

PRISM

*a theological forum
for the United Church
of Christ*

Volume 22, Number 1, Spring 2008

whose side God is on, just go to the record. It's the widow and the orphan, the stranger and the poor who are blessed in the eyes of God. It is kindness and mercy that prove the power of faith, and it's justice that measures the worth of the state, not empire. Kings are held accountable for how the poor fare under their reign; presidents, too. Prophets speak to the gap between rich and poor as a reason for God's judgment. Poverty and justice are religious issues, and Jesus moves among the disinherited.

For I was hungry and you gave me food. I was naked and you gave me clothing. I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink. I was a stranger and you welcomed me. I was sick and you took care of me. I was in prison and you visited me. Then the righteous will answer him, "Lord, when was it we saw you hungry and gave you food, or thirsty and gave you something to drink? And when was it we saw you a stranger and welcomed you, or naked and gave you clothing? And when was it that we saw you sick or in prison and visited you? And the Lord will answer them, "Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these, who are members of my family, you did it to me. (Matthew 25:35-40, adapted)

This is the Jesus who drove the money changers out of the temple of Jerusalem, and it is this Jesus called back to duty who will drive the money changers out of the temples of democracy.

Thank you very much.

BALANCING PIETY AND INTELLECT Perspectives on the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement of General Synod 25

Jonathan New

The "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement of General Synod 25 recommending multiple paths to ordained ministry marks a significant departure for the United Church of Christ. No longer is the requirement of four years of college and three years of seminary the standard for ministerial preparation. At our 50th anniversary, it is worth asking how ordination has been understood in the United Church of Christ and its predecessor denominations, as well as how that understanding has changed over time. Further, in light of the Pronouncement, it seems equally important to note if and when authorizing bodies made provision for paths to ordained ministry other than seminary. A close look at the United Church of Christ's *Manuals on Ministry* and their equivalents for the Congregational Christian and Evangelical and Reformed Churches exposes the tensions in perspectives on ordained ministry as well as the roots of these tensions in the traditions that came together in our denomination's formation. The *Manuals* reveal that the Pronouncement is, in many ways, consistent with past understandings of ordination and what constitutes sufficient preparation for it. Yet they also demonstrate that the Pronouncement signals a dramatic shift for the United Church of Christ, a shift that may help restore balance to the dual aims of piety and intellect in ministerial formation.

PRE-UCC UNDERSTANDINGS OF ORDAINED MINISTRY

Concepts of ordained ministry developed by the Congregational Christian Churches and the Reformed and Evangelical Church in the years before the United Church of Christ merger reflect a strong emphasis on graduate

Jonathan B. New is an ordained minister in the United Church of Christ currently serving as a pastor in the Vermont Conference and is a D.Min. candidate at Andover Newton Theological School.

theological education as essential to adequate ministerial preparation.¹ From the time of its union, the Congregational Christian Churches outlined this understanding of ministry in a series of manuals that provided the basis of what has become *Manual on Ministry* in the United Church of Christ. The 1936 *Manual of the Congregational and Christian Churches: A Compendium of Information, Forms, and Services* is an early attempt at setting down a common view of ordained ministry as well as standards for its preparation, practice, and discipline.

This *Manual*, written by Charles Emerson Burton, outlines the high educational standards for ordained ministry. College and seminary degrees were required of the candidate for ordination, though a provision was made for the candidate to have undertaken a prescribed course of study "in very exceptional cases."² Burton had a dim view of making provisions, arguing that any tendency to waive the standard of college and seminary should be resisted. Further, he urges that any provision for an alternative course of study be "comprehensive and intensive" and overseen by a seminary. That Burton saw fit to caution strongly against departing from the higher educational standards of academic preparation indicates that the practice of making "exceptions" was not as exceptional as he might have liked.³ At any rate, it was a practice he apparently thought needed to be curbed.

This stress on academic preparation is also demonstrated in requirements for other forms of authorized ministry allowed at the time. At the time, licentiates and licensed lay preachers were also recognized. However, only those on track for ordination and who had completed at least one year of seminary training could be considered for licentiate status, allowing the candidate to perform the basic functions of a local church pastor. Licensed lay preachers, on the other hand, who were not contemplating ordination—having neither the time nor opportunity for full academic preparation—were to be afforded such licensure only in "exceptional cases."

The 1947 *Manual* revision demonstrates continuing stress on the high quality of candidates for ordination.⁴ The status of "in care of Association" was introduced at this time to provide a "period of mutual acquaintance" between the candidate for the ministry and the Association committee. The practical result was earlier and more frequent contact, allowing closer scrutiny of progress toward ordination. After a year "in care" the candidate could become a licentiate, a status that the *Manual* clearly stated was not a separate form of ministry but only a probationary learning status—granted for one-year periods and not ordinarily exceeding three years in all—for those actively pursuing ordained ministry (i.e., enrolled in the second or third year of seminary).

The 1947 *Manual* also recognized the new category of the "Local Minister," a status not intended for general adoption but considered a "temporary adjustment to a highly localized need." While it acknowledged that there are places where it is impossible to "obtain men who can meet the qualifications required for unlimited ordination," it cautioned that granting this status

should be discouraged "except in cases of real necessity." Further, it could only apply to those who did not expect to seek academic training. It was also a **limited** ordination, offering full standing but valid only within, and while serving in, the Association granting the status. These provisions reveal a struggle between maintaining high academic standards and the reality of circumstances that do not allow for ordaining "fully qualified" people. Further, the status of Local Minister was created expressly in order to "guard against lowering of standards." Those ordained under this special accommodation were exceptions to the rule.⁵

A final version of the Congregational Christian manual appeared in 1953 as *The Ministry: A Handbook of Standards, Procedures, and Services*. Its stated aim—maintenance of high standards—is best expressed in its clarifications regarding licensure and Local Ministers. The *Handbook* reaffirmed that licensure is a "first professional step" toward ordination. However, it departed from its predecessors by allowing for "exceptional cases." Licensure might be granted, where age or other considerations made seminary impossible, if the licentiate was willing to pursue theological studies under the direction of the Committee on Ministry and strive to meet the educational requirements for ordination. Notably, Committees are directed to the seminaries or the Department of Ministry for recommended reading lists.

