

***Theologia* and Governance:  
Integration and Organisation  
in  
New Zealand Presbyterian Ministry Formation.  
1961-1997**

**Paper presented to the New Zealand Presbyterian Research  
Network  
May 2007**

**Susan Jones**

Theological education, and particularly the formation of ministers, has been much discussed internationally, especially since the 1960s. The most visible and accessible literature available is in North America where the journal *Theological Education* has been published since 1966. *Theological Education* is the vehicle of the Association of Theological Schools which, with Lily Endowment funding has fostered extensive research into theological education in North America.

In Britain and the commonwealth countries, debate about theological education and ministry formation has been less visible, since it usually takes place within church colleges only sometimes associated with universities. Any intra-church debate is often hidden in church reports and reviews. A brief Canadian article in a 1970 issue of *Theological Education* caught the eye, however. Jess Zeigler argues simply that theological schools should be intentionally designed for their purpose, the formation of ministers, and that part of their design would be to keep

classical theological education and practical education unified. Twenty six years later, Gordon T. Smith also wrote out of the Canadian context about the theological school having an obligation to provide a context in which spiritual formation of ministry students is fostered, as he puts it to provide

A context or setting in which to reflect on vocation, work through one's emotional response to God, to others and to the world and come to terms with critical aspects of sexuality and gender."<sup>1</sup>

Smith also argues that character formation should not be left to chance in the seminary, suggesting that the school's interest in character formation be outlined at the beginning of the course, reviewed annually and evaluated at the end.<sup>2</sup> Smith advocates careful selection of faculty of those who can be adequate role models in spiritual and character formation in the theological school.

Both Ziegler and Smith hereby explicitly and implicitly underline the importance of governance, those decisions made by governing boards, heads of institutions and staff, about the design of a programme. The theological school's vision of the desired outcome in ministry formation first needs to be adequate for the context in which graduating students will minister. If these outcomes are to be realised, the design of programmes and maintenance of the school's ethos are subsequently obligations of those in governance. Hence the title of this paper, "*Theologia* and Governance: Integration and Organisation in Ministry Formation".

---

<sup>1</sup> Gordon t. Smith, "Spiritual Formation in the Academy: A Unifying Model." *Theological Education* 33/1 (1996):89.

<sup>2</sup> P.89

The organisers of the school are responsible for the degree of integration which will be realised. This does not mean some students and some staff may not be able to achieve integration or *theologia* even if a school was not geared to that outcome, it is patently obvious many have over the years, but a greater degree of integration can be achieved in staff and students, and particularly in some of the most resistant students, if the governance of the school supports and expects that, plans programmes to maximise formation and shows it values integration as an important goal by evaluating students' progress in it.

To discover how New Zealand Presbyterian ministry formation fares in this respect, we need to return first to the beginning of the North American debate. In 1966, Charles Feilding was commissioned to survey theological education in North America. He was disturbed that he was constantly referred to the pastoral or field-work departments when he asked whether "the academic departments teach so that the student is encouraged and enabled actually to form his ministry by the doctrine of Christ."<sup>3</sup> Feilding was convinced the division of many training programmes into academic and practical was too simple. The journal *Theological Education* was begun that same year and provided an open forum for much discontent about the state of theological education, declared by more than one writer to be in crisis. Over decades, many solutions were proposed, some suggesting a widening of courses, others suggesting reform within the institution and curriculum.<sup>4</sup>

It was not until 1983 that Edward Farley got to the root cause of the disease of theological education, as opposed to suggesting cure of only the

---

<sup>3</sup> Charles R. Feilding, *Education for Ministry*, 9

<sup>4</sup> David H. Kelsey and Barbara Wheeler, "Mind-reading: Notes on the Basic Issues Program," *Theological Education* XX (Spring 1984): 10.

symptoms of dis-ease. His *Theologia*, traced *theologia's* fortunes from the early Christian centuries to the twentieth century. Farley's concept of *theologia* is what he terms "a salvifically oriented knowledge of divine being." In other words, a knowledge of God which is more than knowing and which has also brought about a spiritual consequence in a person's life. In other words, knowledge which functions.

