

2030: A Theological Odyssey of the Work of the Theological Educator

New Faculty Conference
October 2013

Daniel Aleshire
The Association of Theological Schools

Consider that it is 2030. You are now a mid-career faculty member in a theological school. The twenty-five-year-old students you will be teaching are in the second grade this year. They are busy learning multiple digit subtraction. Do you remember when you first “borrowed” a number? By 2030, some things will have changed in elementary education. “No child left behind” and “Race to the Top” will be gone—their pervasive trust in mega-data to assess educational attainment will have been exposed as an inadequate basis for social policy. What will the shape of theological education be when these second graders are in your class? How will the work you most hope to do be different from it is now, perhaps different from what you have been trained for in your accomplished graduate education?

I think that theological education in North America has always been on a kind of odyssey. I have limited experience with odysseys. I read *The Odyssey*, at least a long excerpt of it, in a world literature class in college. I especially liked the part about the sirens, but as I mentioned, I was in college, and the image of sirens overtook more subtle literary significance. I watched *2001: A Space Odyssey*—a science fiction film about space and the future that speculated about artificial intelligence. I have characterized theological education as an odyssey not because I think that it has encounters with sirens or artificial intelligence—although the presence of either might have an interesting effect on our work—but because I think the image fits the saga of theological education across the past several centuries. It is an odyssey, in the dictionary sense of the word: “a long wandering or voyage usually marked by many changes of fortune.” I am not sure that there ever will be a destination—when we finally get everything right once and for all. Your careers in theological education join a wandering enterprise that likes to think it is stable, and perhaps understanding the odyssey will provide perspective about why your work has the shape that it now has, and how that work will be changing over the next decades.

So, this talk traces the odyssey to date and speculates about the changes of fortune that are underway and will continue to take shape in the next twenty years. I have two problems with such a presentation: I am not a historian nor am I futurist. This talk would no doubt be better if I were either. My claim for expertise is having hung around theological education for almost forty years now and having some good friends who are historians and excellent readers of trends. I want to point out four places on the odyssey and the fifth place toward which theological education is heading.

1. The classics as theological curriculum for learned ministers

American Protestant theological education began in colleges or universities that were founded in the colonies. The colonial training of ministers was an education in the classics. Both “clergy and laity were to receive the same education, one that fitted them ideally for service in either of the two public realms,

church or commonwealth.”¹ Of course, not many ministers had any training, but those who did were educated to be Christian gentlemen who were intellectual leaders and culture shapers. The colonists adapted the English model of the “learned gentleman.” Early battles in this educational moment centered around issues like “dumbing down” the curriculum by the tendency of some schools to allow students to read the classical texts in English rather than Latin or Greek. “Learned” meant steeped in Greek, Roman, and European classics and languages; it did not mean proficient in biblical texts and theology, other than that they were a part of the classic canon. This model often made educated clergy the public intellectuals of colonial America. There were other models, especially those that focused on non-English speaking immigrant communities like German Lutherans or Brethren. Catholics were small in number and during much of the colonial period depended on priests from Europe. Harvard and Yale, and less prestigious schools, educated English speaking clergy in the classics and provided for erudite ministerial leadership that led the church and contributed to shaping the culture.

In a way, there were no theological educators at this time. Teachers of clergy knew the classics and were pious, and they guided students toward an understanding of ministry as the exercise of piety and intellect for the church and the betterment of society.

2. The emergence of theological schools and development of specialized theological studies

After nationhood, the education of Protestant ministers moved from the colleges to the first theological schools. Andover was founded in 1808 by Congregationalists who reacted to the appointment of liberal, Unitarian-leaning Henry Ware to the Hollis Chair at Harvard. The Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church was founded in 1811, separating ministerial education from the College of New Jersey, now Princeton University, and establishing an institution under the direct control of the church. Princeton required faculty to swear “an *ex animo* (literally, from the soul) oath that their theology was that of the Westminster Confession and Catechisms.”¹ While Andover was not under strict church control, the founding documents required every professor to be “a man of sound and orthodox principles in divinity” and to make a public declaration of his opposition not only to “Atheists and Infidels, but to Jews, Mahommentans, Arians, Pelagians, Antinomians, Socinians, Unitarians, and Universalists, and to all other heresies and errors, ancient and modern, which may be opposed to the Gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men.”² Glenn Miller concludes that, in effect, “Andover defined the academic standards; Princeton set the ecclesiastical standards.”³