The answer to why the *Handbook* would suggest offering exceptions for licensure lies in how it views Local Ministers. Though acknowledging it exists, the *Handbook* states that Local Minister status "cannot be conscientiously commended." Pleading for one consistent idea of ordained ministry, the *Handbook* recommends avoiding Local Minister status altogether. Only in exceptional cases should the status of Lay Preacher or Licentiate be employed to meet urgent needs. In conclusion, the *Handbook* says that its purpose is that "our ministers may more effectively order themselves in accord with the high nature of our calling." From the *Handbook's* perspective, what was at stake was a consistent understanding of ordained ministry that preserved the ministry as a high calling. The key was having a fully qualified clergy, and that meant fully educated.

The *Handbook* also makes explicit its understanding of the nature of ordained ministry. In addition to God's calling, ordination recognizes "the competency of the candidate . . . to preach the word, to preside over the sacraments, and to render the pastoral and administrative services required of a minister." Thus, two basic criteria for ordination are affirmed—call and competence. Some may be called to ministry, but all must be fully prepared to exercise that ministry.

The Evangelical and Reformed Church's answer to the Congregational Christian *Manual* did not appear until the 1957 publication of *A Guidebook for the Committee on Church and Ministry of the Synod*.⁶ Like the Congregational Christian Churches, the Evangelical and Reformed Church was concerned about the quality of the ministry and recognized that a well-prepared Committee on Church and Ministry was key to keeping ministerial

standards high. The *Guidebook* reflected the struggle that was also going on in the Congregational Christian Churches between the dire need for clergy and the desire to have fully fit ministers. It charged Committees on Church and Ministry to exercise caution and even deny ordination when in doubt about a candidate's fitness, because congregations had suffered under ministers who were "unqualified, incompetent, or even unscrupulous." Like the 1953 Congregational Christian *Handbook*, the *Guidebook* recognized practical considerations that might tempt the Committees to reduce standards, but charged them with ensuring quality to safeguard the "high calling" of ministry.

The *Guidebook* also dealt with "licentiates." This category referred to those temporarily authorized to preach and administer the sacraments and rites after having completed "a course of theological training, and having passed a satisfactory examination before the Board of Examiners." With the *Guidebook*, however, the term was dropped and "candidates for ordination" was inserted in its place. As in the Congregational Christian Churches, to be licensed one had to be a student "under care" who was actively pursuing academic preparation for the ordained ministry, not simply a member who had completed a "prescribed course of theological training." Though not as much of a stage or step toward ordination as in the Congregational Christian Churches, licensure at this point in the life of the Evangelical and Reformed Churches required a person to be approaching ordination.

The *Guidebook* also described the Evangelical and Reformed understanding of ordained ministry following the 1956 amendments to its Constitution and Bylaws. An ordained minister was described as "a member of the church, called by Christ to the ministry of the Word, ordained and consecrated by prayer and the laying on of hands to preach the gospel, exercise pastoral oversight, to administer the Holy sacrament and to perform the rites of the Church." Like the 1953 Congregational Christian *Handbook*, this guide specified a divine call to the ministry as a central criterion for ordination. While reference to the candidate's competence or preparation is absent from this document, the Evangelical and Reformed Bylaws charge the candidate with preparing himself for the office of minister specifically through seminary training. Both the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church expected both a true call to ministry and fitness for that ministry through academic preparation.

The Evangelical and Reformed Church, like the Congregational Christian Churches, also expected competency in the exercise of a pastor's administrative duties. Though not embedded in the Constitution and Bylaws, the *Guidebook* took pains, with these in mind, to define the "sacred office of the minister as preacher, pastor, counsellor, director of religious education and administrator." Of note, firstly, is the notion that this is a "sacred office." Such language is foreign to the Congregational Christian *Handbook*. However, the *Handbook's* definition of ordained ministry quoted above does refer not only to God's call but to "God's continued grace and guidance" in the exercise of ministry.

The Congregational Christian *Handbook* and *Manuals* and the Reformed and Evangelical *Guidebook* both aimed to establish common understandings and standards for the various forms of ministry across the Church. They consistently affirmed the principle of high educational standards for ministerial preparation and cautioned the Church about the dangers of lowering them. While acknowledging the reality of local church needs and circumstances where the standard of educational preparation might be put aside, they also warned of the damage unqualified clergy could inflict, urging Committees to prevent those who were not academically prepared from being ordained. When alternatives were offered, they continued to stress academic preparation, establishing formal theological education as the standard. For the Evangelical and Reformed Church and the Congregational Christian Churches alike, the "high calling" and "sacred office" of the ordained minister needed to be ensured by graduate-level theological education.

UCC MANUALS ON MINISTRY

The first *Manual on the Ministry in the United Church of Christ*, published in 1963, offers a strongly worded justification for ordained ministry.⁷ The *Manual* comments that the "renewed awareness of the importance of the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers" is a hopeful development. Yet it affirms the custom found in the New Testament and Reformation tradition, as well as a continued need in the Church, for "special people" (i.e., those called by God and ordained by the Church) to perform particular full-time ministries. The *Manual* acknowledges that at times ordained ministry has failed and even damaged the Church, but argues that the Church has thrived under strong ordained leadership that has in turn spurred on the laity. The 1963 *Manual* continues:

Whether our roots are in the Continental or English Reformation, in the sand dunes of Cape Cod or the hills of Pennsylvania, all of us come from a heritage which believed that preaching and the administration of the sacraments should be done 'decently and in order,' and to that end we have insisted that where at all possible these functions should be performed by people whose learning and piety have been tested and proved before hands of ordination have been laid upon them.

Observing the time-honored belief that order and decency with respect to the office of ordained minister are a priority, the *Manual* upholds the standard of learning and piety in those ordained. It adds that if it did not attach special requirements to ordained ministry, the Church might "fall victim to charlatans and false prophets." This view of the need for ordained ministry has continued through today, present in each version of *Manual on the Ministry* and ultimately being affirmed, though debated, in the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement. Yet even the 1963 *Manual* acknowledges that some question the Church's need for an ordained ministry.

The 1963 *Manual* speaks to the four forms of authorized ministry acknowledged by the United Church of Christ at the time—Commissioned Worker, Lay Minister, Licentiate, and Ordained Minister. It affirms that unordained people can possess a divine call and spiritual gifts similar to those attributed to ordained ministers. It encourages people who have gifts normally recognized as qualifying them for ordained ministry (“either in lesser degree than would be required for ordination; or to just as great a degree but under circumstances which make ordination impossible”) to pursue recognition as Lay Ministers. Approved reasons for becoming a recognized (not authorized) Lay Minister include assisting with worship leadership, supply preaching, and, “under very special circumstances,” pastoring a church. However, the *Manual* adds, **“This recourse should never be encouraged in churches merely too frugal to pay for a fully qualified pastor, nor should it be regarded as an equivalent substitute for an ordained ministry.”** In other words, it should only occur when there is no hope that a church could support ordained ministry. Moreover, though it concerns the “nearly ordainable” person, this person should not be considered a “fully qualified” pastor. Thus, a person who is called and gifted must also have academic training as the final seal of ordination.

