At least that possibility needs to be discussed.

Joseph C. Hough, Jr. is dean of the School of Theology at Claremont, California. He wrote "The University as the City of Human Hope" as number 16 in the Occasional Paper series. This paper was originally delivered at a consultation on reform in theological education held at Vanderbilt University in the fall of 1979.