These two schools and the scores of others that were founded in the nineteenth century were confessionally related to competitive theological traditions, and they changed the structure of the education of clergy. Education moved away the study of the classics and the educational effort to cultivate Christian gentleman. Andover and Princeton required students to have the bachelor’s degree prior to seminary, and study increasingly focused on a theological curriculum. While many Protestant ministers were not seminary educated, those who were experienced a curriculum similar to the one described in the founding documents of Andover: natural theology (apologetics, philosophy, and ethics), sacred literature, ecclesiastical history, and Christian theology.⁴ Theological education was morphing into

¹ Glenn Miller, *Piety and Intellect: The Aims and Purposes of Ante-Bellum Theological Education* (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools, 1990), 48. This volume described this era of theological education in length.

² Margaret Lamberts Bendroth, *A School of the Church: Andover Newton across Two Centuries* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 15.

³ Miller, *Piety and Intellect*, 113.

⁴ Bendroth, *A School of the Church*, 19.

a form of education that focused on more specialized studies, a more technical understanding of the theological curriculum that reflected those specializations, and the growth of scholarship in these specialties. Increasingly, ministers were trained to know something different from laity.

Seminaries were never without their detractors. Even though nineteenth-century schools were all tightly aligned with ecclesial bodies, they did not receive the funding that the missionary movement did. They attracted controversy, and in an era of deeply competitive confessional commitments, when people assumed that hell was very hot and a person could go there because of the wrong theology, they were often the centers of doctrinal battles. Revivalist movements, like the Methodists, feared them. A history of Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary characterizes the mid-nineteenth-century Methodist perception this way: “We had got along quite well so far without them. Why run the risks of quenching the spirit and opening the floodgates of heresy.”⁵ Garrett Seminary was started, amid the worries, and Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and others spent the nineteenth century founding seminaries that taught a theological curriculum that concentrated on Bible, theology, and history.

A theological faculty emerged for the first time as seminaries were formed and developed as unique institutions. They had academic content that was separate from the classics, but they did not have “disciplines.” Faculty were clergy who had been taught a common body of divinity and who, in turn, taught that common body to future ministers. Good faculty members were persons of piety who faithfully and intelligently adhered to the particular confessional commitment of a school and its related ecclesial constituency. They knew the body of divinity and conveyed it to their students.

3. Professional theological education

As these schools matured during the nineteenth century, the more general catalogue of “body of divinity” emerged into disciplines, and as disciplines became more defined, scholarship advanced according to disciplinary patterns of inquiry. Glenn Miller argues that Old Testament appears to be the first area that developed as its own specialty and New Testament the last, since it belonged to the whole theological faculty.⁶ The creeds to which faculty subscribed had become less affirmable by the end of the nineteenth century, as scholarly work on the Bible redefined the understanding of its formation and meaning and as the modern age brought advances in economics, manufacturing, transportation, and science that redefined human understanding. Scholarship expanded dramatically and began taking on the forms that we associate it with today. The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis and the American Society of Church History were formed in the 1880s—both by Philip Schaff.⁷

Biblical scholarship became the focus of major changes (and conflicts) in theological schools. As American scholars attended to Wellhausen and other European scholars who invented critical biblical scholarship, controversies ensued in both conservative and liberal schools. Crawford Toy at Southern Baptist in Louisville lost his professorship for views that were increasingly accepted in Old Testament studies, and Charles Briggs at Union lost his fight with the Presbyterians over his views on the Bible. Briggs kept his job, but Union lost its ties with the Presbyterians. Scholarship was advancing on the basis of scholarship more than on the confessions or pious views of the Bible. The science and theology battles of the early

⁵ Frederick Norwood, *From Dawn to Midday at Garrett* (Evanston, IL, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary, 1978), 6.

⁶ Glenn Miller, *Piety and Profession* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007), 45.

⁷ Miller, *Piety and Profession*, 55.

twentieth century led to similar skirmishes with theologians, as some found ways to affirm both the doctrine of creation and evolution.