Following the Congregational Christian tradition, this *Manual* speaks of licensure only for those on the path to ordination, actively involved in academic preparation, and a “student in care of Association.” It commends licensure (when supervised) as a helpful aspect of a candidate’s preparation for the ministry and a test of “vocational purpose,” as well as a way to solve the practical need for income during seminary. It also argues against licensing those not preparing for ordained ministry, strongly condemning its use as a substitute for ordination. It declares that the Association would be compromised and the meaning of ordination diluted if a person, after multiple licensure renewals and abetted by his church, applies for ordination. Further, it advocates calling those without theological education who are permitted to serve as pastor—a situation it admits is inevitable and even desirable under very special circumstances—Lay Ministers, not Licentiatees. In this way the *Manual* attempts to preserve the meaning of ordination and the importance of theological education. While some may be qualified to practice ministry, from the *Manual’s* perspective, only called, gifted, and educated persons may fully be prepared for ordained ministry.

The *Manual’s* discussion of the meaning of ministerial standing and ordination in the newly formed United Church of Christ is instructive to current debates as well. It contrasts ministerial **character** (i.e., the “actual change of condition of life which occurs at the time of ordination” which is “invisible, spiritual, having to do with a person’s status before God”) with ministerial **standing** (i.e., “the church’s recognition of one’s ministerial **character**” that is “visible, legal, having to do with one’s status in the eyes of the organized church”). Nevertheless, the *Manual* observes that not everyone would accept that there is any ministerial character independent of ministerial standing. Indeed, some would say revoking a minister’s standing

destroys a person’s ministerial **character**. This echoes the Congregational Christian *Manuals* and *Handbook* position that losing standing for cause means being deposed from the ministry. Yet the 1963 *Manual* also indicates the contrary position that it is not possible for a minister to be “unordained”—that is, ministerial character is indelible after ordination. The *Manual* does not attempt to resolve these competing notions. Significantly, where it deals with revocation of ministerial standing for cause, there is no discussion as to whether such a person remains an ordained minister. All of this demonstrates the debate about the meaning of ordained ministry that characterized the early years of the United Church of Christ.

The 1968 revision of *Manual on the Ministry* includes a change concerning the understanding of ordination. It describes ordination as “the rite whereby the United Church of Christ . . . sets into the service of the church, by prayer and the laying on of hands, those of its members God has called to the Christian ministry.” Significantly, the action of the church is not setting the ordinand **apart**, but setting the ordinand **into**, the service of the church. This shift of emphasis may indicate that the “setting apart” of some was becoming increasingly repugnant to those who wanted to ensure that ministry be understood as a shared endeavour among all God’s people. It also begs the questions about the distinctiveness of the ordinand and why ordination is necessary in the first place.

The major addition found in the 1973 *Manual* is the “Guidelines for Ordination and Ministerial Standing” which set out standards for ministry. These standards are the candidate’s 1) spiritual and personal qualifications as a person called by God, 2) intellectual ability and skills, and 3) formal training (i.e., bachelor’s and seminary degrees). Despite affirming that call, gifts, and training are necessary, the Guidelines acknowledge that “specialized and particular requirements for ministry in today’s rapidly changing world” may be required and may outweigh the lack of an academic degree. For example, in urban or rural situations, particular gifts such as community organizing may be of greater consequence than formal academic training. The Guidelines argue that people with such gifts who will be serving in these communities may be ordained. This provision constitutes the first argument made for ordination without full academic training in any of the *Handbooks*, *Guidebooks*, or *Manuals*. Significantly, it reveals an awareness that the strength of a person’s gifts may override educational deficiencies depending on the Church’s situation of need.

The *Manual* underwent a major revision in 1977 and received a new title: *A Manual on the Ministry: Perspectives and Procedures for Authorizing Ministry in the United Church of Christ*.⁸ Though the 1977 *Manual* has a different look and feel, nonetheless, with respect to the forms of authorized ministry, it parallels its immediate predecessor. Ordained ministry receives, by far, the most attention and the freshest presentation. The historical and theological perspectives on authorized ministry in the United Church of Christ laid out in the 1977 *Manual* are conspicuously thorough. Pains are taken not only to understand the historical development of ordained ministry in the

Protestant churches, but also to compare each of the various United Church of Christ strains—Reformed, Evangelical, Christian, and Congregational. The 1977 *Manual* consciously considers the theology underlying ordination. It names the Holy Spirit's calling of a person as a prerequisite and affirms the importance of theological education as an ordination requirement, citing the primacy of the Word in our Church tradition. Finally, it presents the Association as the body that determines whether the candidate's "Christian experience, preparation and fitness are such that they wish to ordain him or her as a minister." While call and theological education are key prerequisites to ordination, fitness for ordained ministry is also essential. The candidate's full preparation to serve the Church is critical, the *Manual* argues, because of the complex of functions and tasks that are largely the responsibility of the pastor (i.e., preaching, teaching, administering the sacraments, pastoral care, and community leadership). Others, nonordained, may be able to do any number of these tasks as well or better than the ordained person. However, the combination of these functions and responsibilities in the office of the ordained minister justifies the Church's setting those people apart.

In the section on ordained ministry, the presentation of ordination reverts to the pre-1973 *Manual* understandings, once more describing the person as called by God and "set apart" by the Church. However, the *Manual* includes a significant change with respect to preparation for ordained ministry. For the first time, it specifically states that a bachelor's degree and a Master of Divinity degree from an accredited seminary constitute the basic educational preparation for ordination.⁹ At the same time, it suggests that other routes may be followed in special situations, with the Committee on the Ministry formulating a "program of training and experience which is designed to acquire the necessary knowledge and skills." This is the first *Manual* that indicates that alternative paths to ordination might be as acceptable as the standard educational preparation for ordained ministry. Note that the burden of determining an appropriate plan for ministerial preparedness falls on the shoulders of the Committee on the Ministry, as the Committee will ultimately determine a candidate's fitness. Those looking for a shortcut to ordination are warned: "Alternative routes normally will require more, rather than less, time to complete." "Other routes" will be strenuous in other ways.