*Theologia* consists of two parts. One we would recognise as academic theology – the inculcating of knowledge about God. Farley terms it *scientia*. The other part of *theologia* is what we might call faith, that illumination of mind which also acts in our spiritual formation. Farley calls this *episteme*. One only needs to think of some lectures attended in times past where, in a theology lecture or a biblical studies or church history topic, the material was delivered with no reference to how this may operate in the life of faith, to understand that in our present situation, mostly *scientia* and *episteme* are fragmented from each other in theological education.

Farley traces this fragmentation to a moment in Europe in 1830 when Friedrich Schleiermacher was a member of the founding committee of what would become the first truly modern research university, the University of Berlin. Most universities now have followed in the steps of Berlin, including the University of Otago. Farley argues that Schleiermacher found, to his surprise and dismay, that theology's inclusion in the University was hotly debated, as others could not see how theology as previously taught in European universities, could be subjected to thoroughgoing rational research. Schleiermacher won the day, but by arguing for theology as a university subject for the

professional education of ministers, in the same manner lawyers and doctors would be educated at the same University.

This professional education would be academic and rational like the other disciplines at Berlin, so theology *scientia* became the public preserve of the university (and incidentally, of professional clergy), while theology *episteme* was left to the private domain of the laity and the churches. While pastoral theology was included as a university subject, it now was burdened with the entire responsibility for professional education in ministry tasks, other subjects being relieved of that task and thereby, Farley argues, diminished. Even though pastoral theology departments have striven to be academic, the relative status of pastoral papers in university departments today still reflects this early disdain of faith-related matters, the preferred removal of *episteme* from the university scene.

Following Farley's work, David Kelsey has usefully termed the two major modes of education as 'Athens' and 'Berlin'. In ancient Athens, education was achieved by an apprentice style model where the teacher's focus was the student and the end goal was *paideia* - an integrated knowledge of the Good, more a kind of formation of the person. A Christian *paideia* is an integrated knowledge of God.

In contrast, in the Berlin method, the teacher's primary interest is in their research and the end goal for the student is the gathering of knowledge about particular and specific subjects.<sup>5</sup> The person is educated or trained in a specialist area of knowledge. This metaphoric comparison

---

<sup>5</sup> David H. Kelsey, *Between Athens and Berlin: The Theological Education Debate*. (Grand Rapids, MI, William B. Eerdmans 1993.)

delineates the differences between these two methods and thereby points up the difficulty encountered by those who seek to form ministers. They are interested both in the student gathering knowledge, *scientia*, and in the student acquiring *paideia* or *episteme*. A combination which is sometimes hard to hold together. When Kelsey analysed four books<sup>6</sup> recently published about theological education, suggesting analysis and reform, he described two of them as following an Athens model of theological education and two the Berlin model. Yet all four had much the same goals.

Edward Farley was considered by those engaged in the theological education debate to have explained the core problem and he is regarded as a seminal writer. In a smaller article, Farley lists the characteristics of a theological school demonstrating complete fragmentation of *theologia* and the characteristics of a school which might be said to be recovering *theologia*. I used these characteristics to assess the fragmentation or otherwise of *theologia* in New Zealand Presbyterian ministry formation programmes from 1961-1997.

Before we move to assessing Presbyterian ministry formation through these characteristics, how did Presbyterian ministry formation begin? The goal of Presbyterian ministry formation was written into the founding *Institutes* of the new Wakefield Settlement of Otago prepared in Britain before the ships left for New Zealand. A system to appoint ministers was provided for until New Zealand candidates for the ministry would be trained “at a Divinity College in New Zealand.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Edward Farley, “The Reform of Theological Education as a Theological Task.” *Theological Education* (Spring 1981): 93-117.

<sup>7</sup> “The Institutes of Otago Church and Schools” Clause IV cited in Gillies *The Presbyterian Church Trust*.

The Scottish penchant for education and an educated ministry was partly behind the remarkably early inauguration of a University in 1869. It was a shock, however, to those Scottish settlers who had supposed that theology would be included in the University as it had been at home, to find that determined secularists opposed that move. This meant that in 1876 with the first Otago arts graduates now ready for ministry formation, a Presbyterian Theological College was required and a Professor appointed. Classes took place in William Salmond's home on the site of the present St Margaret's College. While this was not a university college, the four fold pattern of theological curriculum so deplored by Farley was present: Systematic theology, Biblical Studies a, Church History and some pastoral subjects such as homiletics. Salmond had in fact studied at Berlin, though this may have been just a summer experience. The College grew out of Salmond's home and in 1909, Knox College was built expressly to provide both accommodation for the Theological Hall and as a residential college which would include other non-theological university students to mix with the resident ministry students.

