

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY

An Excellent Ministry

ADALBERT R. KRETZMANN

The Ecumenical Century and the Parish

ALVIN N. ROGNESS

Lutheranism in American Theological Education

JERALD C. BRAUER

Theological Education and the Special Ministries

C. THOMAS SPITZ

Homiletics

Brief Studies

Book Review

Vol. XXXVI

June 1965

No. 3

Theological Education and the Special Ministries

C. THOMAS SPITZ

I

There have been two major developments in the recent history of theological education in America which have been of special interest to the special ministries. Both have been stimulated greatly by the agonizing reappraisal and introspection in which most theological schools and denominational departments of theological education have been engaged regarding their purpose, function, and curricula.

First, the probing and the reconsideration of purpose and function have resulted in the improvement of the program at the theological schools. Libraries, faculties, facilities have been improved. Internships have been established where none were demanded before. Clinical training has been introduced. Field work has progressed beyond mere exposure to the multiplicity of parish activities. Graduate study and in-service training programs have been made more readily available.

Further progress of benefit — also to the special ministries — is likely to be most profitably advanced by recognizing the positive things which have already happened and by building on them.

But there has also been another area of major development. We are no longer willing to limit theological education to the operation of theological schools. We are now admitting that a total program of

theological education includes far more than formal training for the traditional church vocations, that it must indeed include the theological education of the whole church, that it must include that level of intensive theological training which goes beyond even the most sophisticated program of parish education, and that theological departments and schools owe it to the churches they serve to be much more directly and actively and effectively involved in that total theological education of the whole church.¹

It is this participation in the total theological education of the whole church by which theological schools and departments will make their greatest contribution to the development and training of the special ministries.

It should be underlined here at the outset that this presentation will attempt to deal with the relationship of theological education and the special ministries and not so much with the more specific questions of special training programs for special ministries. Special training programs are important and reference will inevitably be made to them, but basic to their consideration and effective implementation is the prior question of theological education.

II

But just what are the *special* ministries? Current literature employs the term in a

C. Thomas Spitz is director of broadcasting for the Lutheran Hour.

¹ Elmer G. Homrighausen, "No Monopoly in Theological Education," *The Christian Century*, April 24, 1957.

variety of ways, each of which has a certain validity.

Perhaps the most popular use of the term is applied to the function of those who are serving congregations in forms of ministry other than those of pastor, teacher, and deaconess. Their training and theological sensitizing is one of the pressing concerns confronting churches today. Included are the specialists in youth work, in music, the social workers in congregational programs of social concern, the people trained in adult education, in counseling, as business administrators, and so on. Their number and the variety of their assignments is increasing rapidly.

A second, very similar category is illustrated in the growing crop of metropolitan ministries established in cities throughout the United States. These ministries feature a variety of transparochial, metropolitan involvements particularly in the areas of counseling, youth work, social action, and so on. Lutherans, too, are becoming involved increasingly, particularly as they watch and, sometimes in slightly variant forms, imitate the patterns of the All-Lutheran Urban Church Planning ministry in Baltimore.²

But these newer ministries are not unique to the United States or to the Western world. The Detroit Industrial Mission has its counterparts in various places throughout the world, in the Vila Antastacio industrial evangelism project in Brazil, in the Kansai area industrial mission in Japan, in industrial areas of England and France, and in the urban evangelism

² John Wagner, Jr., "New Forms of Parish Life," *The Diakonia of the Church in a New Age*, (Valparaiso, Ind.: Valparaiso University Institute, May 1964).

project of the joint Planning Committee of the Churches in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The potential variety of specialties in these ministries is apparent just in looking at the specific personnel requests made for the single project in Port Harcourt. This single project has requested a port chaplain, an industrial chaplain, a trades union worker, two health visitors, a probation officer, a psychiatric social worker, and an adult education officer.³

Other current expressions of special, intercongregational ministry include the use of the mass media and religious drama, medical missions, agricultural ministries, employment services, and the administration of welfare agencies and other service groups.