One final point is worth mentioning with regard to alternative paths in the 1977 *Manual*. Opening up this possibility more fully also had some impact on how Committees on the Ministry were looking at the preparation of all candidates for ordained ministry. The *Manual* says, "The Committee also will need to develop processes and means for ascertaining whether a candidate for ordination does possess the required gifts and competencies. This is true for all candidates." Here we begin to see a hint of doubt about the seminary degree as a guarantee of sufficient preparation.

The last major revision of the *Manual* took place in 1986.¹⁰ In replacing the category of Commissioned Worker with Commissioned Ministry, the denomination recognized that this is a form of **ministry**, not just a

church-related **service**. However, elevating commissioning to the status of authorized **ministry** required establishing more comprehensive requirements and standards to legitimize this new ministerial form. Qualifications now included a bachelor's degree or its equivalent; basic knowledge about the Bible, theology, church history, and UCC history, polity and practice obtained through college or seminary courses or through an Association-approved course of study; and basic skills (e.g., working with persons and groups, administration, planning, and organizing). These and other qualifications were also presented in "The Church's Expectations of its Candidates for Commissioned Ministry," a new feature of the *Manual* that outlined the Church's ideas on what a candidate for commissioned ministry ought to be, to know, and to be able to do. Added to a body of knowledge and skills reflecting the above qualifications were such things as the ability to articulate a theological position, familiarity with the resources available in the candidate's church-related field, keeping abreast of issues and concerns of the denomination, and a number of personal qualities. This new *Manual* attempts to set more rigorous standards for commissioning with a strong emphasis on education and skills training, but with the possibility of obtaining these through multiple means.

Of particular significance in the 1986 *Manual* is the supplanting of Licentiates and Lay Ministers by Licensed Ministers. This form of authorized ministry no longer required being an in care student in order to be granted a license to perform some of the functions that were normally reserved for ordained ministers, nor did it need to be considered a step on the way toward ordination. Licensed Ministry, as in the past, was created by the Church's need, "for those special situations when ordained ministers are not available to provide these services to a local church." These "special situations" included supply preaching and ministerial leadership for smaller churches with little prospect of calling a fully trained ordained minister.

While the Church's position on Licensed Ministry became more open, more comprehensive requirements accompanied the creation of this newly conceived category. As for Commissioned Ministry, the *Manual* offered "The Church's Expectations of its Candidates for Licensed Ministry" to help Committees on the Ministry set their standards for Licensure. In addition to a sense of call, the candidate was to have a high school education or the equivalent. The candidate also needed to have engaged in the study of and give evidence of knowledge in the Bible, biblical interpretation, theology, worship, sacraments, liturgy, UCC history, polity, and practice Church history contemporary culture, and Christian ethics. The candidate must have acquired skills in preaching and worship leadership, listening and communicating, and pastoral care. Licensed ministers should also be able to articulate a theological position and be prepared to lead the church as a community in mission. Thus, the 1986 *Manual* attempts to set a standard of preparation for Licensed Ministry by outlining the knowledge and skills needed for this form of ministry.

A key change in the 1986 *Manual* is the possibility of substituting

"educational equivalents" for bachelor's and seminary degrees. This possibility is taken up fully in an appendix to the *Manual* titled, "Educational Equivalencies." The appendix notes the high value the United Church of Christ has placed on a learned ministry, on academic degrees as the evidence of this advanced education, and on the standard of college and seminary education. It also affirms that offering equivalencies to earned educational degrees is meant in no way to undermine the importance of institutional academic preparation. Further, educational equivalency is not to be viewed as a shortcut for academic preparation, warning as in the past that such candidates should expect it will take them longer to prepare for ordination than those who follow the "normal route." This *Manual* also expands the instances when "special circumstances warrant special consideration":

1. when the situation makes it impossible for a candidate to complete a formal degree program in a reasonable time-frame
2. when a candidate's experience in ministry provides evidence of considerable knowledge and skill
3. when the Church's need to have a person authorized for ministry outweighs the desire to have the candidate attain formal academic degrees
4. when the Church's needs and "the cultural patterns of leadership in a particular community may be a determinative factor"

In short, it acknowledges that the Church's need or the candidate's circumstances or particular gifts might be factors sufficiently compelling to override the "norm and preference" for full academic preparation for ordained ministry. The 1986 *Manual* is evidence that the opportunity for educational equivalency was put forward in light of these compelling special circumstances and out of support for the denomination's commitment to an educated and learned ministry.

Though equivalency was to be determined by the Association Committees on the Ministry, the *Manual* offered guidance. When considering candidates, ministry and life experience should be determining factors, but the kind and quality of these experiences must be evaluated. In addition, the Committee must determine that it is not possible for the candidate to secure an academic degree. With respect to the equivalency itself, the educational experience must be linked directly to the normal ministerial requirements of the specific ministry for which the candidate seeks authorization. Further, the candidate ought to be able to "enter into collegial relationships with persons who have achieved the prescribed academic courses." The knowledge and skills areas listed in the *Manual's* "The Church's Expectations of its Candidates for Ordination" were also designed to help Committees evaluate whether or not equivalency routes were sufficiently rigorous. Specific suggestions for alternative paths in the *Manual* included courses at a nearby school, a "reading program," a special mentoring relationship, or a seminary certificate program. However, every candidate must demonstrate "attained

knowledge and skills comparable to those persons who have fulfilled the academic requirements." The concern for an educated and learned ministry was a value "not to be dislodged in any administration of equivalency." Thus the 1986 *Manual*, while affirming other routes to ordination, strongly emphasizes the need for retaining the level of standard that had traditionally been set and maintained by academic attainment.

MANUAL ON MINISTRY — AN ASSESSMENT

From its first edition, the *Manual* has kept open debate about the meaning of ordination. At times, different versions have acknowledged profound differences in the understanding of ordained ministry within the denomination, most apparent when the ministry of the laity was being re-affirmed. Yet the principle of the priesthood of all believers also raised questions about the meaning of ordination, exemplified in the 1977 *Manual's* statement, "In the midst of much discussion of the ministry of the laity today, the particularity of the ordained minister's office often is unclear." If ministry belongs to all Christians, why it was necessary to "set apart" certain persons for ordained ministry, especially if the creation of a special class of Christian resulted in undermining the ministry of the laity? This question led the denomination to change "set apart" to "set into" in the definition of ordination (reflected in the 1968 *Manual*) with the hope that this would "herald an era of new excitement in the ministry of all Christians." In the United Church of Christ, there has been a tendency to safeguard the priesthood of all believers and to downplay the specialness of the ordained. Yet the change in phraseology concerning ordination was short-lived, reflecting the sense within the denomination that the special status or quality of the ordained should be affirmed. Despite the challenge, the United Church of Christ has sought to hold these differing perspectives in creative tension.