The Presbyterians continued through all this time, quite systematically, to press the University for theology to be included in the curriculum. This was continually denied until 1946 when a Faculty of Theology was formed because it could be underwritten financially by the National Council of Churches which had formed during the war in 1941. A letter from the Dean, Samuel Hunter, to the Rev. Jack Bates, an outside examiner, tells him that the Dunedin examiners were performing their tasks for no fee so as to minimise any financial loss and therefore any burden on the NCC. The Churches of Christ and the Anglican Church also had ministry colleges in the city and so the first honorary lecturers in

the Faculty of Theology were Presbyterian, Anglican and Church of Christ, all of them continuing to be paid by their churches. The church colleges were declared to be affiliated with the University. Over the years, the Anglican and Church of Christ involvement came to an end and only Presbyterians provided theological teaching for the Otago BD, most of the teaching classrooms and were bearing most of the cost of the theological library at Knox College, until the involvement of Holy Cross in the 1980s.

The Otago BD continued the four fold pattern, though one which excluded pastoral theology: Systematics, Old and New Testament and Church History. In a newspaper report at the time of the setting up of the Faculty one person maintained that only academic concerns would be covered in the degree, though the Anglican Archdeacon Whitehead also declared that studying theology could lead to the salvation of students.

Two areas give case study evidence of whether the Theological Hall was continuing to fragment *theologia* or was recovering it, one is the passage of pastoral theology from 1961-1997 and the other is the relationship between the church and the university during that period. Farley's criteria give a tool for understanding this.

Farley's criteria for whether *theologia* is fragmented includes: first, predominant use of the traditional theological disciplines in their four fold pattern, especially when these are under strict university control of funding and research requirements. Second, the presence of pastoral theology as a separate subject, used as a bridging discipline with the other areas of theological study. Third, strong representation or use of a professional view of ministry which over-emphasises the acquisition of



skills, or use of a theory-to-practice model. That is, a four fold pattern, pastoral theology, and professional ministry.

Farley's criteria for signs of the recovery of *theologia* are, first, signs of interdisciplinary teaching, second, movement away from the divided academic pattern of studies towards reflective ministry practice, and third, use of the word formation in order to lead to good formational opportunities, valuing of the concept and description of the end goals of formational programmes. That is, interdisciplinary work, movement towards reflective ministry practice, and formation valued and evaluated.

How then does New Zealand Presbyterian ministry formation between 1961 and 1997 fit any of these criteria? This time range was chosen because of the first successful move towards a Professor of Pastoral Theology in 1961 and the opening of the School of Ministry with a separate University Department of Theology and Religious Studies in 1997.

### **Case Study: Pastoral Theology**

While the first successful move to get a Professor of Pastoral Theology at the Hall began in 1961, it would not be until 1970 that the Rev Ian Dixon was inducted as the first Professor of Pastoral Theology. It is interesting that another obvious candidate for the position was Graham Robinson, a layman with an American doctorate in education who regarded ministry formation as a professional training. The church chose an experienced minister rather than a professional educationalist.

Prior to 1970, the Theological Hall professors had taught pastoral subjects alongside their specialities. It might be assumed if the

Professor of Systematic Theology also taught the same class Homiletics, that some transfer of personality or knowledge or ethos might have occurred. When a separate Professor of Pastoral Theology was first proposed in 1961, the staff were initially resistant, saying that they enjoyed teaching these extra subjects and that their concentration in the hands of one teacher could be dangerous. They also claimed, in an opinion which would align with Farley's later argument, that under a separate Professorship the teaching of pastoral theology could become too academic and specialised. Farley not only disliked the four fold pattern of theological education as being a fragmentation of *theologia*, but he also pointed out that the rise of seeing ministry formation as professional education for ministers led to a theory/practice divide. For Farley, the ancient understanding of the word *theologia* was that *theologia* already had a *praxis* element.

It will be remembered that Farley's criteria for the fragmentation of *theologia* was the presence of pastoral theology as a separate subject and in that alone the appointment of a Professor of Pastoral Theology fragmented *theologia* more than it had been prior to the Professor's appointment, however skilled or wise that Professor might be. The presence of pastoral theology as a separate subject leaves all the responsibility for connecting theory with practice to that department. Other subjects are then relieved of any need to show connections between the content of their papers – *scientia* - and ministry practice. While some teachers, particularly those within a Theological Hall might continue to show those connections, there is no requirement for them to do so.

