

# EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 5

---

Volume 5 • Number 1 • April 1981

---

## Evangelical Review of Theology

*Articles and book reviews selected from publications  
worldwide for an international readership,  
interpreting the Christian faith for contemporary  
living.*

GENERAL EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS



Published by  
THE PATERNOSTER PRESS

Two steps need to be taken in order to prevent further trouble. The 'normal church' needs to examine itself with a view to living as a more authentic community. It also needs to examine the indisputably biblical themes which the communities have rediscovered and they for so long have neglected. The communities on their part need to examine these themes again and constantly keep themselves alert to them and to their Christian brothers to ensure that they have not and will not mistake the letter of the law for the intention and will of God.

Those who live in evangelical communities do so because they sincerely believe this lifestyle to be more biblical than that of the normal church. But the weakness of the biblical evidence supporting that claim and the anti-biblical nature which has developed as a result in the lifestyle of some communities, should make one cautious. Further, the widespread quest for community of all types, not just religious, in today's western society would suggest that unknown to the recruits other motives are really at work. Recruits to secular communities may well be reacting to the futility, hypocrisy and carelessness of secular society. Recruits to religious communities are reacting to those same features within the church. And by any standards that is a condemnation the 'normal church' must take seriously.

-----  
**Rev. Derek Tidball is Director of Studies at London Bible College, UK.**

# **Theological Education and Christian Education: A Theological Educator's Point of View**

**Andrew Hsiao**

*Reprinted from The South East Asia Journal of Theology, Vol. 20, No. 1 (1979), with permission*

## **INTRODUCTION**

In a recent Church Workers Seminar in Taipei, conducted by this speaker and attended by more than 40 pastors and evangelists, two courses were offered. One was on the doctrine of the Church, the other on Christian education. Questions were raised as to the suitability of the latter subject. Some participants hinted that since they were mainly pastors rather than Sunday school teachers, the value of the CE course was questionable.

Knowing that the attitude of the participants was crucial to the success or failure of this course, "Introduction to Christian Education", I began the class with a brain-storming session. I asked the ministers to list on the blackboard the various activities and programmes which are normally conducted each week in the local congregation. More than twenty items were suggested, including Sunday worship, Sunday school, Bible study classes, catechetical

and confirmation instruction, youth fellowship meetings, women's and men's meetings, choir rehearsal, etc.

I next asked the participants to think carefully as to how many of the activities were related to CE. To their surprise they discovered that more than 80 per cent of what they had mentioned are in the field of CE.

This finding not only greatly aroused interest in CE among this group of ministers, but at the same time also raised a serious question as to the relation between TE and CE: If the majority of activities in a church in which the minister is normally involved are educational in nature, then what should be the proper relation between Christian education and theological education, which is usually designed for the training of church ministers?

Before any attempt is made to answer this question it may be in order to take a glance at the present situation regarding the relation between TE and CE, as well as review the development of the relation between theology and Christian education in the past.

### **THE RELATION BETWEEN TE AND CE TODAY**

Theological education and Christian education are two distinctive functions or programmes of the church. As a whole, the former is chiefly designed for the training of professional churchworkers, while the latter is largely aimed at the nurture of believers. Since CE activities form a major part of the life and work of the church, as shown by the Taipei Seminar, CE has gradually been recognized by more and more theological educators as an integral part of the seminary curriculum. However, by and large, the role that CE plays in the total TE curriculum as a discipline of study is still not more than that of a handmaid.

A glance at the 1978 Directory of Theological Schools in Asia shows that only 24 out of 176 schools, or 13.6 per cent of those providing statistics (out of a possible 500 schools), offer special programmes in CE.<sup>1</sup> Four of the 24 schools offer a certificate or diploma of CE, 20 offer CE degrees on the bachelor's level and only one offers CE degrees on both the bachelor's and master's levels. To be sure, the statistics are far from complete as only 35 per cent of all the Asian theological schools have provided the information requested. But it is doubtful whether the percentage of 13.6 would be appreciably increased were the information from all 500 schools available.

If our observation mentioned above is correct that 80 per cent, or the majority of the work of the congregations is educational, then we might well question whether the Asian seminaries are meeting the special needs of CE workers in the churches today.

Again, if CE programmes constitute the major part of the life and work of the congregations, then the question is not only how many seminaries offer special programmes to train Christian educators, but how much CE training each seminary provides for the future pastors. For practical reasons, most churches in Asia today cannot rely on experts to conduct their CE programmes but depend instead mainly on instruction given by pastors. The study of CE on the part of pastors in the seminaries is therefore crucial if the Asian churches expect to have effective CE programmes.

