EVANGELICAL REVIEW OF THEOLOGY

VOLUME 17

Volume 17 • Number 4 • October 1993

Evangelical Review of Theology

Articles and book reviews original and selected from publications worldwide for an international readership for the purpose of discerning the obedience of faith

EDITOR: BRUCE J. NICHOLLS

Published by
PATERNOSTER PERIODICALS

spend a considerable amount of time with those bereaved and suffering, occasionally because of tragic circumstances. It is these experiences which provide clues to my personal history in this matter. Therefore it is out of this context that my particular questions arise. I trust that this reflection is all the more real for that.

———————————

Rev. M. Cartledge teaches at the Vining College of Theology, Akure, Nigeria. p. 484

Competing Paradigms in Theological Education Today

Grahame Cheesman

Printed with permission

In this article the author discusses five models of theological education for training people for ministry in today's complex society whether Western or Third World. He argues for a integrated balance in academic, spiritual and practical training and appeals for a better understanding between denominational theological schools and those that belong to the Bible School Movement.
Editor

Theological Education today is complex, diverse and often unsure of itself. Criticism from the churches and missionary societies has become vocal and some are voting with their feet, setting up initiatives only partly involving the traditional 'Ivory Steeples' or 'theological sausage machines'.[1] Two thirds world Christians are radically-rethinking the structure and content of theological education as they have received it at the hands of the missionary enterprise.[2]

Theological educators are urgently in need of a new understanding, an up-to-date theoretical model which allows them to thank God for the usefulness of their calling, but which also frees them to take on board the changes necessary to serve the new situations in the world and the Church.

Present day Theological Education is, of course, a mongrel. Systems and attitudes from the past live uncomfortably with modern conceptions of the task. Even the term Theological Education harbours radical mis-conceptions because both the words, theology and education, have unhappily narrowed their field of meaning in the 20th century. Theology has become for us a group of scientific disciplines which can p. 485 exist

[1] Mike Starkey 'Ivory Steeples?' *Third Way*, October 1989 pp. 22–24.

[2] 'I propose first that we dump the academic model once and for all—degrees, accreditation, tenure, the works.' John Frame 'Proposals for a New Seminary' in Harvie M. Conn and Samuel F. Rowen, *Missions and Theological Education in World Perspective*, Associates of Urbanus, Farmington, p. 377. For a more constructive approach, Lesslie Newbigin 'Theological Education in World Perspective', *ibid.* pp. 318.

without the love and experience of God. Education is usually taken as synonymous with study and scholarship rather than a maturing of the person assisted by learning.[3]

I want to analyze the task using paradigms or dominant models. This tool has recently been used to great effect in theology by Avery Dulles and Hans Kung and in missiology by Donald Bosch, all following the work of Thomas Kuhn in the natural sciences.[4] I will not use the word paradigm in the full technical sense of Kuhn (although it has been said that he uses the term in at least twenty-two senses himself).[5] In the context of this paper, a paradigm is a model of interpretation of the task of Theological Education which has become dominant in a particular era or culture and which today competes for importance with other historical and cultural models as we seek to understand the nature of Theological Education today.

While this approach will not enable us to count the trees, it may, more modestly, but more fundamentally, help us to see the true shape of the wood.

1. THE ACADEMIC PARADIGM

In the Academic Model, Theological Education as the training of the mind, is placed first, not because it is historically prior but because it presently dominates Theological Education. The great universities were founded in the 12th and 13th centuries and swiftly became the loci for theological work and training. Theology became an Aristotelian university science under such men as Aquinas. Then, as the Enlightenment built on the Renaissance, a great sea change took place in theology. It broke free from authority (whether that of the Scriptures or the Church) and became another enquiry, subject to the same rules of evidence as others.

Not that theology continued to exist as a unitary concept. It was p. 486 broken down into separate disciplines, usually the fourfold pattern of Biblical studies, dogmatics, Church history and practical theology, and each subject rapidly underwent social institutionalization with specialist conferences, journals and societies.[6]

Much of this is to the good. A desire to demonstrate that the study of revealed religion can and should be academically rigorous must be welcomed. It is no less than the completion of the act of worship; a loving of the Lord your God with all your mind. As it trickles down into the churches, it will wean us away from the inappropriate proof-text use of Scripture as the basis for our spiritual lives and provide a solid platform for spirituality in real theology and real biblical knowledge.