New disciplines emerged in the twentieth century. There were professors of church efficiency and Sunday School pedagogy. Anton Boisen began the scholarship that led to a very different perspective on the care of souls that developed into the pastoral counseling movement. By the 1950s, the first field education courses appeared in some seminary curricula. The primary controversy these new disciplines introduced was objection from the existing disciplines and perceptions of ministry. Is the learned minister one who knows theology and Bible in the way that they need to be known in the modern era, or is a learned minister someone who knows how to do the multi-faceted work of ministry? This argument reflected the reality that theological disciplines were firmly established, and disciplines have different assumptions about meaning and value as well as different epistemological strategies. They also have territorial tendencies. The genius and unresolvable conflicts of the modern theological school were born.

Glenn Miller titled his history of theological education from 1870–1970 *Piety and Profession*. *Profession* takes on two meanings: the first is that the schools and scholarship were professionalizing; the second is that the educational purpose of the schools began to understand ministerial education as professional education. By the end of this era, H. Richard Niebuhr⁸ wrote about the pastor as pastoral director in the *Purpose of the Church and its Ministry* in 1956, and James Glasse wrote *Profession: Minister* in 1970.⁹ The Niebuhr book was the report of a study of theological education sponsored by ATS, and the Glass book was written with support from ATS. As such, they are more than individualistic perceptions of ministry; they reflect a more corporate understanding of ministry. While the professional model of ministry attracted criticism, the increasingly professionalized nature of disciplinary scholarship did not.

A good theological school faculty member in this era mastered a scholarly theological discipline, contributed to its advancement with new insights or ideas, and instructed students in a discipline so that they had a sophisticated understanding of a scholarly area that would inform their professional practice of ministry. Professors had a discipline, and that was the primary tool for their scholarly work.

(3a. There were Catholics in the land)

I need to pause to note that between 1780 and 1880 Roman Catholics immigrated to the United States in great numbers (from about 30,000 Catholics served by about thirty priests to six million Catholics served by 6,000 priests). The Seminary of St. Sulpice at Baltimore had its first graduate in 1792 and preceded Andover and Princeton as a freestanding seminary. Catholic theological education in this and other seminaries that would be founded in the nineteenth century operated apart from early Catholic colleges and universities and completely separate from institutions educating Protestant ministers. The seminaries followed the updated rubrics of the Tridentine seminary decree of minor and major seminaries. Theological education was completely separate from college education and was under the direct supervision of the diocesan bishop or ordinary of a religious order. Controversies were more likely to be about foreign priests versus US priests, or among different immigrants groups than about the Bible or science. Catholic seminaries Americanized in the first half of the twentieth century, but it was not until

⁸ H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry* (New York: Harper and Row, 1956).

⁹ James D. Glasse, *Profession: Minister* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968).

Vatican II that Roman Catholic seminaries began to integrate with Protestant theological education.¹⁰ They did this in two ways. First, the minor seminary system basically came apart, and priest candidates began to attend a college or college seminary for an undergraduate degree, then go to a post-baccalaureate theologate or seminary, which reflects the established Protestant model. Second, they sought membership in and accreditation by ATS, which contributed to standardizing institutional and educational efforts. The Catholics, in my judgment, introduced to the broader world of theological education the next big step in the theological education odyssey, a point I will address in a moment.

4. Plurality and theological education

During the last part of the twentieth century, theological education diversified in almost every way imaginable. The dominant model continued to be the professional, but it was clearly losing its homogenous dominance.

Disciplines splintered into sub-disciplines, and altogether new ones developed. Biblical studies, which had used history as a comparative axis for critical study, added a host of new areas that serve the same function. Theology was redenominated by social location so that, in addition to fundamental theological categories, Black, feminist, and womanist theology emerged in the United States, Dalit theology in India, and liberation theology in Latin America. To add further complexity, the argument quickly developed as to whether these new areas were new disciplines or new perspective on existing disciplines. If they are the first, they have a claim to space in the theological curriculum in ways they cannot if they are the second.

Much of the information needed for scholarly pursuit has migrated from the civilized world of the library to the unmediated wild west of the Internet. Educational practices have diversified in many ways. Residential theological education primarily for pastors has diversified into residential, extension campus, and distance learning for pastors, other religious leaders, counselors, academics, and lay persons.