---

<sup>1</sup> Asia Theological Association, 1978 Directory of Theological Schools in Asia (Taipei, Taiwan).

However, even a casual glance at the curricula of the seminaries<sup>2</sup> readily gives the impression that CE as a discipline is greatly neglected, if not totally so in many cases. Many schools offer only one or two subjects in this field, such as Sunday school teaching, children's work, theory and practice of Christian education, etc. out of a total of 60–70 subjects; others limit the number of credits to CE courses to four to six out of a total of 128–160. To be sure, there are also seminaries that have a more balanced curriculum in which the importance of CE is duly recognized. The number of these schools, however, is very small.

The reasons for neglecting CE in TE curricula in Asia today may well be many. The transplanting of curricula from the West without question is certainly a major one. Most of the theological schools in Asia were founded by missionaries from the West a number of years ago, when CE was not yet a part, certainly not an important part of teaching in the seminaries in the West, such as in the USA. Even today CE as such is still an unknown or an unimportant subject of study in many European seminaries. This is partly because in many European countries where Christianity is a state religion, the teaching of religion is usually the task of the public schools. And as such, religious teaching in many cases has gradually become synonymous with character education, and thus the training of teachers of religion is usually the responsibility of the teacher schools rather than the seminaries.

The Asian churches are different. Christianity in Asia is not a state religion. We cannot degrade CE to mere character education, nor can we rely on public schools for training Christian educators. It thus becomes mainly the responsibility of the seminaries to provide the kind of TE in which students are adequately trained to serve churches in which CE is a major part of their life and work.

The transplantation of western curricula and the educational system of the state churches can only in part explain the neglect of CE in TE in Asia and Europe. The most basic reason is, however, a philosophical and theological one which was caused by the misunderstanding and ignorance of the proper relation between theology and CE. There was a theological ignorance on the part of the Christian educators as well as an educational ignorance on the part of theologians.

A brief review of the development of the relationship between these two will not only help to explain more clearly the problems between TE and CE today, but will help to point more convincingly to their future relationship. Since CE has been more sensitive to its relations with theology than theology to its relations with CE, it is easier to review the development of the relations between the two from the point of view of CE. This development can roughly be divided into four periods.

## **WHEN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION HAD NO NEED OF THEOLOGY**

CE as it is today is usually traced back to 1780 when the Sunday school movement had its beginning. In fact the term "Sunday schools" and "CE" were regarded as almost synonymous in the nineteenth century. During the first 125 years, the central concern of this modern CE

---

<sup>2</sup> In connection with the revision of curriculum of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Hong Kong, the writer collected a large number of catalogues from seminaries in various parts of the world.

movement was evangelism, particularly the evangelization of children. This was what James Smart called “the evangelistic period”.<sup>3</sup>

Since the main purpose of CE in this period was child evangelism, “therefore, the only thing to be done with the child was to bring every means to bear to effect a conversion, and, until such conversion took place, the child was to be regarded and treated as not yet a Christian.”<sup>4</sup>

This attitude was severely criticized and challenged by people like Horace Bushnell, who, in 1847, published a famous book, *Christian Nurture*. Bushnell stressed a great deal the importance of Christian family influence on the faith and character of a child. He argued that “the child who has grown up into the faith of a Christian home cannot be treated as though he were an unbeliever.”<sup>5</sup>

Yet all through this period and continuing into the twentieth century Christian educators were so involved in evangelism that they gave no thought to theology. Their interest was centred on telling Bible stories, teaching gospel songs, drilling “golden verses,” etc. They paid little attention to the theories of learning, educational principles or the tasks of personality development, much less to theology. They did not bother to find out what theology was all about, nor did they see any real need for theology as such in CE.

## INVOLVEMENT IN THEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIES

As opposition against the evangelistic type of education increased, CE was forced to undergo a significant change. The opposition was mainly an educational one, at least at the outset. The evangelistic methods in teaching were questioned, the literalistic approach to the Bible was challenged, and the disregard of educational principles in curriculum materials was criticized.