Recently initial consultations were held to plan a special ministry in park and recreation areas to people on vacation, the forerunners of the leisure society to come. It is in many ways a leisure society which is already here. It is described as the "two homes and a motorboat" society. The fixed edifice-related ministry of our congregations and the institutionally, organizationally oriented concept of personal ministry which has been pressed upon our people are not going to meet either their needs or their opportunities.

Our leisure society will require both special emphases and understandings in the ministry of the local congregation and a sizable number of separately structured, intercongregational expressions of ministry. The locale and specific nature of the ministry will vary, but the theological training and understanding required will

³ John V. Taylor, C[hurch] M[ission] S[ociety] *News-Letter*, (No. 268, February 1964).

be the same wherever the ministry is located.

In both congregational and intercongregational ministries, the church will be using people out of the fields of sociology, social work, psychology, counseling, communications, journalism, accounting, business management, medicine, and education. For these people from other backgrounds of training and vocational experience some type of special program of theological education or of theological sensitization at least is necessary.

A third category of special ministries arises as the church continues to employ for leadership positions in ministries in social welfare, in counseling, in communications, and so on, a great many people whose professional training is in theology. They will be placed in positions of responsibility to a second discipline for which they will require the special training and orientation of that discipline.

However unprepared they may be in that second discipline, their leadership as churchmen can be effective if their theological education has provided them with the point of view and equipped them with the resources of faith, intellect, and theological skill through which God may call them and speak to them and qualify them in the uniqueness of their service in a new and unfamiliar setting. But even then, both throughout their employment there and especially while they are undergoing the special training of the second discipline, they will need some kind of continuing program of theological study and sensitization by which they may retain a theological perspective, base, and rationale for the new emphasis of their service. It has all too often been observed that some people,

who were originally trained in theology and who subsequently assumed a particular interest and involvement in some other discipline, tend to be theologically less alert than those who begin in another discipline and then come to a theological concern.

A fourth category of special ministries includes all those carried on by people whose ministry has no structural or organizational relationship of any kind to the institutional church. These are the people employed in state institutions and public programs, the people who have acquired responsible positions and leadership roles in the power structures of society, the people in professional life and public education. These are the people who are really on the frontier of the church's ministry to the world.

The church is already a decade or two late in making available the special training needed for the new church vocations. It would be doubly tragic if, in belatedly meeting this challenge, the church became so absorbed in the task that it would ignore or overlook the needs of the people in non-church-related special ministries. Their theological training both directly and through their congregations is the challenge of this decade and the next.

What real difference dare there be in the theological education of the Christian social worker employed by a congregation or church institution and of the one employed by a state institution?

What difference should there be in the help which the church makes available to the special youth counselor in a Synod-sponsored inner city team ministry and that made available to the Lutheran woman who is counselor of girls in a 3,000-student

high school in Manila? Or how about the needs of theological education for the Christian who teaches in one of the metropolitan slum schools where the teacher almost inadvertently becomes surrogate parent, hero, tutor, pastor, and friend?

What are the special ministries?

They range from the special emphases which have come into the pastoral office — things like industrial evangelism and intercultural outreach — through the proliferation of the newer forms of service to the congregation and church at large to the otherwise secular positions transformed into special ministries just because they are occupied by Christians.

Now it is certainly true that these various categories of special ministry may require rather different training programs adequate to their specific needs in techniques and skills. That may be what makes them special both over against the traditional forms of ministry and over against each other. In their need for theological education, however, all these special ministries are the same. They need it, not so much because they have a specialty, but because they have a ministry.

III

So also theological education for the special ministries seems to involve theological education for every other facet of ministry.

The traditional offices of ministry — and the theological education invested in them — are quite understandably going to influence and shape many of the special ministries. And well they might, particularly as they express in special dimension and emphasis the relationship of the kerygmatic ministry to all ministries.

It is not very difficult, unfortunately, to find someone in a special ministry who is ready to complain about the unfriendly, uncooperative attitude of some pastor or teacher. The attitudes of pastors and teachers are in major part the products of their theological education or lack of it. Their recognition of all those forms of ministry which are duly ordered by the church and which truly make themselves servants of the Gospel is the product of a theological understanding. Their openness to the newer forms and shapes of ministry — and let's not underestimate the importance of their attitude and understanding and openness in helping to fix the whole posture of the church on this point — will depend greatly upon their theological interpretation of the listing of ministries in 1 Cor. 12 and Ephesians 4. Whether they accept these as listings of specific, fixed offices or of functions which might vary in form from place to place and time to time will in large measure shape their attitude toward and their role in the special ministries. It will be the formal process of theological education by which they will grasp a theology which, in any situation or at any time, can speak in constructive criticism and in critical construction of the shapes and forms of the church and its ministry.