Theological schools have changed as an increasing number of women have enrolled, now comprising about 34 percent of total seminary enrollment, and an increasing number of racial/ethnic students have enrolled, now comprising about 28 percent of total enrollment. This period began with a solid majority of all schools identifying as mainline Protestant. It ends with more evangelical Protestant schools than mainline Protestant ones, and with evangelical schools enrolling 63 percent of all students in ATS member schools while mainline schools enroll about 27 percent. Fifty years ago, the West was still the stronghold of Christianity in the world, and now the center of gravity for world Christianity has moved to the East and Global South. Congregational practices are changing; religious identification is changing; and the social location of religion in the culture is changing. The religious world that made the professional model of ministry and discipline focused theological education effective has changed.

It is as if everything that was settled in 1960 has changed in the past fifty years. Glenn Miller just finished his third volume on the history of US Protestant theological education, covering the 1970s to the present, and it will be published as *Piety and Plurality*. Both the church and theological education have gone post-

¹⁰ Joseph M. White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989). This is a comprehensive and detailed history. Conclusions to this point in the paragraph are drawn from it.

modern: it is hard to find a center, and naming anything as the center can be perceived as a symptom of intellectual incompetence.¹¹

5. Formational theological education

What is the emerging model of ministry?

Theological education reflects models of ministry, and those models, in turn, reflect particular moments in the culture and the church. Theological education, as has been true since the founding of Andover and Princeton, has part of its identity in the church and another part of its identity in higher education. Both the church and higher education are undergoing substantive changes. Theological education as it exists today cannot escape the changes that are happening around it. If the professional model of ministry does not fit the current reality in the church, what model needs to be developed? If a new model of ministry emerges, what pattern of theological education will follow?

Let's consider a potential model of ministry first. Henri Nouwen, in the early years of the growing complexity and fragmentation of the current era, argued that: "The minister is the one who can make this search for authenticity possible, not by standing to the side as a neutral screen or impartial observer, but as an articulate witness to Christ, who puts his own search at the disposal of others."¹² This is, by any current standard, an old if not ancient observation, and you may wonder why I dug it up. It has been critiqued as an overly therapeutic—especially the image of the "wounded healer"—and as a model of ministry that does not serve the entrepreneurial leadership needed by struggling churches. I think that all of these concerns are valid and have expressed some of them myself, but I also think that this image of ministry may have been ahead of its time. It was a leading edge statement. If there is any truth in his definition, what model of theological education would support it?

Let's assume that this model of ministry is maturing, with some variations, into a dominant model of ministry. What pattern of theological education will prepare students to function in this kind of ministry? We are in a transitional moment, and the school will develop a new model of theological education much more slowly than the church will change a dominant model of ministry. The previous model, disciplinary focused specialized education, took about fifty years to develop and lasted in full form for another fifty years, so these fundamental shifts do not come often and do not flit away quickly.

What model of theological education fits this model of ministry?

The model of theological education that is emerging, that fits the changing realities of American religion, and that responds to the dramatic expansion of disciplines and theological information, that takes seriously the reality that seminary students are less "traditioned" than they have been in the past, that fits

¹¹ There have been more than a few laments about the fragmentation of the theological curriculum and recommendations for changes. Much of the effort during the 1980s was related to a project sponsored by ATS called the "Basic Issues Project." It sought to reexamine the basic aims and purposes of theological education. This effort, and its related scholarly work, produced many important books, and I will mention four that comprise the most significant analysis of theological education at this time: Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); Edward Farley, *The Fragility of Knowledge: Theological Education in the Church and University* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); David Kelsey, *To Understand God Truly: What's Theological About A Theological School?* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992); and David Kelsey, *Between Athens and Berlin: the Theological Education Debate* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1993).