A concerted expression of this opposition was the organization of the Religious Education Association in Chicago in 1903. This was later regarded as the beginning of a new religious education movement. Strong voices were raised calling for the introduction of more intelligent methods of Bible study as well as a more educational approach to curriculum development. Christian Education at this point entered what can be called a “religious education period,”<sup>6</sup> or simply an educational period. What followed was an unusual enthusiasm in adopting educational theories, psychological principles, social concerns, etc. into CE. It is understandable that the name “religious” was preferred to that of “Christian” during this time.<sup>7</sup>

Though the various forces that gathered at Chicago in 1903 and launched the new movement “were united more by their consciousness of the inadequacy of the Sunday School and their desire for a new day in religious education than by their adherence to any

---

<sup>3</sup> James D. Smart, *The Teaching Ministry of the Church* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), p.61.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p.52.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, also cf. Horace Bushnell, *Christian Nurture* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 1947), p.31.

<sup>6</sup> James Smart, *op. cit.*, p.62.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p.58.

theological point of view," CE was nevertheless dragged into severe theological controversies from that time on. Just as "the membership in the churches became ever more sharply divided between liberals and conversionists, who were eventually to call each other modernists and fundamentalists,"<sup>8</sup> so were also the Christian educators.

But Christian educators as a whole at that time were not ready for much intelligent theological dialogue. Some of them were basically evangelists while others were largely educationalists. Very few Christian educators at that time had a good grip on theology and fewer still were able to deal with CE theologically. The result was that they were tossed about by the theological controversies raging between the modernists and fundamentalists, without being able to formulate a theological position of their own.

Some Christian educators, mainly liberals, such as George A. Coe and Ernest Chave, did try to introduce a theological foundation for CE. But their effort did not succeed mainly because their theology was more humanistic than biblical and was therefore "unworthy of consideration".<sup>9</sup> Their failure in theology, however, did not annul the great contributions they had made in education, such as upgrading the Sunday school from a chiefly evangelistic campaign to an educational movement.

### **WHEN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION TOOK THEOLOGY AS A 'CLUE'**

The change that took place in Christian education in the first half of this century was both encouraging and discouraging. The introduction of educational principles and insights, for example, helped to bring CE to the level of "education". The moving away from evangelistic purposes and practices, however, is in part responsible for the deterioration from Christian education to "religious education" and at times to mere "education".

This deterioration alarmed Christian educators. Questions were raised: What has gone wrong with CE? How can CE be truly Christian and at the same time really educational? What should be done to reform CE today?

Various answers were suggested and various efforts were made at the close of the first half of this century. The most significant and most convincing answer, however, came from Randolph C. Miller in 1950 when he published *The Clue to Christian Education*. This book aroused so much interest among Christian educators that the year 1950 was later regarded by some as the beginning of another period, the period of "theological recovery," as James Smart called it.<sup>10</sup>

Miller believed that the "clue" to the solution of the problems in CE was theology. He said, "that with this clue I could open the doors of the associated questions of methods, evangelism, and parent cooperation."<sup>11</sup> He further stated, "The major task of Christian education today is to discover and impart the relevance of Christian truth. The one missing

---

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p.55.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p.58.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p.62.

<sup>11</sup> Randolph Cramp Miller, *The Clue to Christian Education* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950), p.viii.

topic in most educational schemes today is *theology*, and in theology properly interpreted lies the answer to most of the pressing educational problems of the day.”<sup>12</sup>

In order to avoid misunderstanding, Miller explained that “this is not a plea to return to a content-centered curriculum ... it is not a desire to return to indoctrination,” nor is theology at the centre of the CE curriculum. “The center of the curriculum is a two-fold relationship between God and the learner. The curriculum is both God-centered and experience-centered.”<sup>13</sup> But he insisted “theology must be prior to the curriculum,”<sup>14</sup> and “theology, which is truth from a Christian perspective, must be the presupposition of any curriculum.”<sup>15</sup>

At the end of the first chapter of this book, Miller summarized his ideas in a one-sentence statement: “The clue to Christian education is the rediscovery of a relevant theology which will bridge the gap between content and method, providing the background and perspective of Christian truth by which the best methods and content will be used as tools to bring the learners into the right relationship with the living God who is revealed to us in Jesus Christ, using the guidance of parents and the fellowship of life in the Church as the environment in which Christian nurture will take place.”<sup>16</sup>

Miller’s slogan or battle-cry—the clue to CE is theology—was met with great enthusiasm and it did bring increasing consensus into the educational work of the church. By the middle of the 1960s when Howard Grimes wrote an article, “Theological Foundations for Christian Education,” he said, “the struggle for the recognition of the crucial nature of theology in relation to Christian teaching has probably won.”<sup>17</sup> By way of review Grimes then stated, “Perhaps we have also to some extent recovered a relevant theology as the *content of what is taught*. We have made considerable progress in relating theology to the *process of teaching*.” But he quickly admitted, “We have done much less with regard to *theology and methodology*. Here is one of the relatively unexplored areas of the church’s teaching ministry.”<sup>18</sup>

With theology as the clue, CE made progress and enjoyed stability in the 1950s and 1960s.