Academic study also enables mission. One of the greatest tasks in mission today is to engage with secular, pluralistic, presuppositions of Western culture. Academic excellence will enable us to move out of the past to understand and to confront the world as it is today.

---

[3] E. Farley *Theologia*, the Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1983, pp. 29–66, 152–156.

[4] Thomas S. Kuhn *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*, Chicago, 1962, 2nd edition 1970. Kung and others in Hans Kung and David Tracy (eds.) *Paradigm Change in Theology*, T. & T. Clarke, Edinburgh, 1989, apply his ideas to historical theology, Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan, 1988 (2nd Edit.) applies the concept to an area of theology and, more recently, David J. Bosch *Transforming Mission, Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission*, Orbis Books, New York, 1991, applies the idea to Missiology.

[5] Bosch, *op. cit.* p. 185.

[6] Farley's analysis on this point is important, *op. cit.* ch. 2 (pp. 29–48).

Furthermore, as theology has become an academic discipline, so it has dissolved denominational boundaries and contributed to the unity of the Church.

However, the academic paradigm also has a negative influence on Theological Education. It was a concept of knowing moving within the orbit of ideas and reason, which formed the universities in the middle ages and re-wrote the meaning of theology. And, as Western culture has travelled on, knowledge has become ever more closely associated with information. Not only that, but nowadays our highly competitive culture measures success in preparation for one's life work in terms of educational attainment.

In allowing our training to be dominated by teaching we have permitted prevailing culture to dictate our method. While theological education must be compatible to a degree with the culture it serves, it has no mandate to be subservient. It is to serve the needs of the Church of God. The Biblical attitude to knowing is wider, more holistic and often involves relationship.[7] Theology cannot just be a university discipline. It must speak about the student's relationship with God.

One of the tragedies of modern theological education is that this model, only partly justifiable in Western culture, has been imported p. 487 all over the world in the founding of two-thirds world colleges and the often unwise interchange of students between those colleges and Western institutions. Status in two thirds world colleges often becomes dependent on academic excellence in Western seminaries or universities.

A further problem with the academic model is that it usually projects the educator primarily as a lecturer. The lecturer then becomes a role model for the aspiring servant of God. The student goes on to enter a form of ministry, seeing the task as primarily a cerebral one. The attitude of the lecturer who complains 'I wish I had a few more lectures to deal with holiness properly' becomes the attitude of the minister who assumes that the job is done after a fine sermon on Romans 6.

Another problem, often, but not essentially, created by the academic model is that of entry requirements. If the growth in academic concern is not matched by an equal commitment to those without academic achievements then the colleges enter the realm of intellectual snobbery. Such attitude denies training to many useful servants of God. Alternatively, colleges will embrace low academic achievers only to put them through agonies of stress and self-doubt as they seek to keep up academically. Many practitioners know this to be one of the biggest problems in theological education today.

The academic model is inadequate to describe the task of theological education. It strengthens no more than one factor in the ultimate usefulness of the servant of God. Plenty of mature believers have been able to turn upside down their corner of the world without having experienced academic theology.

Nevertheless, at its best, the academic paradigm is teaching both knowledge and the ability to think. With the help of the Spirit it can be a significant factor in producing not just theologians, but obedient theologians, applied theology, a knowledge of the Scriptures that develops into love.

2. THE MONASTIC PARADIGM

By this I mean Theological Education through a firmly structured community with the primary goal of personal spiritual development. The monasteries were concerned with

---

[7] Carl F. Henry article on 'Knowledge' *International Standard Bible Encylopedia Revised*, Ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1986, vol. 3, pp. 48–50. R. Bultmann, Article on (girwskw) and cognates in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Ed. G. Kittel, Trans. G. W. Bromily, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1964, vol. 1, pp. 689–719.

theological education almost from the beginning, the Irish and then English institutions leading the way in the 7th, 8th and 9th centuries. This model re-entered the Christian training scene more recently with the rise of the Bible Colleges and was a reaction to the academic paradigm. The difference between the older monastic paradigm and the early Bible College P. 488 movement was that whereas monasticism became bi-polar, creating saints AND scholars, the early Bible Colleges were not concerned with scholarship. This has changed with the maturing of the concept and since the second world war, concern for academic rigour has grown steadily in the Bible Colleges.