Under this paradigm, systematic theology may not then connect with preaching practice or with catechetical development, church history may not

connect with church growth movements and their philosophies, and biblical studies may not connect with faith development through use of scripture.<sup>8</sup>

Farley argues that theory and practice are not separate areas, but belong together under in all the theological disciplines.

It would not be long after the appointment of the Professor of Pastoral Theology at the Theological Hall that pastoral theology itself was fragmented into the acceptably academic content for the new University of Otago Bachelor of Theology degree, and other aspects of pastoral work seen to be vocational and preferably limited to the church colleges. When the proposal for the new B. Theol. was circulated around the university departments, some adverse comments were obviously made about the degree being too vocational. The response to this critique from the now ecumenical Faculty of Presbyterian and Catholic, teachers defended the inclusion of pastoral theology in the degree, first giving its overseas pedigree in Scotland and at American universities such as Harvard, Yale and Chicago, then adding the following defence:

It should be emphasised that the proposed courses do not by any means cover all the skills required by the participating churches for ordination. There are additional areas of pastoral preparation which are only appropriate for a theological college. We have included only those courses which have a strong academic content suitable for a university degree, for the degree is not primarily intended to be vocational. To meet the case of any students who do not require the degree as part of their professional training, we have added a regulation permitting such students to offer up to two additional Arts or Science units in place of Pastoral Studies I and 2.<sup>9</sup>

In this defence, the Faculty members do not fall into the professional-education-for-ministers trap, but they do fragment pastoral *theologia* into its “strong academic content suitable for a university degree” separate from the “additional areas of pastoral preparation which are only

---

<sup>8</sup> Susan Jones, “Governing for Theologia: Governance of Presbyterian Ministry Formation in the Presbyterian Church of Aotearoa New Zealand 1961-1997.” PhD thesis, University of Otago, 2006

<sup>9</sup> Faculty of Theology Minutes, 1951-76, 103.

appropriate for a theological college.” In microcosm, we see what we could call pastoral *theologia* being fragmented here just as Farley claims *theologia* was fragmented at the founding of the University of Berlin.

Another of Farley’s criteria for the fragmentation of *theologia* was use of the professional paradigm for the theological disciplines. The language of professional ministry was not used greatly through most of the history of the Presbyterian ministry formation programme. Graham Robinson did however use it as the basis of his inaugural address in which he linked being formed for ministry to learning to ride a bicycle. He argued for several reforms if the Theological Hall was to fulfil the purpose he thought it had, of being a Professional School of Christian Ministry. Robinson’s claim that theologically oriented ministry training did not prepare students to “do anything beyond be an academician.”<sup>10</sup> would have been one with which Farley concurred. Robinson states:

We have realised this limitation and tried to remedy it by tacking on “practical work” this has been done in a somewhat haphazard way without re-thinking the total programme of the Theological college with the result that the Practical Training fits very awkwardly in the curriculum and is for many an interruption: a nuisance.<sup>11</sup>

Generally the language of professionalism did not persist within the general reports from the Hall, and Robinson was not long enough at the Hall to further promote this way of imaging ministry formation. The 2002 School of Ministry handbook does name professional skill formation as one thing the programme aimed to integrate with “cognitive learning, emotional maturation and nurturing of Christian discipleship and spirituality.”

---

<sup>10</sup> Graham Robinson, "A Professional School for Christian Ministry," *Colloquium* 3/2 (1968): 53.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

The Senatus passed a resolution of appreciation when the first Professor of pastoral theology, the Rev Ian Dixon, retired. Ironically, though his emphasis on training for ministry being the core business of the Hall is appreciated, he is also thanked for his insistence on what is termed in the minute as professional training, and his establishment therefore of the pastoral theology department on a “solid foundation.” Thus, ironically we see with at this moment of the ‘successful’ advent of a department of pastoral studies that all the three criteria of Farley’s for the fragmentation of theologia are present: the four fold pattern is continued and is now entrenched in the degree structure of the B. Theol., therefore under strict University control, there is a separate pastoral studies department and professional training is the sense in which the ministry formation of the time was understood.