## NEW RELATIONS WITH THEOLOGY

Though the struggle for the recognition of theology as the clue in relation to CE was won, the victory was short-lived. Theology which became the dominant discipline that influenced

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p.5.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p.10.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p.15.

<sup>17</sup> Howard Grimes, “Theological Foundations for Christian Education,” in Marvin Taylor (ed.), *Introduction to Christian Education*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p.39.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p.40.

CE in the 1950s and 1960s was, in the words of Sara Little, “no longer the clue” by the 1970s. “General educational philosophy and practice were again ‘respectable’.”<sup>19</sup>

This shift was chiefly caused, according to Little, by the “turbulent sixties,” when many unusual events took place, such as the assassinations of John Kennedy and Martin Luther King, the rise of the “death of God” movement, the holding of Vatican II, etc. These and other events not only caused fundamental shifts in moral and religious attitudes in the West but also engendered serious doubts among some Christian educators about the dominant role of theology in CE. Hence a search for a new relationship began.

What then is the relationship between theology and CE in the 1970s and after? Instead of offering a direct answer, Little suggested five possible alternatives:

1. Theology as content to be taught
2. Theology as norm
3. Theology as irrelevant
4. “Doing” theology as educating
5. Education in dialogue with theology<sup>20</sup>

While it is not likely that any one of the five alternatives would be accepted as “the” way to relate CE to theology, the last one would seem to be more acceptable to both Christian educators and theologians. Dialogue assumes independence of theology and of education, and permits interaction and mutual benefit between them. The dominance of education in the early part of this century and the dominance of theology in the 1950s and 1960s will likely not be repeated, and a healthier decision on CE theories and practices will be possible when education and theology are engaged in free dialogue. (Sara Little was probably right when she contemplated the future relation of CE and theology as follows: “In the final analysis, then, whatever the shape of the future, the ‘health’ of religious education is interwound with that of theology.”<sup>21</sup>)

## SOME SUGGESTIONS

From the brief review made above, we find that CE has reached a point of seeking a new relationship with theology. This can be done by way of dialogue, as Sara Little suggested. In dialogue both theology and CE can maintain their independence and both are free to think critically as to how they are and how they should be related to each other. It is in keeping with this spirit of dialogue that we proceed to talk about the future direction for the relationship between TE and CE.

There may be many factors that both make up and condition the future relation between TE and CE. There are two, however, which seem to be most crucial. One is related to the Christian educator’s understanding of the relation between theology and CE; the other relates to the theological educator’s ability to integrate CE into TE. What follows is a two-fold attempt: first, to single out some basic facts underlying the close relation between the

---

<sup>19</sup> Sara Little, “Theology and Religious Education,” in Marvin Taylor (ed.), *Foundations for Christian Education in an Era of Change* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976), p.31.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.31–33.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, p.39.



two from a “theological point of view”; second, to recommend some practical ways to integrate CE into TE from an “educational point of view”.

## HOW THEOLOGY IS RELATED TO CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Theology is closely related to CE. The following four aspects of this relation are worthy of special mention.

1. *Theology as content.* One of the major tasks of Christian teaching is to communicate Christian faith. This faith has to be stated theologically. Much of the teaching carried out by a Sunday school teacher is in fact theology. When he tells the children that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, he is referring to Christology; when he stresses that he who believes in Jesus will be saved, he is making use of soteriology; when he upholds the Bible as the Word of God, he confirms one of the most important theological beliefs, the doctrine of revelation. Christian education will become weak and empty if its content is not based on sound theology.

2. *Theology as process.* Theology may affect our understanding of the process of CE. “If we understand the Christian faith in terms of ethical values, we will see that process as the education of character,” says Howard Grimes. “If we see it as intellectual assent to propositions about God, we will understand the process of teaching as being largely transmission of subject matter. If, however, we understand the Christian faith as crucially a relation with God as revealed in Jesus Christ, we will seek for a process which encourages this relationship.”<sup>22</sup> Since Christian faith was understood by Christian educators in the past as mainly a matter of conversion, the process of education was therefore one of evangelism. Today in churches where the Christian faith is understood not only in terms of knowledge but also of life and action, nurture is adopted as a process of CE. If we expect CE to move toward the right direction, a right theological understanding of Christian faith is a must.