The Bible College Movement can be seen to have begun when H. Grattan Guiness founded the East London Institute for Home and Foreign Missions in 1877 at the instigation of Hudson Taylor.[8] Since then, the Bible College Movement has proved itself a remarkably adaptable and useful tool. The movement began in the U.K. and U.S.A. with four main concerns: to train Christian workers without the 'corrupting' influence of universities or liberal denominational colleges, to prepare non-ordained missionaries, to train lay people for witness and to emphasise spiritual development as the key to equipping Christian workers.[9]

Edgar Lee puts the point clearly;

> The original intention of the Bible movement was to train men and women for Christian service in a warm spiritual environment.[10]

He goes on to quote William Menzies speaking about Central Bible College;

> The ethos of the school was designed to be an intense spiritual atmosphere, an atmosphere created by scheduling numerous prayer meetings and worship services through the week. The centre of gravity was spiritual development rather than academic excellence.[11]

Bible Colleges as we encounter them today, however, are the product of one hundred years of evolution and nowadays the lines between them and many denominational colleges have blurred.[12] p. 489

Spiritual development was placed as the first objective by the colleges (Bible and denominational) participating in the 1990 U.K. survey by Bunting[13] and it is not hard to see why. The greatest qualification for Christian service is a person's relationship with God. This permeates all aspects of life and work and the greatest damage is done when it

---

[8] Elizabeth Pritchard, *For Such a Time*, Victory press, Eastbourne, 1973, pp. 14/15.

[9] Article 'Bible Schools (American)' by Earle E. Cairns in *New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*. Ed. J. D. Douglas, Exeter, Paternoster Press, Revised Edition, 1978. S. E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American people*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1972, p. 812.

[10] Edgar Lee, 'Spiritual Dimensions of the Bible College Academic Program', *Theological Education Today*, Jan–June 1987, p.4.

[11] *ibid* p. 4. See also p. 5, 'The deep conviction that receptive faith takes precedence over critical study is a cornerstone of the Bible college movement' George Sweeting writing on Moody Bible Institute.

[12] Witness the History of Spurgeon's College and the present composition of the Association of Bible College Principals.

[13] Ian D. Bunting *The Places to Train, A Survey of Theological Training in Britain*, MARC Europe, London, 1990.

is absent.[14] Biblically, it is the basis for understanding and therefore of all biblical and theological study.[15] The old Wesleyan had a point when, after listening to a less than gentle Calvinistic preacher, he turned to his friend and said, 'I wish his heart was as soft as his head'.

Furthermore, it is within community that such growth is designed to occur for believers. Community is a pattern of theological education arising from the nature of the Church. The college or seminary is not a church, but it is part of the Church so the concept of the mutual ministry of the body of Christ very much applies. Such an intense community of teachers, the taught, ancillary staff and their families[16] is often the very aspect of theological education which is remembered by the student as having most impact on his or her life. It is perhaps the most powerful tool of theological education.

Yet, while spiritual development is widely acknowledged as the top priority in theological education, this is almost always wishful thinking rather than realized policy. Structures of pastoral care within the community are generally swamped by the academic timetable. Space to grow is invaded by the essay schedule. Furthermore, the increasing age of students in some countries brings with it the greater likelihood of a spouse and children and this compounds the difficulty of integrating the student into the community.

Both spiritual development and community atmosphere suffer in the eyes of Western oriented educators with a certain fuzziness of definition. The spiritual, communal life of the college involves commitment to the Lord and to the task of loving each other, an openness and enjoyment in fellowship, a corporate devotional and prayer p. 490 life which has reality. Such matters are not easy to quantify statistically for an end-of-year report.

The biggest disadvantage is that the atmosphere created, whenever this model dominates, is artificial, it has little correspondence to the world of service the students will eventually enter. Future service needs to cast its shadow before and inject reality into the classroom and the community.