And it is inevitable that they will be directly, personally involved in them. Even where the congregation may actually have a social welfare resource to which disturbed or needy persons can be referred, the pastor is seldom able to divorce himself completely from the cases. James Cross of the Social Welfare Department of the Missouri Synod reports that the pastor "continues to be directly involved,

except in those very rare cases in which the problem has no relationship to the person's faith or in which the person is neither a member of the congregation nor accepts his need for spiritual help. And despite the wealth of social welfare resources, despite the rapid increase in the types and kinds of counseling specialists, there is still a wide variety of human needs which tend to 'fall between the cracks.' And so the counseling buck stops at the office of the parish pastor."⁴

If, in the future, the ministry of the church is going to emphasize to greater degree the use of smaller home and neighborhood groups — a trend already established in many areas throughout the world — there will be a growing need for people, lay people, who can serve in leadership at those points. Who will contribute most to their continuing preparation and theological education if not the pastor?

If the church's ministry of the future will more and more express itself through professionally oriented koinonia groups, some provision will have to be made for continuing assistance to the lay leadership in special ministry demanded by such groups. Who will provide this continuing assistance if not the pastor?

Gibson Winter appears to be a prophet of the predictable when he says: "The past image conceived of the ministry is the work of the clergyman with auxiliary aids from the laity; the ministry of the New Christendom is the work of the laity with auxiliary help from theological specialists."⁵

⁴ James Cross and Charles Reichert, "Pastors Can't Pass the Buck," *Advance*, (March 1964)

⁵ Gibson Winter, "The New Christendom in the Metropolis," *Christianity and Crisis* (November 1962).

No pastor can produce or provide that kind of ministry with ministries out of a vacuum. His basic training must have provided a good foundation. He must be kept in a continuous learning process. His understandings and insights must be freshened and updated. Any kind of once-and-for-all-time program of theological training for a 40-year ministry will not be sufficient — and never was.

The church simply cannot now afford to wait for another decade or two of graduates who may have received a theological education more suitable to and for the special ministries. The whole church, and particularly the graduates of previous decades, must somehow be brought into a continuing program of theological education relevant to the continually changing situations and forms of both society and ministry.

Those who are training the pastors and teachers and those who by their program emphases and promotion are guiding and pressuring the ministry of today's parish should probably receive special attention in this regard. Their relationship to the special ministries is itself rather special.

There is no question about the role of professors at theological schools. Their involvement is obvious as they train the people who themselves go into the special ministries or prepare others for them. But who prepares the professors, especially those who are still training students only for the residentially based, one-man ministries of the middle class, rural communities of the past?

And what about that burgeoning number of program specialists, executives, editors, planners, and administrators who by their writing and activity now influence so much of the theological growth and un-

derstanding of the church? In some denominations their number, together with that of the educators, is 40 percent of all ordained workers. All too often they are actually expected to sound and act as though the very life of the church depended only upon their defense and promotion of established systems of organization and traditional forms of service. Who is providing the continuing theological education for their contribution to the theological orientation and sensitizing and teaching of the church and its special ministries?

Where are those professors and church leaders going to get the theologically sensitive exposure and involvement in today's ministry which they need if they are to do an adequate job of teaching, programing, structuring, and administering?

IV

It must be admitted that existing programs of theological education have attempted in a limited way to meet some of the challenge of the special ministries.

Recent years have produced the development and growing use of programs of clinical training within the regular theological curriculum. These programs of field experience have shown themselves to be very helpful — almost indispensable — in providing undergraduates with firsthand contact with culture and in preparing them both for special ministries and for special emphases in ministry.

The fact that students benefit from such a working contact with a variety of field experiences does not, however, support the demands frequently heard for the addition of an almost endless number of specialty courses to the theological school curricu-

lum. Such a proliferation of courses and fragmentation of the curriculum may be both unwise and quite unnecessary.