### **Case Study: Church and University**

When the relationship of the Church and the University is examined, continuing signs of fragmentation are visible. While church teachers taught the original Otago BD within their own church colleges it would be understandable if the connection between the academic theological subjects and the practice of ministry were underlined by lecturers and perhaps arose out of students’ questions. With the creation of the pastoral theology department within the Theological Hall, generalist teaching was at an end and the four fold pattern became more and more deeply inscribed. The Geering debate can be viewed as a symptom of this root cause. With academic theological work being taught in a way unrelated to faith development, people in the churches were subsequently kept ignorant by ministers who had been given no models by which they might incorporate newer scholarship in their preaching,

either in a way which recommended the newer scholarship or in a way which critiqued it. When the four fold pattern becomes deeply entrenched, for academic respectability, the theological disciplines appeal more to their allied university disciplines than to the confessional church. Theology allies to philosophy, church history to the historical disciplines and biblical studies with literary criticism. This produces a degree which suits an academic, as Robinson observed, but does not provide the integration required for good ministerial practice where *theologia* is required.

There has always been what could be called a theology/faith tension within the Presbyterian Church – a tension between theology *scientia* and theology *episteme*, the knowledge which leads to faith in God. Many a special committee suggested ways in which more work oriented to the ministry task could be included in the Theological Hall's programme. Nine of these special committees were convened between 1961 and 1997. The 1978 Special Committee on Ministry Training even suggested moving to a five term year and the incorporation of eleven electives in practical work. The rebuttal to this suggestion by the Hall staff was that since the Hall was in partnership with the University, it was "honour bound to preserve a high academic standard" and that Professors responsible for research needed "ample" time to maintain this programme. Again, this debate resonates with the debate which must have ensued between Schleiermacher and his fellow members on this founding committee in Berlin.

Not that all the ministry students being prepared for Presbyterian ministry took the university degrees. In 1972 only a third of them studied for the BD. This in part led to the promotion of a primary degree in theology. A

Hall class could then contain ministry students doing the BD, the B Theol and some completing only the Hall's own Diploma in Ministry. This new primary degree in theology was proposed as early as 1969, but met with objections at first, coming into being only in 1972. This brought about a significant formational change. With students other than ministry students being able to take B.Theol papers as part of another major, the composition of classes changed. Now alongside Presbyterian ordinands were not only Catholic priests in training but also students who could be of other faiths or no faith. While there were personal advantage in this in that ordinands met and discussed theology with other students not on the ordination path, this made it ethically impossible for teachers to over-emphasise the requirements of one tradition over another or to make frequent application to ministry practice which was only applicable to some of the class. Thus formational opportunities were reduced.

In 1979 a special committee heavily critiqued the ability of the Theological Hall training to accommodate Pacific Island students, many of whom at that time had lower educational qualifications on entering the Hall than did Palagi students. Being required to study in a residential programme outside of their normal context was also heavily criticised. Prior to the development of teleconferencing and distance papers, part of the reason for locating in Dunedin was in fact to attend the University of Otago lectures, at that time the only University theology offered in the country.

From 1981, Holy Cross and the Theological Hall participated in common lectures. Integral to this idea was that these should eventually take place on the University campus. Formerly all lectures in theology had been held at Holy Cross in Mosgiel and at the Theological Hall, Knox College.

This move, which became permanent in 1987 after a three year trial, made attendance at theology lectures more physically possible for non-ministry students who wanted to include a few theology papers in their degree, increasing the pluralism within classes. In 1984, as the lectures moved on to campus, an honours degree in theology was also introduced, making continuing specialisation by ministry students before during or instead of parish ministry more probable. All of these are moves which if not countered within the theological colleges reduce the opportunities for formational work.

In 1992, the Presbyterian Church and the Catholic Bishops of New Zealand signed an agreement with the University of Otago for the church teachers to be paid for their university work. This was of great financial assistance to the Presbyterians though it gave the University the right to review the Faculty. In 1995, the University review's recommendations were that the University should form its own autonomous department of Theology and Religious Studies. This left the Presbyterian and Catholic churches to cover their own ministry preparation. Holy Cross moved to Auckland and in 1997 the School of Ministry opened at Knox College, offering a two year ordination studies programme to follow a foundational theology degree. In time, this degree could be completed at the University of Auckland, at Otago or at the Bible College of New Zealand.