Nevertheless, this model is under-valued today, it may be that some alternatives to college or seminary training nowadays would not look so attractive if the institutions had not allowed the pendulum to swing so far from the spiritual/pastoral towards the academic. If the college is perceived as simply where you go to get knowledge then there are plenty of cheaper and easier alternative systems of knowledge acquisition.

3. THE TRAINING PARADIGM

Theological Education as training for service is a task-oriented model. It takes its justification for a view of the ministry or missionary service as a profession. Its natural home is the seminary, an institution which became important in Roman Catholic circles after the Council of Trent, which entered North American Theological Education last century and which now dominates the task there. The model is becoming more popular in secular as well as theological education. In the U.K. and elsewhere, governments are concerned to shorten the perceived distance between vocational and academic achievement. Theological Education is being forced to decide where it belongs.

---

[14] See Bruce Nicholls 'The Role of Spiritual Development in Theological education', *Evangelical Theological Education Today 2 Agenda for Renewal*, Ed. Paul Bowers, Nairobi, Evangel Publishing House/WEF, 1982.

[15] John 7 v. 17, 1 Cor. 2 vs. 6–16.

[16] See Chow, 'An integrated approach to Theological Education' *Theological Education Today*, Sept. 1981, p. 8 and especially John M. Frame, *op. cit.* pp. 369–388.

In the past, particularly in the Bible College Movement, this paradigm has often been taken to extremes. Some colleges with a missionary ethos would even at times have hints of the atmosphere of an army training base or a jungle camp. Accompanying this model has sometimes been an emphasis on spiritual warfare and a hard life, boiled cabbage and floor scrubbing duty, all of which are 'good missionary training'.

The emphasis on relevant training has been strenthened by a new attitude to theology as a practical task rather than a science. The new approach arose this century as anthropology, sociology and even politics made an impact on Theological Education. It is a movement which rightly takes seriously the situation in which theology is done and the uniqueness of each situation. So, the student is not 'given' theology as a tightly bound parcel of information to pass on to the p. 491 waiting world; he is trained to do the task of theology in his day and in his place of ministry.

The traditional, informational-based theological student who eventually finds himself in a practical ministry situation puts up on the shelf his notes on Appolinarianism, Pan-en-theism or Supralapsarianism and cobbles together a new practical theology based on the more useful parts of his classroom learning along with the experience he gains in the job.[17] The student taught theology as a task has less problem bridging the chasm between the classroom and the world when he leaves the one and enters the other.

Theology as done in the N.T. was formed by practitioners; active pastors and teachers in the churches, and especially by missionaries such as Paul. Because of that, it was related to and a part of the struggles and needs of the world and the church in which they operated.[18] It answered real current questions, set out relevant ethical norms and was mixed up with teaching on the spiritual life; theology and spirituality giving rise to each other.[19]

One of the positive influences of this model is seen in the growing interest in practical assignments for students. In the last twenty years block placements have been enthusiastically embraced by many colleges and the average length of such placements is now about 10 weeks for inter-denominational colleges and 12 weeks for denominational colleges in the O.K.[20]

This training model also provides a sense of purpose and reality for the student and therefore for the tutor. You will not lecture on Romans in quite the same way if you know your students are involved in practical ministry (or you should not). A healthy to-and-fro between classroom and street enlivens both locations.

This sense of purpose will insist that the college lecturer re-orientate his teaching in a number of ways. He has to teach expository courses at every level with spiritual and practical application.[21] He has to teach theology in such a way that it touches the thinking of the world, in sociology, literature, politics even. He has to deal with devotional and p. 492 practical subjects with the same academic rigour that he applies to biblical and theological studies (as traditionally defined) so that he does not re-inforce the alienation from the other side. He must deal with the theological issues about God with a humble

---

[17] See Frame *op, cit.* pp. 371/2.

[18] See the articles by Charles H. Kraft 'Dynamic Equivalence Theologising' pp. 258–285, Daniel Van Allmen 'The Birth of Theology', pp. 325–348, and other articles in section III of Charles H. Kraft and Tom N. Wisley *Readings in Dynamic Indigeneity*, Pasadena, William Carey Library, 1979.

[19] Especially in the epistles of Paul.

[20] Bunting *op. cit.* p. 43.

