

The Shape of Practical Theology
Class Discussion
Jon Dybdahl
July 17, 2006

Dybdahl chose the book because...when the DMin was first proposed at the seminary there were some objections to it.

DMin has tripled from 2000 to now.

DMin started to grow when we started an on-campus global mission.

Took a while for acceptance from the “pure” theologians or systematic theologians.

Pure theology has been the dominant force in the seminary from the very beginning.

Pure theologian sees the DMin as second class.

Tolerated rather than endorsed.

Therefore, you better have some pure theology in the DMin courses.

So, the initial curriculum had Theological Foundation as a beginning course.

All the books were like *The Shape of Practical Theology*

The class was a 3-hour class rather than an eight hour class.

Global mission caused a fair number of complaints when the DMin was connected with folks having to take the class for their mission emphasis.

We don't just want a theological foundation, but also a spiritual foundation.

Originally, we took the person who taught pure theology and mixed them in with the other professors and courses.

What remains from the original class is the one book, *The Shape of Practical Theology*.

This is the practical theologians' offering to the history of the DMin pure theologians.

For many seminaries this would be an introductory book to practical theology.

Thus, this is the historical subplot behind this book...

Traditionally, the viewpoint or paradigm-pure theology was at the top and dictated practical theology.

We tell people what to think and you tell them where to stand (from a pure theologian).

What does Anderson say...the bridge was constructed for one-way traffic.

In other words from pure theology to practical theology.

Anderson wants a bridge that is two-way.

The book is written in the context that gives two-way exchange.

My thesis is that traffic on the bridge connecting theory and practice flows both ways.

The line between theoretical and practical theology is no longer drawn so deeply or sharply.

Dept. of mission and practices speaks to a more practical support of ministry and out of the 3rd world scenario.

The history of this lies with the European model of education and comes out of state churches.

He gives the example of the divorce in his church and how he dealt with it.

So easy in the classroom to parse words and then you go to people on the streets and look them in the eye and what do you do?

Well, if they're saying this and we can't do it—what good is it?

All the theories of inspiration—can I preach the Word with conviction and power?

If I can, that then means I have an adequate view of inspiration.

My actual thesis is that it is harder to do real theology rather than pure theology.

Reason: because it doesn't have to be practical.