This made fragmentation of *theologia* within New Zealand Presbyterian ministry formation complete, both pedagogically and geographically. Whether or not the teaching of the theological disciplines by church teachers prior to 1997 had been partisan, now they would be taught by teachers employed in a state university who faced classes of independent students as well as ministry candidates. These teachers



would have been selected by a university concerned mainly with academic qualifications. Any opportunities for integration with the realities of a Presbyterian minister's role during theological study were lost. The only requirement of the lecturer was to present a balanced academic treatment of the material, theology, bible or history. The foundational degree was a training in theology - *scientia*. Now the University of Otago was properly in the Berlin model of education.

The School of Ministry received then, a group of students each year with varied theological training from different institutions. Knowing only the titles of papers studied, not exactly what each student had been taught within their classes, it was an impossible task to expect teachers to ensure full integration of that theological training with the tasks of ministry. Also, only two years were available for the formative effects of the residential programme to exert their influence on the ordinand. Spiritual or character development no longer was mentored or evaluated during the three years or more of foundational studies,<sup>12</sup> what was done only began with the ordination programme. Some students expecting the ordination studies to be purely practical, resisted the bookwork required in some ordination studies papers, while those with theological deficiencies were unable to be helped as the university timetables were too interruptive of School of Ministry programmes.

Farley's three signs of fragmentation were therefore fully present during the existence of the School of Ministry. Pastoral theology was a separate subject in most theological degrees and also was separated out from university theology as a special two year programme situated in Dunedin. The four fold pattern was left firmly in place, the review and

---

<sup>12</sup> Apart from whatever contact a convenor of a Presbytery student committee kept with their ministry student

subsequent formation of the university department having interrupted staff plans for an interdisciplinary programme. The use of the word 'professional' is used as one of the four things to be integrated during the ordination studies programme. Both the signing of the 1992 agreement and the subsequent inability of the Presbyterian Church to form its own theological department were due to a declining membership providing fewer financial resources for the church to control its own ministry formation at all of its stages. The guiding principle of the initial governance decisions regarding the School of Ministry was primarily finance, not the interests and needs of a formational programme, so it is not surprising that *theologia* continued to be fragmented during the existence of the School of Ministry.

Several writers, without going into the depths which Farley has, have discussed the importance in ministry formation for spiritual and personal development to not only be made room for, but for them to be the focus of theological school and seminary programmes. Though they would not have used the word, their goal in this personal and spiritual formation alongside academic classes is in fact, *theologia* or wisdom. Forster Freeman's choice of D-Min research topic - "Is the contemplative approach to spiritual direction an effective way to advance Protestants' readiness for ministry?"<sup>13</sup> - arose from his finding this lack in his own training across three seminaries.

What I needed in my uncertainty and inarticulateness, was for a seminary to take initiative not only to make formal provision for a spiritual direction program to complement the intellectual curriculum and the practicums, but also to incorporate it into the catalog and orientation sessions, and openly to encourage voluntary participation. My seminaries, like other Protestant schools in those days, however, saw their educational responsibility to be in

---

<sup>13</sup> Forster Freeman, *Readiness for Ministry Through Spiritual Direction*. (Washington DC: The Alban Institute, 1986), 2.

the realm of cognitive study and field work. The spiritual development was expected somehow to come naturally.<sup>14</sup>

It remains to be seen if Presbyterian ministry formation in the future, delivered by whatever vehicle, will fulfil Farley's criteria for the recovery of *theologia*: interdisciplinary teaching, movement towards reflective ministry practice and talk of formation which leads to programmes which promote it. Of these three, only reflective ministry practice is intentionally present in the current system. Such a recovery will not happen if it is left to a few staff or students, it requires a governance system staffed with people who take the recovery of *theologia* seriously enough to devote money to it, set up structures to promote it, employ staff who can model it, who will ensure the school names it as the prime outcome of ministry formation, and evaluate its presence in the life of any Presbyterian person being prepared for the ministry of word and sacrament.

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 3. Freeman identifies several blocks for seminaries taking up this responsibility: rationalist views of knowledge, the need for acceptance by academia, prejudice against Roman Catholic priestly-style mediation, fear of pietistic and moralistic stances and belief that academic study alone would be enough to foster inner development. Some teachers believed they could work with students' personal and spiritual issues, forgetting they were also their assessors.