[21] Lee, *op. cit.* p. 7.

care and a devotional heart. Such lectures would often appropriately include a hymn of worship as did Barth's classes in Bonn.[22]

In summary, the training paradigm leads to a theological attitude which is bi-polar. Theology is preaching. It is missiology. It is rooted in the content of the Scriptures and builds a bridge into the situation of those among whom the theologian lives and moves and has his being. It is not a body of knowledge, it is a task. And it is a task to be done in the real world of today, answering the real questions which are in the student's mind and heart.

Nevertheless, as a dominant model, training has a steely coldness; the elevation of technique above conviction, of relevance above truth. It projects an activist approach which sees the pleasing of God as residing in doing more than being. It allows sociological perspectives to determine the content of theology. So Theological Education is defined more by what the Church does than by what the Church is. At its worst, it can bind theology to the way the Church sees its task and how the Church behaves in any one time and place. At its best, it displays only one important component of theological education.

4. THE BUSINESS PARADIGM

This model of Theological Education as a business enterprise has grown in importance as leadership and management concepts have been taken on board by principals, staff and college councils over the last few years. Colleges provide a service for a fee. Courses are seen as the 'products' and as such are influenced by the marketplace. Growth objectives are formulated. The presentation to the public requires a company logo and an advertising budget. Among other things, the principal becomes a managing director, responsible to the chairman of the board, with the treasurer peering over his shoulder. Almost all colleges and seminaries in Europe and North America have gone some way down this road.

The first thing to be said in favour of this model is that it stresses accountability and stewardship. Institutional Theological Education is an extremely expensive way to train a Christian worker. Even a small p. 493 college will have a budget which taxes the support capabilities of its church group or constituency, and considerable capital assets, often bought or built through the disembursments of charitable trusts. So this model becomes a necessary perspective. Its application has helped many theological training institutions onto a sound financial basis and therefore into a secure ministry for years to come.

Secondly, market-led courses are indicative of a servant attitude. Churches and missionary societies do not exist to provide the colleges and seminaries with students. Colleges exist to provide the churches and societies with workers. It follows that students must be able to do the job as it exists today and theological education programmes must reflect what is required. This has not always been so,[23] but the business model has had a significant role in bringing our previous paradigm, the training model, to the fore.

Nevertheless, this model, like the others, has dangers and disadvantages. Perhaps the most dangerous, because the most subtle, is that the new terminology shifts the emphasis of theological education. For instance, this model requires us to identify products to sell. In the past, the 'products' of the system were the students. Under this model, they must

---

[22] Eberhard Busch, *Karl Barth*, Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1975, pp. 256 and 258.

[23] See Point 2 of the Manifesto on the renewal of Evangelical Theological Education published in connection with the meeting of the International Council of Accrediting Agencies in Malawi in 1981. *Theological Education Today*, April–June, 1984 pp. 1–6. Frame, *op. cit.*, pp. 371f. and Steward, 'Tensions in North American Theological Education' *Evangelical Review of Theology*, Jan. 1990, p. 43.

be the courses, because these can be sold in the market place and so generate income. The emphasis on the people we are training, then, becomes partly sidelined in a marketing-led organization. This shift of students as the *raison d'etre* of the whole exercise into customers of our products is worrying.

Economic viability is also a two-edged sword. It is a welcome ultimate aim, but must not become the dominant short term objective. Sometimes a college or seminary should do something which is not economically sensible, such as taking a controversial decision which alienates a proportion of its support base, accepting an outstanding student with inadequate means, or refusing a marginally unsuitable potential student despite the seminary's overdraft.

A third problem with this model is that marketability can unduly affect curriculum design. This is the other side of the coin from the positive servanthood attitude the model engenders. What is wanted may not always be what is needed. As the president of Denver p. 494 Theological Seminary commented 'We believe we must have a strong sense of mission, and respond to the market only where it clearly fits with the mission of the seminary'.[24]

5. THE DISCIPLESHIP PARADIGM

There has been a growing awareness, in the third world particularly, of the importance of this model of Theological Education as a training relationship. In Church History, we encounter this model in the postgraduate 'discipleship' type schools in the U.S.A. of the last century in which a number of prospective ministers attached themselves to a prominent pastor/teacher. A similar system existed among dissenters in the U.K. But its history goes back further than that. Just how far we have moved from the educational methods of Christ is dramatically shown in Adeyemo's classic playlet;[25]

Student:	I can't outline what you say.
Teacher:	Life and thought and conversation seldom conform to an outline.
Student:	But that makes it hard to prepare for the exam.
Teacher:	What exam?
Student:	The one at the end of your course.
Teacher:	You will be taking my exams the rest of your life.