There are already throughout the world a growing number of special training and sensitizing programs to which theological schools may well relate themselves, their faculties, and their students. The emphases of these centers at the moment are on urban ministry and ministry in an industrial-technological society. Notable examples include the Urban Training Center in Chicago, William Temple College and Luton Industrial College in England, the Dutch Academic Institute for Adult Education at Utrecht, the Industrial Seminar of the Gossner Mission in Germany, the special courses offered in conjunction with the Limuru Theological Seminar in Kenya, the School of Theology at Doshisha University in Kyoto, Japan, the Christian Institute for the Study of Religion and Society in South India, and an experimental training course being conducted this year by the Department of City and Industry of the Church of Christ in Thailand.

A notable example of advanced training is that being offered by the *Missionsakademie* of the University of Hamburg. The need for Christian writers and mass media people has produced the special training program in this area of concern at Kitwe in Eastern Africa. And another kind of special emphasis is being served through the Islam in Africa Project centered in Nigeria.

Information and understanding for students, teachers, and active workers is the goal and promise of programs such as the urban seminars now being planned and conducted by David Schuller.

The January 1963 issue of *Pastoral Psychology* listed 77 agencies which provide conferences, institutes, lecture series, and seminars on pastoral care and counseling. All of these are brief programs lasting from an hour to several days.

Listed in the same issue were a variety of comprehensive courses in pastoral care leading to graduate degrees and a number of individual programs offering resident and full-time training in accredited agencies.

Lay academies can be an important means of relating theological education to the life and ministry of the church in its cultural setting. The Lutheran Faith in Life Institutes are a significant development in this direction. So are the special institutes planned and conducted by the Lutheran Academy for Scholarship.

The Walther League has recently undertaken an Arcadia Association Program of in-depth training for the laity. This program is planned to emphasize particularly seminars and joint study opportunities for people within specific professional groupings.

Such programs conducted off the campuses of the theological schools can have the distinct advantage of being on the spot, in the field. They can be more than abstract study centers. They can be conducted realistically in the setting to which their preparation applies. Incorporated into them can be an actual involvement in the pertinent ministry. They can be practicing laboratories of probing, experimentation, and exploration.

The more responsible ones at any rate, like the new Urban Training Center in Chicago, include all these functions.

The separated training programs also

have their potential dangers, of course, especially from the point of concern for their theological adequacy. They can become so technique-oriented that they become little more theologically than mechanical trade schools. In listing the deficiencies in the service of the evangelical academies in Germany, a special memorandum issued in 1963 makes particular reference to the inadequacy of theological concern and training frequently demonstrated by academy staff members.⁶

What advantage has the church gained if its ministering people become adept counselors, psychologists, and sociologists but no longer have anything theologically worthwhile to contribute to a ministry which is faithful to God's mission to the world?

Theological schools and departments cannot be blamed directly for the theological shortcomings and weaknesses in these separated training programs. But they can be asked to address themselves aggressively to the problem.

First of all, they must recognize the validity of such special training activities and must guide and encourage their development. It was the social welfare people who initiated and insistently promoted the existing relationships between clinical pastoral education and the seminaries. But it is doubtful whether any of the new "special ministries" will be as well organized as people of the social welfare discipline or as able to exert that kind of influence. It is essential therefore that theological schools and departments of theo-

⁶ *Laity*, Bulletin of the Departments on the Laity and on Cooperation of Men and Women in Church, Family and Society, World Council of Churches (Geneva, No. 17, May 1964).

logical education themselves initiate and contribute forcefully to the development of training programs adequate for the special ministries. After all, if not from the departments of theological education, from whom shall the church expect leadership in this concern for all training programs for ministry?

At this point it might seem desirable to suggest a number of needed special training programs. The temptation to do so will be resisted. We might only be guilty of suggesting the adoption of training program solutions which would be outdated before they got implemented — and yet never die.