¹² Henri J. M. Nouwen, *The Wounded Healer: Ministry in Contemporary Society* (New York: Doubleday, 1972), 103.

readily into the increasingly pluralistic nature of theological schools and the church, is, what I will call *formational theological education*. It has emerged since the 1990s and is growing in theological schools, although it is not yet recognized or understood. Perhaps the first formal codification of a new model was a statement in the ATS accrediting standards that were adopted in 1996 and reaffirmed when the standards were revised in 2012. The standard states: “In a theological school, the overarching goal is the development of theological understanding, that is, aptitude for theological reflection and wisdom pertaining to responsible life in faith. Comprehended in this overarching goal are others such as deepening spiritual awareness, growing in moral sensibility and character, gaining an intellectual grasp of the tradition of the faith community, and acquiring the abilities requisite to the exercise of ministry in that community.”¹³

Formational theological education includes educating for an intellectual grasp of theological disciplines and competent pastoral skills, but it undertakes this work with more attention to authentic humanity, relational ability, and spiritual maturity than the older professional model did. In many ways, it fits Nouwen’s statement about ministry. Consider it once again: “The minister is the one who can make this search for authenticity possible, (think personal) not by standing to the side as a neutral screen or impartial observer, (think not professional) but as an articulate witness to Christ, (think spiritual) who puts his own search at the disposal of others (think relational). This is not a “learned clergy” vision of ministry, nor is it a “professional” vision. Greg Jones and Kevin Armstrong argue that, “insofar as (theological schools) are preparing people for Christian pastoral ministry, they are necessarily involved in formation as well as education, in shaping character as well as conveying content and patterns of thinking, in nurturing holiness as well as equipping people with skills”¹⁴

Educational characteristics of the formational model

The model may not be sufficiently developed so that a precise definition is possible, but there are several characteristics that make it describable. Formational theological education focuses on the development of religious leaders more than on the intellectual content necessary for professional practice. It calls for educational goals that cultivate habits, perceptions, a way of being in the world, a kind of theological *habitus*,¹⁵ combined with a sense of personal wellness and growing spiritual maturity. Formational theological education takes Christian character and spirituality seriously and gives considerable attention to integration. It engages a more personal form of learning. While it is intellectually engaged, it reflects a different form of academic effort than the one associated with scholarly discipline learning and professional theological education. (Research assignments have been decreasing, while integration and theological reflection assignments have been increasing, for example.) Like the change from the classic model to the professional, it will be critiqued as less academic, perceived as surrender to cultural demands.

Effect of the formational model on theological faculty

The current way to order the rapidly growing amount of information is to organize disciplines into sub-disciplines—the process of specialization—and this tendency will continue. It is on a collision course, however, with the institutional realities of most theological schools and, very likely, the intellectual needs

¹³ ATS Commission on Accrediting General Institutional Standards, Standard 3, section 3.1.1. The standards reflected some of the work of the Basic Issues Project of the 1980s, but extended it in ways that moved in other directions that were being pursued in that project.

¹⁴ L. Gregory Jones and Kevin R. Armstrong, *Resurrecting Excellence: Shaping Faithful Christian Ministry* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 121.

¹⁵ Farley introduced this term in *Theologia*, see footnote 11.

of the church. A few schools will be able to afford enough faculty members to accommodate the growing sub-disciplines, but most will not. Faculty in theological schools will become responsible for a wider range of knowledge, and that will require a re-disciplining of subjects. The re-disciplining will require an intellectual effort that values the grand narrative, attending to the faults about previous grand narratives but using them rather than jettisoning them. The change will also require faculty to think in different terms about subject mastery.

It will also require faculty to learn how to teach in increasingly individualized ways. At its peak, the professional model had students arriving at seminary with a relatively common background, having a common seminary experience, and going to similar ministry positions in the denominations they grew up in and related to the seminaries they attended. This provided for a very standardized approach to theological education. Even though none of this exists anymore, schools have been conducting educational programs as if it did. They have added electives and made some accommodations, but as the schools slowly live into the new model, instruction will become much more individualized than it is now.

Faculty who participate in ATS meetings have talked about how much more student traffic they are having, and how the questions are not just about the course requirements but about struggles of the soul or vocational identity. You may be able to teach some principles about these issues, but in the end, they are addressed one individual at a time. At this point, faculty members are inclined to talk about these conversations as interruptions to their “real” work of disciplinary research. Seminary faculty, for the most part, do not know what the ATS accrediting standards say, nor do graduate schools assume that any model exists other than that of disciplinary specialization. So, no one has kept a secret from you; the work of most faculty and the patterns of graduate education are working out of a prior model of ministry and a correspondingly prior model of theological education. You are starting your theological teaching in a transitional moment. You are working in an environment where the students and the church increasingly need you to be theological educators, but the systems of reward are still set up for disciplinary specialists.