[24] Quoted in Steward, *op. cit.* p. 47.

[25] Tokunboh Adeyemo 'The renewal of Theological Education', in *Evangelical Theological Education Today*, Ed. Paul Bowers, p. 7.

Student: I don't understand a lot of what you are teaching us.

Teacher: You won't for three years.

Student: That's the whole course?

Teacher: No, it's only the beginning of the course.

Student: Do you have any idea of what my class standing will be?

Teacher: You'll fail the course, along with the rest. But then all of you except one will turn the world upside down.

Student: When we've finished, will we know as much as the Pharisees?

Teacher: No. You won't know as much, but you'll be changed. Do you want to be changed?

Student: I think so. Is your teaching relevant?

Teacher: Is it true?

Student: You seem to throw questions back at me instead of answerin them.

Teacher: That's because the answers are in you, not in me.

Student: Will we see you in class tomorrow? p. 495

Teacher: The class continues at supper and the camp-fire tonight. Do you think I only teach words?

Student: Is there an assignment?

Teacher: Yes, help me catch some fish for supper.

To a degree, no tutor can escape the clutches of the discipleship phenomenon. The tutor has always been the medium and the medium has always been the dominant message.[26] Looking back on our own student experience, it is the quality of life, attitudes and enthusiasm, of a few teachers that are remembered when much of the content of the teaching is forgotten—often 24 hours after the end of the exam.

Conversely, the tutor who is ineffective as a person, uncommitted, unable to offer a clear message from his or her life, can have a devasting effect on the acceptance of the truths taught. This may not be an over-riding argument if the subject is biology or the history of the civil war. But, for the teaching of biblical truth, it raises the issues of hypocrisy. As Martin Buber said, 'The teacher must himself be what he wants his pupils to become.'[27] The Discipleship paradigm consciously harnesses this effect in a training college.

Communication theory would suggest that discipleship is a far more efficient tool for learning than the standard information transfer by lecture. It relates learning to life and reality. In fact it integrates the process of learning and change within the student in the practical, spiritual and academic fields.

However, the model is not a Western model and does not fit well into Western cultural and educational structures (which, of course dominate theological education today). Firstly we encounter the problem of time, because the discipleship model is one greedy for that Western commodity. As Kornfield says,

> The impact that a professor makes on a student will generally be directly proportional to the quantity of time spent together times the quality of time spent together.[28]

Secondly, walking down this road will be unsettling and threatening to the tutorial staff. It is easier to lecture on holiness than to show it. Many would prefer to teach horniletics than to hold up their sermons as examples. The classroom situation does not require open-ness and the p. 496 vulnerability of personal relationship so it is emotionally cheap. In many teaching situations there is fear of rejection, doubt and insecurity about ability on both sides. You can protect yourself to an extent in a formal classroom setting but you are exposed in discipleship contact.[29]

Thirdly, the growing level of academic specialization amongst theological tutors today and their specialized experience of christian work is another area of difficulty. Institutions nowadays possess an Old Testament tutor, pastoral theology tutor, a theology tutor, none of whom is able to mark the other's work. Some never tread the pulpit steps, others have never evangelized among the mud huts of Africa. This cannot be avoided and is, in fact, a strength of the system, exposing students to learning from a wide variety of skill and experiences.

Unless we intend to abandon the Western institution altogether, we will have to develop discipleship learning alongside a formal, fragmented, specialist academic mode. In our struggle to balance and combine the classroom with discipleship, we are living in an unstable zone; two culturally different tectonic plates are rubbing against each other. Either the edges of each will crumble or one will clearly rise above the other.

---

[26] Kornfield, 'A Working Proposal for an Alternative Model of Higher Education' Pt2, *Theological Education Today*, Sept. 1983, p. 1.