This tension in the United Church of Christ's understandings of the meaning of ordained ministry has often been described as the distinction between **empowerment** and **embodiment** perspectives on or justifications for ordination. Louis H. Gunneman writes,

Empowerment is given by the community of faith for the meeting of its needs. It is a functional perspective. Embodiment characterizes a ministry based on God's call in which divine gifts are provided for ministering, that is, for "building up the Body of Christ [Eph. 4:12]." Both patterns belong to UCC traditions, for a theology of empowerment and a theology of embodiment can be traced in our historic traditions.¹¹

For the empowerment perspective, functionality is key. Changing "set apart" to "set into" was based on the understanding of the ordained minister as one who fills certain roles (e.g., priest, prophet, shepherd, counsellor, teacher, and preacher). This view suggests that ordained ministers are no more holy than others, but are empowered to function as leaders in and

on behalf of the Church because they have gifts that the Church can use. Barbara Brown Zikmund explains that this view fit the Congregationalist and Christian understandings of the relative importance of the clergy to the existence of the Church, as well as the frontier experience of some of the Evangelical Synods that often had to accept a lack of ordained ministerial leadership.¹² In contrast, an embodiment view, while not claiming that the ordained are better than others, affirms the ordinand's specialness on the basis of God's call and gifts. This goes beyond effectiveness or competency, as well as the Church's recognition of leadership, by emphasizing the uniqueness of the ordained minister's relationship with and responsibility to God. This was the preferred understanding of ordained ministry within the German Reformed churches and, generally, in those churches where traditions of strong pastoral leadership predominated. Though either embodiment or empowerment may have found greater emphasis at any given time, both have continued to inform the denomination's overall understanding of the nature of ordained ministry.

A key justification for ordained ministry has involved the ordained minister's function in helping preserve and nurture the Church's well-being. The existence of the *Manuals* and the growing reliance on them testifies to the subsequent concern for effective leadership. In the United Church of Christ, ministerial excellence has been ensured primarily through educational requirements that have also distinguished ordained ministry from all other forms. As fears arose that the establishment of Commissioned Ministry and Licensed Ministry would lower ministerial standards, the debate focussed on academic preparation rather than on a candidate's call and gifts. This emphasis on accredited theological education deepened over time. When the denomination began to lay out standards of professional conduct in its ministerial "Codes" and "Expectations" for ordained ministry, the Church depended on theological schools to prepare candidates to meet these standards. Yet, at the same time, the United Church of Christ *Manual on Ministry* and its predecessors have acknowledged, directly or indirectly, either the practice or at least the inclination to ordain ministers who did not meet the educational standard. The local church's actual needs for ordained ministerial leadership have continued to challenge full academic preparation as the standard for ordained ministerial preparation.

Twenty years after the last major revision of the *Manual*, the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement of General Synod 25 argues that the number and urgency of "special situations" has grown and again reshaped our understanding of ministry and its preparation. It lists a number of circumstances which it describes as "problematic" for the Church: 1) small churches that cannot afford full-time seminary-trained ministers; 2) skillful and faithful licensed ministers with proven ministerial experience hindered from pursuing ministry because of ordination standards; 3) called and gifted people from racial and ethnic minority groups being excluded from ordained ministry because of the present academic standards for ordination; and 4) with sensitivity to the needs of local church cultures, the

recognition that "diversities within the Church challenge the assumption that the same paths and preparation for ministry are appropriate for all." These examples reflect the sense of a growing crisis in pastoral leadership within the United Church of Christ connected to the limited way that preparation for ordination has been cast.¹³ General Minister and President of the United Church of Christ, John H. Thomas, has summed this up as the "not enough" crisis—not enough seminarians; not enough students who we can expect to serve several decades in active ministry; not enough graduates of theological schools interested in parish ministry; not enough parishes able to pay seminary trained clergy; and not enough geographical and financial access for those who want theological training delivered in the traditional ways.¹⁴ That the Pronouncement effectively dismantles graduate theological education as the standard for ministerial preparation by recommending multiple paths is acknowledgment of and testimony to the real pressure these and other factors have been exerting on the Church and its need for strong ministerial leadership.

Committees on the Ministry, like their Congregational Christian and Evangelical and Reformed predecessors, have always faced a dilemma.¹⁵ On the one hand, normative principles for ordination (i.e., graduate theological education) were needed to preserve standards of quality. On the other hand, local congregations needed ministerial leadership. This tension between maintaining standards and serving the Church's needs has, over the years, brought us ever closer to dismantling graduate theological education as standard for preparing ordained ministers. The 1977 *Manual* acknowledged special situations and indicated that other routes were a possibility. While stating that the norm and preference remained formal degree attainment, the 1986 *Manual* went further, by including an appendix on "Educational Equivalency" that provided a general roadmap for alternative routes. With the passing of the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement of General Synod 25 and the implementation of its recommendations, that roadmap will become more detailed and established.¹⁶ The Pronouncement, then, is an attempt to help the denomination resolve its perennial dilemma between meeting Church needs and maintaining ministerial standards.

Yet the principle of maintaining high ministerial standards continues. In offering its "Educational Equivalencies," the 1986 *Manual* warned that these should not be interpreted as a lowering of standards. An educated and learned ministry, it affirmed, was a value "not to be dislodged in any administration of equivalency." It is critical to understand that the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement also attempts to maintain this principle of an educated and learned ministry. Indeed, the content and structure of its recommendations with respect to multiple paths reflects the strong desire to safeguard it well. Its special notation that "Each path of preparation [i.e., seminary, regional theological formation programs, or mentoring] requires a minimum of seven years of preparation" may be seen as an attempt to convince critics that rigor will be maintained. However, there will undoubtedly be many who hold that anything short of graduate

theological education is not full preparation for ordained ministry. Yet the Pronouncement challenges the notion that academic institutions alone can produce an educated and learned ministry. Its goal is not reducing standards but expanding the means for attaining them.