Perhaps we can learn something from the business world here. A favorite principle employed in the recruitment and training of executives is the following: "Find people who are able to grasp concepts and to think in concepts. When confronted with the changes in situation which require retraining, set up the intensive program most suitable to the needs and times. If you've got the right kind of people, they will retrain easily. If they can't grasp or think in concepts, no amount of retraining will ever make them anything more than hacks."

Now, some people are looking to theological education today and insisting that it immediately set up these intensive programs of training and retraining. Everyone agrees that they are necessary. There would also be real advantages gained if they were set up by established theological schools and departments of theological education. But the essential task of theological education will continue to be the development of the ability to conceptualize

theologically, to grasp and to deal with and to work through theological concepts.

Secondly, the theological schools must find adequate ways of relating to special training activities already established.

With regard to the more formal training programs, all schools might do well to investigate the arrangement which has been established between the Chicago Theological Seminary and the Urban Training Center in that city. According to that arrangement, small groups of students will be placed with the center for the same number of hours and on the same basis as the seminary normally assigns for other clinical courses. The seminary students will share with the regular students all the activities of the center.

Or consider the seminary involvement planned into an industrial mission in Japan.

At the level of the theological seminaries, special courses and seminars on Christian responsibility in industrial society have been instituted, and courses in social ethics related to industrial society have also been begun. There is also a "Student in Industry Programme" under the National Christian Council, whereby about fifteen students each year share in ordinary industrial jobs for a month in the Osaka area, spending the evenings in discussion of problems, and hearing expert lectures on industry. This has meant that there are now ministers coming into the Church with a genuine understanding of the problems of industrial society. In all these and in other ways, the Church in Japan is finding a greater flexibility and openness to society, and is helped to respond more faithfully to the needs of a particular situation.⁷

⁷ Colin W. Williams, *What in the World* (New York: National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, 1964).

It might be good and desirable from several points of view, of course, if all the necessary special training activities — formal and informal — credit courses and institutes — could actually be made a part of the life of the theological schools. Such placement of the training activities would inevitably bring into campus life each year a number of people already engaged in leadership in the special ministries. It would also tend to invite the participation of laymen who are eager to receive intensive training for their special ministry as the church in the world. In both instances, regular theological school students would find themselves in a living contact with people who have vitally experienced the church's inescapable confrontation with contemporary culture.

This advantage could be gained, of course, only if the special training were offered within the regular academic life and not if it were treated as a summer — or other recess time — adjunct.

But the concerned educators and administrators in theological education still occupy a most reasonable position when they express caution about the addition of all kinds of special courses to the curriculum. They insist — and rightly so — that the addition of a few more so-called practical courses of applied theology and that new relationships to special training programs do not in themselves help the schools make a maximum contribution to preparation for the special ministries. Their schools are, after all, theological schools, and their maximum contribution must be measured by the faithfulness with which they equip their students with that understanding basic to any ministry, namely, the knowledge of God and of the

nature of His relationship and of His revelation of Himself to man and this world.

Even the most vocal proponents of special training must admit that this is so. But the emphasis on the theological dimension and the matter of additional involvement in special training are not mutually exclusive demands. Indeed, they must be pursued simultaneously.

And where the special training programs must be separately conducted, it is the theological dimension about which theological schools and departments must be most concerned and which they must somehow contribute, even if necessary by subtle infiltration.

V

And now, finally, what benefits can the theological schools and denominational systems of theological education supply right out of their regular operation?

There is, first of all, the continuing matter of seeking a continuing relevance for theological education. If it is not relevant, can it be truly theological? The situation in which and to which God speaks today is no less important than the fact that He has spoken or the setting in which that was done.

The question of relevance in theological education does not deal with the development of special skills and techniques. It deals rather with the necessity of developing and maintaining a theological point of view on the meaning of the Gospel as it confronts contemporary and emerging culture and society.

Relevant theological education demands that the total theological curriculum be related to the urban-industrial-technological setting of the society of this decade. This

will demand more than occasional course references to the contemporary world scene. It will require an actual testing of each of the course offerings. To all the course offerings and to their content must continually be applied an honest, current appraisal of the nature of the church's confrontation with and ministry and mission to today's world.