[27] *ibid.* p. 3.

[28] *op. cit.* Sect. 11, p. 1.

[29] Henri J. M. Nouwen *Reaching Out*, London, Collins, 1975, p. 80. The whole passage pp. 78–84 is of great value.

Unfortunately we often assume that the 'higher' the educational institution, the more the Western model must prevail.

TOWARDS TRAINING THE PERSON

Now that we have examined the dominant models associated with theological education today, we have arrived at the task of synthesis. What has already become clear is that no one paradigm is adequate. Each taken alone becomes a procrustean bed for the task. Working in different cultures will force the theological educator to shift the balance between the various models but balance there must be. The inadequacies of one model will be made up in the strengths of the others and the task of leadership in theological education today is to maintain that balance amid the pressures of culture, tradition, finance and the seductive new idea.

In Western culture (as it is found in the West and as it is spread across the world within the Theological Education Movement) we need to take especial care that the model of academia and increasingly p. 497 those models of training and business do not dominate the more integrative and holistic models of discipleship and community.

In that task, the most fundamental question to answer is 'What is the purpose of a college?' Stated simply, it is to prepare people.

> The goals of theological education must focus on the kind of person we expect the student to become.[30]

We will not achieve these goals in any individual because maturity is an on-going task throught the student's life. College or seminary will be only one influential event in that process.[31] But we are required to be people-orientated. Our primary objective is not to teach courses or skills, but to train people.[32]

This person-related, holistic approach has at least three advantages. *Firstly* it requires humility on behalf of the teachers. We cannot dole out spiritual maturity, fitness for ministry, or knowledge of God as we can lecture notes; it is the work of God. Just as the Reformers came to realize that the Church is not the controller and dispenser of the Holy Spirit but the occasion for his works, so a holistic objective helps the institution to see that clearly about itself.

Secondly, it provides a unifying focus for what is now a very diverse and fragmented task. Farley has written eloquently on this subject and sees a need to re-capture unity by relating theology to the person in training. This article has suggested that the centrality of the person unites an even wider area than Farley works with.[33]

Thirdly, we are then able to distinguish clearly between the means and the end. If the prepared person is the end, the various activities of the college become the means rather

---

[30] Bruce Nicholls, *op. cit.* p. 126. See also James Plueddemann 'Towards a Theology of Theological Education' in *Evangelical Theological Education Today: 2 Agenda For Renewal*, Ed. Paul Bowers, Evangel W.E.F. Nairobi 1982 p. 57. 'Properly understood, theological education facilitates the maturation process in students so that they can in turn facilitate that process in others.'

[31] See Nouwen's concept of student as 'guests' in Henri J. M. Nouwen, *Reaching Out*, London, Collins, 1975, p. 83.

[32] This emphasis is, of course, neither new nor revolutionary. See, for instance, Philip Jacob Spener *Pia Desideria* section 5, English translation reprinted in Peter C. Erb, Ed. Pietists, Selected Writings, SPCK, London, pp. 40–46.

[33] Farley *op. cit.*, especially the first and last two chapters.

than ends in themselves, and each will have its place as it contributes to the ultimate objectives. The traditional structuring of these means has been the Western academic model of the four-legged table; Biblical Studies, Theology, Church History and Pastoral Studies. We have already seen that this academic p. 498 model is inadequate for what we try to do in Theological Education. A model more in keeping with the holistic approach is the three-legged stool of Academic, Spiritual and Ministerial growth.[34] This classification is presently proving influential in the Third World renewal movement in theological education. It is sometimes spoken of as the training of the head, heart and mouth.

This immediately faces us with the issue of balance. Almost all colleges and seminaries are under-resourced with too little money and too few staff who are too busy. Pressure is increasingly being exerted from outside, for instance, to be seen to achieve academic standards or to be training missionaries as adequately as another college. It is hard to keep the stool level.[35]

Some have argued for the priority of one of these three means over the others on the basis that some are more essential for college training and others more essential goals for an 'in ministry' setting. I cannot agree. Academic study is especially appropriate in an intensive way at the beginning of one's ministry but that time cannot be relied on to cover a person's future ministry without a student attitude and student application through life. Great strides can be made spiritually in the hot house of the college but this experience needs also to be the spring of an on-going maturity. Ministry studies are well learnt on the job, but part of that learning is best done in close association with studies and in the team environment of fellow student and staff at college. Institutional Theological Education is a step on the way, an event in the process for all three areas of growth.