If the model changes so that your scholarly field is redefined and the fundamental processes of teaching and student engagement are redefined, it is not hard to see how much your life might be different in 2030. Nothing in your graduate education prepared for this, and there is already enough afoot that a year into your work you may have said, “no one talked about this in graduate school.” They didn’t talk about it because the research universities in which most of you studied are large enough and wealthy enough not only to produce the mountain of new knowledge, but also to staff up for its teaching and scholarly ordering. Change always comes slowly in theological schools, and schools have a tendency to layer changes over old ways of doing things, so the old is never fully abandoned and the new fully adopted. You will live in an educational world that accrues models. One takes the ascendancy and the other recedes, but none ever go completely away. (There are still people who think that the classics model of a “learned clergy” is still in place.)

At this point, I want to return to the Catholics, whom I mentioned parenthetically a little earlier. They invented formational theological education. They did it for ecclesial reasons, and it has been, at different times, troubling and effective. The current version has become increasingly effective across the past thirty years and is a hallmark of priestly education. Candidates for the ministerial priesthood work with faculty in classes, but they also work with spiritual directors and human formators. The faculty, formators, and directors conduct an annual review during the four years of each student’s seminary career. They evaluate him in terms of progress made and progress needed as it relates to the four pillars of priestly formation (intellectual, pastoral, spiritual, and human). Students can be held up in their programs of study even if they have good grades, and they can be moved forward even if their grades are marginal

because there is a broader evaluative net—and that broader net likely fits the character of ministry better than the evaluative model used in most Protestant seminaries, which is academic achievement in courses. It is a system that does not always work effectively; it is more expensive than the “professional” model; but the money might be worth it. The model is helped by ecclesial structures that Protestants don’t have, like internal forum—which means that things said to the spiritual director have a certain seal on them, creating protected space that allows a student to deal honestly with spiritual issues. The Catholic tradition has a long and intellectually lively understanding of Christian spirituality, which Protestants simply don’t have, and that also helps the model. The Protestant model in twenty years will not be as sophisticated as the Catholic model is now, but I think Protestants will move toward it.

Theological educator

The title of this talk includes the term *theological educator*, which has not appeared in the text until now. I think that we need a term for faculty work as formational theological education moves to ascendancy, and I have chosen this one. It will no longer be enough to think of yourself as a biblical scholar or a historian who teaches in a seminary—where your primarily professorial identity is with discipline. Formational education forces you to understand your role as a theological educator—someone who is teaching students who will stand in a pulpit and tell a congregation that something is ultimately true, or work for less than a living wage in an agency that enacts the church’s commitment to justice and mercy, or counsel troubled lives with a theologically informed understanding of human wholeness. You are teaching students whose souls are being crunched while their minds are being expanded, and it is as much your job to deal with the soul crunching as it is to deal with the mind expanding. It is a different way of being a professor. You will never stop being the disciplinary specialist that you were trained to be, but if that is all you choose to be, your work will provide less and less of what is needed as the formational model of theological education settles into the work of seminaries. You may long for the fleshpots of a university department where you can pursue your sub-specialty with two office hours a week so your time can be devoted to your *real* work, research. If you claim an identity as theological educator, however, you will hear the knocks on your office door as an important part of your work and not an interruption to that work. You will teach in ways that help students make connection to other areas of study as well as to ministry contexts. You will be working on themes that give congruence to theological understanding.

To teach in a theological school is to enter an odyssey—a long voyage marked by many changes of fortune. It means that there is value in knowing the places theological education has visited and where the current transitional moment is heading. It is important to realize that the skills necessary for one place on the journey are not necessarily the skills needed for another place, and that theological education has not always been what it is now, that it is changing, and that it will not be in the next century what I am arguing that it is becoming in this one. The professional model of ministry and discipline-based theological education were a perfect fit for each other, and both were a perfect fit for a culturally established religion. The times are changing, and theological education needs to live into what has already been articulated, but the schools change more slowly than the church, which changes more slowly than the culture. Your careers will be affected by these changes, and you will superintend them over time.