If this relevance is to be maintained, the theological schools, which are the well-springs of theological education and thought, and particularly the faculties of such theological schools — all members of the faculty, and not just those in the practical department — must themselves come into dynamic encounter with the thought and action of non-Christian or secular society. And the encounter must be one of dialog and not just monolog.

The possible processes of such encounter are many and varied. The deeper involvement of these schools in the clinical training programs of their students is but one. The enrollment and participation of faculty members in some of the institutions of special training, such as the Urban Training Center in Chicago, is another. The suggestion being heard with increasing frequency, that professors regularly spend a "sabbatical year" in one of the field ministries, is a possible third.

It is a most encouraging sign that some schools are now seeking, not only to experience but actually to produce this encounter with the world. As an illustration, one might cite the action of this seminary in establishing a full-time position in research as part of its school of graduate studies and in staffing this research position with a person who is qualified both as a theologian and as a sociologist. Christian churches and their theological schools dare

not leave to secular sociologists alone the research and conclusions which define the spiritual aspects of our culture and society and God's involvement in them.

Certainly, the more realistic integration of all theological course offerings into the cultural situation would also make any or all of them more usable and attractive and helpful even to those who intend to maintain their professional activity within the secular groupings of society, for example, for the Christian counselor in a state institution, for doctors and lawyers, business and labor leaders who intend to pursue further their professional careers but who want to do so in more effective Christian ministry.

The regular course offerings would also then serve as an adequate theological base at least for any special clinical training which might still have to be separately provided.

As a second immediate benefit which the special ministries might realize from theological schools and departments, there is the possibility of giving to all our churchwide theological education a focus upon people and on the world in which they live rather than upon service to a denomination or upon theological knowledge for the sake of theological knowledge.

In *The Shoes of the Fisherman* by Morris West, a 1963 best seller and a critique of the Roman Catholic Church, there are a few statements which are most applicable to our concern because they express the hopes of many for the ministry of the church.

West has two old priests, Father Rinaldi and Father Leone, talking to each other about the election of a new pope.

Leone heaved his bulky body out of the chair and walked to the big table

where an antique globe stood among a litter of books. He spun the globe slowly on its axis. "Look at it, my friend; the world, our vineyard! Once we colonized it in the name of Christ. Not righteously always, but the Cross was there and the Sacraments were there, and however a man lived—in purple or in chains—there was a chance for him to die like the Son of God. Now Asia is lost to us and Russia. Africa will soon be gone and South America will be next. It is the measure of our failure that we have sat all these years in Rome and watched it happen." He checked the spinning globe with an unsteady hand. "If you had your life over, Rinaldi, what would you do with it?"

Rinaldi attempts a weak reply and then turns the question on Leone, "What would you do if you had to begin again?"

"I've thought about it often," said Leone heavily. "If I didn't marry—and I'm not sure that that's what I needed to make me halfway human—I'd be a country priest with just enough theology to hear confession and just enough Latin to get through Mass. But with heart enough to know what griped in the guts of other men, and made them cry into their pillows at night. I'd sit in front of my church on a summer evening and read my office and talk with the poor and humble and unhappy ones. You know what I am now? A walking encyclopedia of dogma and theological controversy. And who cares about theology except the theologians? We are necessary, but less important than we think. The Church is Christ—Christ and the people. And all the people want to know is whether there is a God and what is His relation with them and how can they get back to Him when they stray."⁸

⁸ Morris West, *The Shoes of the Fisherman* (New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc., 1963).

A greater people-consciousness in all theological education and in the church's image of what should be expected from it would in itself be a tremendous contribution to the special ministries.

As a third immediate contribution, theological schools and departments must extend and expand the existing programs for continued theological education.

Theological training systems cannot be expected in one course of study to equip their students completely for a lifetime of ministry. Rather they must equip their graduates with a point of view and with methods of study which will enable them to be continuing students. The graduate is, of course, supposed to carry on continuous study independently of the discipline of the schools. And there are some of these self-propelled scholars who will take advantage also of existing programs of continuing theological education.

But there is another group of graduates that will continue to study only if real encouragement is consistently given and if assistance is readily available. These are the people least likely to follow any kind of graduate degree program. They are in the great majority numerically.