3. *Theology as methodology.* Methods used in CE today are mainly borrowed from general education and cognate disciplines. Very little has been done in developing a methodology of teaching from theology which would be especially relevant to CE. A look at recent developments in theology today, however, shows that certain contemporary theological ideas may have special implications for methodology in CE. Both Daniel Day Williams in *Current Theological Developments and Religious Education*,<sup>23</sup> and Howard Grimes in *Theological Foundations for Christian Education*, made special reference to Tillich’s “principle of correlation”. This principle means that the questions of life find their answers in the Christian faith. In other words, there is a correlation between the human needs and the Christian Gospel. This principle, if understood correctly will guide us in selecting and developing methodology for Christian education. “Any method should be ruled out,” says Grimes, “which does not in some degree confront the learner with the Christian faith.”<sup>24</sup>

The emphasis on relationship, encounter, or dialogue in contemporary theology is even more directly related to method. This emphasis suggests that the methods we must seek for CE are those that will bring learners into a personal relationship with the teacher, with one

---

<sup>22</sup> Howard Grimes, *op. cit.*, p.32.

<sup>23</sup> Daniel Day Williams, “Current Theological Developments and Religious Education,” in Marvin Taylor (ed.), *Religious Education: A Comprehensive Survey* (Nashville: Abingdon Press), p.49.

<sup>24</sup> Howard Grimes, *op. cit.*, p.38.

another, with the Christian community and especially with God. If CE is expected to have a method which is uniquely Christian, a careful study of theology, particularly contemporary theological ideas would be of great help.

4. *Theology as norm.* Since theology serves as a point of reference both for what is to be taught as well as how it is to be taught—as discussed above—it functions in a normative way. This function is important to CE as it protects CE from falling into any non-Christian or non-theological trap. To be more specific, in order to keep CE truly Christian, the contributions from the various disciplines, such as psychology and philosophy need to be screened with reference to their appropriateness to theological presuppositions before they are accepted. By the same principle, curriculum materials need to be checked and church school practices need to be evaluated. If CE expects to live up to its name, it is important to accept theology as normative.

## **INTEGRATING CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION**

As mentioned previously, a healthy relationship between TE and CE consists of two factors: first, a sound understanding and real appreciation particularly on the part of Christian educators of the close relation that theology has with CE; second, the understanding, ability and determination especially on the part of theological educators in integrating CE into TE. Unless Christian educators clearly understand how much theology means to CE and are willing to include theology in CE, and unless theological educators clearly understand how much CE can contribute to TE and are willing to include it in TE, no healthy relationship between TE and CE can be reached.

The following are some practical suggestions to show what CE can do for TE and in what areas CE can be especially useful in the strengthening of TE.

1. *In the area of objectives.* The task of TE is traditionally confined to the training of church ministers. While this professional training is still no doubt the priority in the regular programme of a seminary, the general objectives of TE may need a careful revision and reshaping in order to meet the changing needs of the church. CE, with its close relation to the life of the church, can certainly offer some guidelines and insights.

Christian education stresses that the church is not an organization of pastors *plus* some members, but rather is a fellowship of all believers *including* the pastors. The whole church has to be educated, not only the pastors, if the church is to grow properly. This is why CE today strives toward the education of all—children, youth and adults—instead of children alone as in the past. In light of this, many seminaries have already revised their objectives and programmes to include the training of laity—lay leaders, voluntary church workers, etc.—for the church.

Even in the training of professional ministers, the objectives can be sharpened if theological educators take note of what CE has discovered about the kind of professional personnel the church needs. What the church needs today is not only those who know how to preach the Word of God from the Bible, but also those who are capable of communicating the Gospel to the people effectively through other avenues such as teaching, writing, counselling and service. What the church needs today are not only those who know how to administer the sacrament to the members of the church according to the tradition of the church, but those who know how to nurture the people with wisdom and love. Above all, what the church demands from the seminaries are not graduates with either fervent heart or a brilliant brain, but servants who are spiritually, intellectually, morally and physically fit

for the work of the kingdom of God, similar to what Christian educators are today asserting, namely, education for the whole man.

2. *In the area of curriculum.* If we agree with some theological educators that “the theological seminary exists for the church; separated from the church the seminary loses its meaning and value,”<sup>25</sup> then one of the most urgent tasks confronting the seminaries is a thorough evaluation of what they teach. Christian education can certainly provide some help for this task.