EFFECTS OF THE "MINISTRY ISSUES" PRONOUNCEMENT

It is difficult to judge the effects the United Church of Christ will encounter through its establishment of multiple paths to ordained ministry. Certainly, there will be some who fear a lowering of ministerial standards. This perception is likely to persist, given how highly academic preparation has been valued in the United Church of Christ and its predecessor traditions. A related and not unreasonable fear is that having multiple paths will create the conditions for a "two-tiered ministry."¹⁷ This is a real possibility and one that was deemed untenable during the "Local Minister" experiment of the 1940s and 1950s in the Congregational Christian Churches. Yet it may be that clearly established requirements for preparation through regionally based theological programs will hold in check any tendency to overvalue one method of preparation or the other. A recent two-year study of judicatory-based programs preparing candidates for authorized ministry suggests the shape and content of these alternative programs, revealing the high degree to which the established theological curriculum of the seminaries tends to dictate what they offer as well.¹⁸ If graduate theological schools continue to be the yardstick by which alternative programs are measured, the new paths may gain greater legitimacy in the eyes of detractors.

These new routes to ordination may never gain ascendancy over graduate theological education, but there are some potential advantages for the Church in creating other means for ministerial preparation. The obvious advantage is that they should increase the number of ordained ministers who are prepared for Church leadership, especially with congregations that find it difficult to support full-time academically prepared ministers. But there may be more as well. John Thomas, while acknowledging that the judicatory-based ministry programs help the church deal with the clergy shortage and leadership crisis, adds that they can also foster renewal to the church and its ministry.¹⁹ This position is echoed by Lance R. Barker and B. Edmon Martin, who have written that these programs are helping to create "models for a renewed vision of ministry and what it means to be the church" which have "contributed to the stabilization and growth of religious capital in areas where geographic, economic, and cultural conditions require new an authentic leadership."²⁰ In making it possible for more people to have access to theological education, these programs re-emphasize the principle of the priesthood of all believers. With such preparation "democratized," struggling, marginal, and marginalized local churches may be strengthened because of the increase in "religious capital" that those trained through the programs bring to them. Moreover, the very existence of these alternative paths contributes to an understanding of

ministry as something in which every Christian may and should be engaged. They demonstrate concretely that ordained ministry need not be exclusive, reserved only for those who have access to seminary training and aptitudes for academic achievement.

The "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement also signals growing changes in the understanding of what constitutes fitness for ordained ministry and, by extension, how to prepare people fully. Facing a leadership crisis -- particularly in the smaller churches--and acknowledging the changing social context in which the Church ministers, and with a renewed commitment to supporting local church communities and cultures in their diversity, the Pronouncement asserts: "In the future, we cannot assume that a college and seminary degree are always sufficient to ensure fitness for ordination, nor can we assume that years of effective ministry, without a seminary degree, are always insufficient to ensure fitness." This statement clearly demonstrates the denomination's lack of full confidence in its once cherished normative standard of seminary-based education for ministerial preparation. While graduate theological education is still valued and may continue to be the dominant method for preparing ordained ministers for some time to come, the United Church of Christ will no longer say that this is its "preference" for ministerial preparation. Doubt has been cast upon seminary training as unassailably sufficient for ministerial preparation.

An implication of the Pronouncement's changed view of ministerial preparation is its call for Committees on the Ministry to adapt their procedures for discernment and decision-making regarding a candidate's gifts and call and an appropriate path of preparation. If an academic degree is no longer the standard for ordained ministry, new ways of assessing ministerial fitness and preparedness for ordination will have to be developed.²¹ A more holistic approach to the appraisal of a candidate will be required. Academic background will need to be appraised along with a person's overall personal, spiritual, psychological, ethical, and theological dimensions. Added responsibility will land squarely in the laps of Association and Conference Committees on Ministry. Time will tell whether the national setting of the United Church of Christ will be able to furnish adequate resources and support for Committees on Ministry in this task, and whether these Committees have the ability to withstand these added pressures.

This raises a further question concerning the distinction between ministerial **preparation** and ministerial **formation**. Throughout the foregoing discussion, preparation for ministry has been spoken of in the generic way in which it is defined by the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement itself. It describes **preparation** for authorized ministry as "intellectual and academic training, spiritual growth, emotional and psychological development, training and skills acquisition, identity formation." Confusingly, the Pronouncement also refers to "processes of formation" that seem to include the aspects of preparation listed above. Yet the subtitle of the Pronouncement—"Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God's

Church"— suggests the awareness of a distinction between **preparation** and **formation** in the overall process that may lead to authorized ministry as well as the awareness of a need for both.²²

Naturally, the Church should recognize this distinction. After all, our denomination has maintained that, to a greater or lesser extent, men and women can be **prepared** for authorized ministry (i.e., education can deliver knowledge, training can provide skills). Yet, for many, **formation** connotes those processes having to do with a change in a person's inner self (i.e., emotional, psychological, and spiritual), prompting us to ponder whether it is possible for us to form candidates for ordination. Is not formation a process that also explicitly involves God? Interestingly, the issue of ministerial **formation**, as distinct from **preparation**, makes no further overt appearance in the Pronouncement. One possible reason is that its presence would once more expose the tension in our understanding of ordination as both functionally and sacramentally established. To speak of ministerial **formation** begs the question of the extent to which God is involved in the creative process operating within a candidate for ordination, and the extent to which this "marks a permanent and indelible change in the spiritual and psychological nature of the one ordinand." It may simply be easiest for the denomination to speak of ministerial **preparation**, since most would agree that candidates are prepared for ministry whether they fall more on the empowerment or embodiment side of the spectrum.

Ministerial formation, more than ministerial preparation, was once the dominant understanding of the proper route to ordained ministry. Of course, Roman Catholics have long referred to the **formation** of their seminarians.²³ But a focus on formation may also be seen in the way that those who began theological schools in the nineteenth century sought to balance piety and intellect.²⁴ While the course of study was academic, the residence requirement was aimed at shaping the student's total experience through community life. An informal curriculum, consisting of student Associations, communal worship, student-led prayer and study groups, and events such as Andover's "Wednesday evening prayer conferences" with faculty, all helped to integrate what was being learned in classes with the student's personal faith and spiritual improvement.²⁵ In the twentieth century, piety and intellect became independent features of theological education, as scholarly disciplines developed specializations.²⁶ Further, current realities would make it nearly impossible for theological schools to return to a central role in ministerial formation. Noting that many seminarians are non-residents, for example, John Thomas asks,

How can one do formation in the traditional sense if students are not present to experience the theological community as a place for worship, encounter, spiritual nurture, pastoral care, and informal theological reflection and dialogue beyond the formal classroom setting?²⁷

Thomas' conclusion is that responsibility for ministerial formation must be shared jointly by theological schools and the Church. Time will tell if

the current changes in understandings of ministry and how best to prepare people for that ministry, coupled with new ways of assessing ministerial fitness, will lead to a greater emphasis on ministerial formation with respect to ordination. However, it seems clear that the move toward a broader concern for ministerial formation will, again, mean an added dimension and challenge for Committees on Ministry.