That these three should occur together at college is important because they are inter-related and so feed off each other. Coming together in training, they often form a critical mass leading to an explosion of growth. Doing brings thinking to life and sifts it for relevance. Study provides the context and direction for doing.[36] As B. B. Warfield says, the study of Scripture is itself a religious exercise.[37] Practical ministry requires faith and so deepens spirituality. And in many other ways, it is the confluence of these three streams at one time in a person's life which is the great contribution that an institutionalized Theological Education makes to a person's growth and usefulness. p. 499

I close with some words written by Bonaventura around 1257. It is from the introduction to *The Soul's Journey into God* and it sets out eloquently the sort of learning that is required of a Theological student.

> First therefore, I invite the reader to the groans of prayer through Christ crucified, through whose blood we are cleansed from the filth of vice—so that he not believe that reading is sufficient without unction, speculation without devotion, investigation without wonder, observation without joy, work without piety, knowledge without love, understanding without humility, endeavor without divine grace, reflection … without divinely inspired wisdom.[38]

---

[34] Robertson McQuilkin 'Bible College Futures' in *Theological Education Today*, July–Sept. 1985.

[35] David Kornfield, *op. cit.* p. 5. See also Edgar Lee op. cit. p. 2.

[36] Stewart *op. cit.* p. 44.

[37] *The Religious Life of Theological Students*, Presbyterian and Reformed, Philipsburg, 1911.

[38] Translated by Ewert Cousins, *Bonaventura*, *The classics of Western Spirituality*, New York, Paulist Press, 1978.

Dr. Grahame Cheesman is Principal of the Belfast College, Belfast, Northern Ireland. p. 500

A Review Article

NEW HORIZONS IN HERMENEUTICS

by Anthony C. Thiselton
(Harper Collins, 703 + xii pp. $29.99/£29.95)

(Reviewed by Richard S. Hess)
Reprinted with permission from Themelios, *Jan 1993*

This comprehensive survey provides Biblical scholars with a first hand acquaintance with hermeneutical theoreticians and the diversity of hermeneutical models open to us today. It is a one volume library on the subject. Thiselton is concerned to affirm and retain both the existence of universals in the interpretation of texts and the need for criteria to evaluate the success or failure of different methods as they apply to the text. Focussing on the cross, Thiselton concludes 'The spirit, the text and the reader engage in a transforming process, which enlarges horizons and creates new horizons'.
Editor

Twelve years after the publication of *The Two Horizons*, which became a classic work in biblical hermeneutics, Thiselton has produced a major synthesis of the issues and people involved in the questions of interpreting texts. The importance of the work for readers justifies a longer review, which can consider the content and some of the theses of the book.

Following an introduction which summarizes the contribution of the study, Thiselton investigates how texts function, both (1) to transform readers, as in speech-acts where texts carry the reader into their own world and may provide a reversal of expectations, and (2) to be transformed themselves through techniques such as intertextuality with changing language functions and pre-intentional backgrounds as well as through semiotics and deconstructionism. The difficulties of grasping an area of research so heavily laden with jargon should not be minimized (*i.e.* this is not a text for the beginner), but the discussion of its various usages and implications is one of the book's strengths.

The chapter '*What is a Text*?' surveys the developments in hermeneutics following on the traditional 'classical-humanist' paradigm which emphasized the author's intention and its possibility of recovery through a study of the text and the context of its origins. The p. 501 New Criticism challenged the recoverability of authorial intention and turned to a focus on the text itself. *Northrop Frye* introduced the postmodernist emphasis on the context of the reader or audience for understanding the text. The American development of reader-response theory suggested that the readers themselves create meaning from the text. Reader interests became dominant. In his application of these ideas to biblical studies, Thiselton considers the sense in which promises are given to Israel and to the church but it remains for the hearers to believe and to appropriate them. Further, he observes the Christian confession of the role of the Holy Spirit at work in the origin of the texts, in their transmission, and in the lives of the readers. The developments in