Christian educators have found out that the major part of the life and work in the church is educational. As such, TE is obliged to give CE proper recognition in what is taught in the seminaries. Yet, in our previous discussion, we found that the place given to CE in the seminary curriculum was far from adequate. The simplest way to correct this situation is by offering special programmes for training CE experts and providing more CE courses for all students. There are certain subjects which should be required of all those who plan to go into the ministry, such as: a brief introduction to CE; some information on growth and characteristics of the various age groups; general method in teaching and group work; basic understanding of organization, administration and supervision of CE; and basic theory and practice of counselling.

Not only has CE to be evaluated according to the needs of the church; all other disciplines need to go through the same evaluation. In this way we may find that some courses must be dropped from our curriculum, others need to be revised and still others ought to be added.

However, curriculum includes not only the subjects taught but also much more. Just as CE curriculum is defined as “experience under guidance toward the fulfilment of the purpose of CE,”<sup>26</sup> so TE curriculum should include the experiences that will contribute the most to the training of the kind of leaders the church needs. These experiences may include, in terms frequently used by Christian educators, study, worship, fellowship, service and witness. Theological education curriculum would be greatly strengthened and enriched if the place of these experiences in the curriculum were properly recognized.

3. *In the area of methodology.* This is the area where TE can probably learn the most from CE. The fact that CE borrows methods from general education and its cognate disciplines should first of all encourage TE to learn from CE. The neglect of effective communication on the part of theologians and the emphasis on effective teaching on the part of Christian educators have sometimes become a joke. As one has put it: “A theologian is one who always make the simple Christian faith complicated; a Christian educator is one who tries to make the complicated Christian doctrine simple.”

There are a great number of educational laws, principles and concerns that have been proved by Christian educators to be very important in teaching which deserve the attention of theological educators: the interest and needs of students; the language and symbols used by the teacher; the context where the teaching and learning takes place; the laws of readiness, effect and practice in learning; the laws of the teacher, the pupil and the lesson in teaching; the learning process; the crises of conversion, of doubt and of despair; the nature of personal existence; the possibility and character of the “I-Thou” relationship and others.

---

<sup>25</sup> Andrew Hsiao, “The Three Great Tasks of the Theological Seminary,” *Theology and Life*, No. 1, 1978 (Hong Kong: Lutheran Theological Seminary), p.1.

<sup>26</sup> *A Guide for Curriculum in Christian Education* (Chicago: NCCCUSA, 1955), p.25.

Most of these and other educational insights that have grown out directly from modern psychological studies have contributed a great deal to the communication of Christian faith.

There are also a great number of teaching methods and skills that have been proved to be effective in CE. Some of them may prove to be equally effective in the teaching and studying of the various subjects in TE. Some of them are: seminars; counselling; group dynamics; role play; simulation games; case studies; field work; object lessons; and audiovisual teaching and brain-storming sessions. Some of these have already been widely used by theology teachers and some are yet to be tried. The important thing is not what methods the theologians use in teaching but whether they are aware that their teaching can be more effective if proper methods are employed.

## **CONCLUSION**

Theological education and CE are two of the major functions of the church. They are both independent as well as inseparable from each other. Like the two faces of a coin, they are so distinctive that they do not look alike, yet they are so inseparable that they cannot be recognized as two. Without TE, CE can be educational and even religious but it cannot be Christian. It is from theology that CE receives most of its content, finds its norm, derives its process and develops part of its methodology. Apart from sound theology there is no sound CE. It is in TE that CE can develop and grow steadily as a discipline by way of research, experimentation and interaction with other disciplines. It is also in TE that Christian educators are trained.

Equally, TE cannot function properly without CE. Apart from CE there can be theological reflections but hardly TE. Theology is meaningless if it is not clearly interpreted and effectively taught to the people by Christian educators. Theology is useless if it does not answer the many questions of life that are raised in CE studies. It is in CE that TE may find answers to a number of pertinent questions, such as whether the objectives of TE are sound, whether its curriculum is complete, and whether its methodology is effective. It is largely through CE that TE becomes meaningful to the church.

TE and CE, important as they may be, are not ends in themselves. Their ultimate task is to serve the Church so that the Church can fulfil the unique mission received from the Lord Jesus Christ, namely, to make disciples of all nations. It is out of this conviction that TE and CE must be closely related to each other, and it is on this foundation that they will eventually find the right direction of their relationship.

---

**Dr. Andrew Hsiao is President and professor of Christian Education at Lutheran Theological Seminary, Hong Kong.**

# **Theological Education for the Mission of the Church in India**

**Vinay Samuel and Chris Sugden**