CONCLUSION

In assessing the interpretations and recommendations of the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement, it is crucial to remember the forces that have driven such changes in our past. For example, during the Second Great Awakening, ordained ministers were perceived as central to saving the soul of the nation through piety and intellect.²⁸ Consequently, the standard of graduate theological education was born of the need to ensure the preaching of right doctrine. Also, a view of the minister as a professional gained some prominence during the mid-twentieth century, shifting the emphasis of theological preparation dramatically toward practical theology, the arts of ministry, and supervised field work.²⁹ These are only two examples of a broader pattern that has been repeated again and again in American Christianity. As understandings of ministry change over time, these changes cause a shift in the standards of ministerial preparation as well. James W. Fraser has argued that these shifts occur because of a crisis produced by the disparity between new understandings about ministry and old ways of preparing ministers. He writes:

At some points in this history the nature of the ministry has been defined by a certain understanding of theological orthodoxy, at other times the test has been a certain role such as revivalist or an abolitionist, and at other times as someone who met certain professional standards. But whatever the definition, a new definition has usually led its defenders to struggle to maintain it by finding new methods of educating the next generation of clergy so that they will fit the model.³⁰

In other words, when an understanding of the nature of ministry changes, a crisis arises because there are not enough people trained well to do that ministry. At that point, a consensus emerges that new methods of preparation are needed and the standard changes.

The "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement's recommendation for developing multiple routes to ordination fits the pattern described by Fraser. A strong emphasis on an academically trained clergy worked well when the minister needed to be among the most educated persons in his community, to have special skills for a particular form of ministry such as revivalism, to provide strong management for the Church in a society increasingly relying on organization, or to deliver competent leadership for a culture that valued professionalism.³¹ At each of these junctures in the Church's history, educational institutions provided the means of such

preparation. The "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement presents altogether new understandings of ministry that can better lead congregations of racial and ethnic minorities, that places a higher value on the experience and gifts a minister possesses, that meets the needs of the smaller churches that are craving strong ministerial leadership, and that fosters renewal in the Church by encouraging the ministry of the whole people of God. These new perspectives on and new needs for ordained ministry represent a crisis and out of it comes another shift in understandings of how to form people for this ministry.

What kind of shift does the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement really represent? An historical perspective on the *Manuals* shows how understandings about the nature of ordained ministry and perceptions of the Church's needs for ordained ministerial leadership have changed over time, resulting in changes in ministerial preparation. Yet, throughout most of the history of the United Church of Christ and its predecessor traditions, the standard of academic preparation for ordained ministry has been consistent. While other routes to ordination were allowed at times when the Church's need was great, even before the 1950s, when graduate theological education truly became the normative mode of ministerial preparation, the standard of college and seminary degrees had already been in place for many decades. However, cracks in the foundation of this normative standard of ministerial preparation became visible with the 1977 *Manual's* provision for "other routes." These widened considerably with the "Educational Equivalents" of the 1986 *Manual*. Yet the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement represents the passing of a "tipping point," as the generations-old, familiar, and once impregnable edifice that was this standard collapsed.

Graduate theological education will likely remain the norm for ministerial preparation for some time to come. Yet over a few short decades, the absolute primacy of graduate theological training—the belief that it is the best avenue for ministerial preparation — has radically deteriorated in the face of new perspectives on the needs, tasks, functions, and understandings of ordained ministry. With the recommendation that the United Church of Christ develop multiple paths to ordination, our denomination has made a shift in its standard of preparation for the ordained ministry that is at an altogether different order of magnitude than any other in its history. Doubtless, some will bemoan the passing of a clearly defined standard that promised to guarantee that a person had the theological grounding and professional skills for ordained ministry. Further, a conscious move away from a model that largely focussed on whether a person had met the requirements will place an even greater responsibility and strain on Committees on Ministry. Yet moving to a discernment model — with a focus on the whole person and ministerial formation—may prove more in keeping with our heritage and its goal of balancing the development of piety and intellect in those we ordain.

NOTES

1. Fifty years after the Congregationalists founded Andover Theological Seminary in 1808, every other denomination had at least one theological school modelled on its basic pattern (i.e., three-year post-baccalaureate education based on the four-fold emphasis on Bible, theology, Church history, and preaching.) Though some denominations, such as the Methodists, Baptists, and Disciples of Christ, would turn to other methods, by the 1950s the majority of clergy were being trained by theological schools and the 3/4 model was the established norm. See James W. Fraser, *Schooling the Preachers: The Development of Protestant Theological Education in the United States, 1740-1875* (New York: University Press of America, 1988), xii-xiii, 44.
2. That exceptions to the academic standard were made is reasonable, given the clergy situation in the Congregational Christian Churches at the time. It was reported that in 1938 there were only 3,108 ministers in full standing to serve 5,378 Congregational churches. See John von Rohr, *The Shaping of American Congregationalism, 1620-1957* (Cleveland, Ohio: The Pilgrim Press, 1992), 430.
3. The findings of the 1926 Religious Census concerning educational attainment among ministers indicate that there could be a significant gap between the standard for ministerial preparation and reality. (Unfortunately, no data were reported for the Christian Church.) Prior to their mergers, ordination requirements for the Congregational Church and the Reformed Church included college and seminary (with some provision for exceptions), while the Evangelical Synod required seminary training or an approved Conference course of study. However, the Census revealed that the Reformed Church had 80% of clergy having college and seminary degrees and only 5% with neither; the Evangelical Synod had 65% of clergy with both college and seminary degrees and less than 5% with neither; and the Congregational church reported 51% with college and seminary degrees and 22% with neither. For the Congregational Church and the Evangelical Church, it might be argued that though college and seminary were the standard, they were not, in fact, the norm. See Mark A. May, *The Education of American Ministers, Vol. 2, The Profession of the Ministry: Its Status and Problems* (New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934), 17, 19.
4. Reflecting the recommendations of the newly formed American Association of Theological Schools, in addition to college degree, a degree from an "approved" seminary was required.
5. At this point, the possibility of an institutionally sanctioned two-tiered ministry was in effect. We can only guess the extent to which these ministers were treated as, or felt themselves to be, second-class citizens.
6. It may seem odd that publication of a strictly Evangelical and Reformed manual arose just as the denomination was poised for merger. However, it was the impending merger that prompted a perceived need to "set forth an official statement on the ministry in the Evangelical and Reformed Church." We can only assume that it was felt that clarity about ministry in the separate denominations would help as the two entered into formal union.
7. The 1963 UCC *Manual* represents a conscious blending of the versions that emerged out of the Congregational Christian and the Evangelical and Re-