Theological schools and departments must do what they can to help those who need continuing study by removing at least some of the obstacles. Initiative for this must be taken by the schools and departments. It cannot be expected from the graduate whose lack of self-drive has already dulled his pursuit of existing educational opportunities.

It is not so much that continuing education must be made convenient. But it must be made available. I particularly favor the programs which can be moved into the

field, whether as extended seminars of one week or two weeks or three or the short-term, in-residence programs moved from one campus to another.

The thing to be remembered is that programs of continued theological education are a critical need of the special ministries. They are needed for the continuing growth of the church, also in its acceptance and development of the special ministries. They are needed for the continuing growth of the special ministers, whatever their specific function or place of service or relationship to the institutional church.

All people in ministry need to experience regularly — perhaps constantly — that ebb and flow of exposure and reflection which is found in the frequent alternating of experience in the actual situation of ministry and of return or withdrawal for reflection. Programs of continued theological education are vital in answering this need. They must be developed and placed to be available. They must be planned and conducted so that the dynamic of alternating exposure and reflection can function.

VI

We come now to the point where a summation might be useful.

A. Theological education is more than theological schools and training systems. But they are an integral part of it. They should not be so specialized that they actually become isolated and insulated from the total concerns of theological education. Instead, they must exercise real leadership in all areas of concern to theological education.

It may be unwise to fragmentize the curricula of the theological schools. It is equally unwise to fragmentize theological

education itself. Rather it should be unified, not for the sake of control but for the sake of completeness.

B. Theological education for the traditional forms of ministry is very important also to the special ministries. First of all, it will for some time continue to serve as the base for all theological education in the church.

Secondly, it is also this training which produces the people whose understandings are so essential to the acceptance and establishment and encouragement of the special emphases and special ministries. Upon them will depend much of the implementation and much of the local training and feeding of those special ministries.

Thirdly, almost everything that the theological schools will do in a relevant, people-conscious, continuing program of theological education will also be usable at one point or another in special training programs.

C. Theological education must contribute the theological dimension to the increasingly necessary special training for the special ministries of our day. It must both establish special training programs and seek relationships with those already in existence. The initiative for this interest and implementation must come from the theological schools and departments. They must be more than an available resource; they must be initiators.

D. Theological education must permeate the entire life and ministry of the church. Specific schools and special programs may prepare for particular forms of ministry, but theological education by its very nature prepares for function rather than form and should be planned, extended, and conducted accordingly.

E. Theological education must be continuous. No single, once-and-for-all-time training program can prepare any individual for a 10-year ministry, much less a 40-year ministry — whether regular or special (and it may well be that there is something special about each form and shape of ministry).

F. Theological education must get off the campuses of the theological schools. Theological education which is to be continuous, available in special forms to people with special needs, and integrated into the cultural situation cannot be located or conducted exclusively on the campus.

G. "The future task of theological education will be more demanding and more difficult than has been the task of translating a tradition."⁹ The "translating of a tradition" will still be a part of its task, but theological education must also be more than the intellectual sharing and transfer of a body of knowledge about God; it must be that sharing of the living God in which teacher and student are moved, not only to observation, but to actual response. Such theological educa-

tion is relevant. Such theological education establishes a theological base and discipline adequate both to continuing education and to relationships with all forms of ministry.

H. A program of continued theological education and repeated experience in a ministerial situation must be made mandatory for all who serve the church, whether as pastors, teachers, deaconesses, or in special ministry as professors, as program specialists, as ecclesiastical administrators, or as church officers.

I. The concern with which theologian-educators are today looking at training programs adequate to the needs of the special ministries is a demonstration of their devotion and dedication "toward a more excellent ministry." One hundred and twenty-five years ago the fathers of this institution answered the questions of their day in a way gratefully acknowledged by history. The questions of today bear their own burden and must be given their own answer. This institution and those associated with it are attempting to face those questions. Perhaps this is one of the better evidences of Concordia Seminary's 125-year-old vitality. This institution is still directed "toward a more excellent ministry." For that I am sincerely grateful.

St. Louis, Mo.

⁹ Conrad Bergendoff, "The Next Half Century in Theology," *New Dimensions in Lutheran Higher Education* (Washington, D. C.: National Lutheran Education Conference, 1960).