- formed Churches. However, we also see in this first UCC *Manual* a significant increase in its formality, both in structure and content.
8. Being "a Manual" not "the Manual" underscored that this first revision produced by the Office for Church Life and Leadership (OCCL) was aiding Committees on Ministry, not laying down rules and regulations for it to follow. Nor was the interpretation of the United Church of Christ Constitution and Bylaws by OCCL to be thought of as binding for the entire Church. OCCL was offering "perspectives." Yet the *Manual* had doubled in length and offered, among other things, detailed historical and theological perspectives on ministry, complete explanations of the functions and responsibilities of all spheres of church life with respect to authorized ministry, a glossary of terms, a detailed index, and extensive charts outlining every step of the process and the responsibilities pertaining to candidates, local churches, Associations, and Conferences with respect to every form of ministerial authorization. It would have been difficult for Committees on Ministry to experience the *Manual* as anything other than an authority.
 9. The reference to the MDiv reflects the establishment of this degree as the standard for ordination by the Association of Theological Schools in 1970.
 10. This revision followed amendments to the United Church of Christ Constitution and Bylaws in 1984. The most current edition of the UCC *Manual on Ministry*, published in 2002, by the new Parish Life and Leadership Ministry (PLL), is largely different only in its organization. The most significant change in the 2002 *Manual*, beyond its arrangement, is its section on "The Oversight of Ministries in the United Church of Christ: Nurture and Accountability for Authorized Ministry." A new introduction by the PLL Ministry Team explains that the term "oversight" is used to convey the dual necessity of support and ecclesiastical accountability for authorized ministry. With the principle of strengthening authorized ministry by making it more effective and reflective of the integrity God requires playing in the background, Committees on Ministry are reminded of their "sacred responsibility" for proper oversight of all authorized ministers.
 11. Louis H. Gunneman, *United and Uniting: The Meaning of An Ecclesial Journey: United Church of Christ 1957-1987* (New York: United Church Press, 1987), 172.
 12. Barbara Brown Zikmund in Daniel L. Johnson and Charles Hambrick-Stowe, eds. *Theology and Identity: Traditions, Movements, and Polity in the United Church of Christ* (Cleveland, Ohio: United Church Press, 1990), 83.
 13. Bernice Powell Jackson, "Reflection for the Council For Theological Education," *Prism*, Volume 18, no. 1 (Spring 2003), 56.
 14. John H. Thomas in Lance R. Barker and B. Edmon Martin, eds., *Multiple Paths to Ministry: New Theological Models for Theological Education* (Cleveland, Ohio: The Pilgrim Press, 2004), vii.
 15. Roger D. Knight, "An OCCL Staff Member's View of the Manual on Ministry," *Prism*, Volume 2, no. 2 (Fall 1987), 17.
 16. This is already beginning to happen. The Ministry Issues Implementation Committee, in collaboration with PLL, has issued at least two drafts of a working paper titled, "Implementing the Pronouncement, 'Ministry Issues: Forming and Preparing Pastoral Leaders for God's Church.'" Draft two of the working paper (dated February 2007) offers Committees on Ministry guidance concerning the three types of programs of preparation for ordained ministry. The character and development of seminary education, regional educational programs for ordination, and mentoring programs are discussed. In addition, the working paper offers tools for helping Committees on Ministry identify the marks of effective seminary, regional educational, and mentoring programs. Further, an assessment of the progress a candidate is making toward ordination through any of these programs will be assisted by the working paper's tool, "Marks of Readiness for Ordination." This list of characteristics that a candidate might be expected to display with varying degrees of consistency includes sections on 1) spiritual formation for ministry, 2) personal and professional formation for ministry, 3) general knowledge and skills that ordained ministry builds upon, 4) knowledge and skills specific to ordained ministry, and 5) UCC identity formation for ministry.
 17. Jackson, 57.
 18. Barker, 117.
 19. John H. Thomas in Barker, viii.
 20. Barker, 8-9.
 21. Draft two of the "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement working paper speaks explicitly about the Committee on Ministry's role as one of discernment. Again, its "Marks of Readiness for Ordination" should help Committees on Ministry with the assessment that will accompany their discernment process. It is important to note, however, that the Committee's discernment extends to the candidate's call and the program which is most appropriate for that person, in addition to assessing the candidate's progress toward readiness for ordination. The working paper notes that the Pronouncement marks a shift of focus "from the process of preparation by which persons move toward ordination to the persons being prepared." The working paper explains that the point is not whether a person has gone through a process of preparation similar to others, but whether the person is ready for service in the United Church of Christ.
 22. The "Ministry Issues" Pronouncement working paper, in addition to naming discernment as the Committee on Ministry's task, also speaks of the overall process as one of formation. Again, in addition to possessing adequate knowledge and skills, attention is paid to the person's spiritual, personal, professional, and denominational identity formation.
 23. Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver, *The Making of Ministers: Essays on Clergy Training Today* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964), 19-20.
 24. Charles R. Foster, Lisa E. Dahill, Lawrence A. Goleman, Barbara Wang Tolentino, *Educating Clergy: Teaching Practices and Pastoral Imagination* (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, 2006), 231.
 25. *Ibid.*, 197.
 26. *Ibid.*, 237.
 27. John H. Thomas, "The State of Theological Education in the United Church

- of Christ," *Prism*, Volume 17, no. 1 (Spring 2002), 29.
28. Glenn T. Miller, *Piety and Intellect: The Aims and Purposes of Ante-Bellum Theological Education* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990), 23-25.
29. Foster, 237.
30. Fraser, xii, xiv.
31. Barker, 117ff.