

A Summary of Edward Farley's *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education*

Fortress Press, Philadelphia - 1983

Over the next several pages I am going to make a feeble attempt to summarize the argument in Edward Farley's great book, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education*. I will then conclude with some closing thoughts of my own on how Farley's presentation of the problem addressed in this book relates to the ongoing "emergent" discussion. I was introduced to this book by a very special mentor, Jeff Reed, from the Biblical Institute of Leadership Development (www.bild.org) while I was involved in my first church planting experience. Though my interaction with Jeff Reed was brief his encouraging influence on my life by introducing me to concepts like those presented in this book that have deeply impacted my calling as an ecclesial dreamer to this day.

As one who reads this work from outside the structures of formal theological education I am well aware that my interpretations will be biased and in some cases partially or completely inaccurate. While I am sure I will twist this summary in subtle and not so subtle ways to my own benefit it is not my intention to convince others that my interpretations are right. I only hope that this overview will encourage the readers to interact with Edward Farley themselves by reading the book in its entirety. For those who find it interesting I would also recommend Farley's *The Fragility of Knowledge: Theological Education in the Church and University*, which carries the ideas of this book even further by challenging the problems inherent in an Enlightenment understanding of "knowledge" and how that relates to theological education. Together, these books offer a very articulate and scholarly criticism of theological education in the United States.

Edward Farley's *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* is a constructive critique of theological education. While his focus is on graduate level study in Seminary or the University in the United States his critique has relevance to all institutions (church, church schools, etc.) in other geographical contexts as well. Additionally, the majority of the critique is directed towards Protestant theological education but much of it is applicable to Catholic traditions as well. According to Farley:

"All of these schools are caught in the back wash of historical forces which have modified and maybe removed the original rationale for their patterns of theological study."

Farley's argument covers a large range of history and a broad scope of material. It is difficult to briefly summarize the argument but Farley's basic thesis is that *theologia*—a unified understanding of "theology" that leads to a Christian way of life—has been displaced by a disconnected, fragmented understanding of "theology". This displacement has historical and cultural causes but the end result is a loss of *telos* or unifying purpose for theology itself. In its place we have a collection of "sciences" that are loosely gathered together towards a new end—clergy preparation. This new *telos*—clergy preparation—is an external good to theology itself and results in the fragmentation of theological education that we observe today.

Introduction

Farley begins with the claim that criticism of theological education comes from all sides.

"Complaints about theological education are as old as theological education itself. Today they sound forth from many quarters: alumni who say they were not adequately prepared for church work, faculty who bemoan their professional isolation and loneliness, students who experience the ministry fields as trivial and academic fields as irrelevant, laity who are sure that the gospel has long been absent from the school's agenda."

But while these complaints are many, very few seem to believe that the institutions that are responsible for theological education are in need of reform. Farley believes that this is treating only symptoms. By failing to reform the institutions themselves no restoration of theological education can occur.

Farley acknowledges that there are several ways to explore this displacement of *theologia*. As his focus is on theological education in the United States he looks at the rise of the seminary in America and places that in a larger historical context. The basic outline could be diagramed roughly like this:

Historical Periods		The Nature of Education	
Preseminary	From the beginning of the 17 th century to roughly 1800	Pious learning/ divinity	<p>This is a period of unity in “theology”. Theology is still seen as a revealed knowledge of God that leads to wisdom and a way of living life faithfully, or <i>habitus</i>. Theological education as such is open to everyone but its aim is to acquire this wisdom and live a life of <i>habitus</i>. But the stage has been set for some important steps to take place that will lead away from this unified understanding of theology.</p>
			<p>Step 1. The first step in the displacement is the separation of divinity into different areas of pedagogy. This leads to...</p>
Seminary	1800 to the present	Specialized learning	<p>Step 2. Distinguishing ministerial education from college education and the practice of doing “graduate study” in divinity. It is important to note that <i>divinity</i> is still seen as a unified topic in this period but it is becoming a separate area from other fields of study. This is an era of “specialized scholarship” and marks a new approach to education.</p>
		Professional education	<p>Step 3. Step three is the rise of the seminary as a separate institution of theological education. Andover is founded in 1808.</p> <p>“Theology” as a unified subject of study no longer exists. It has been replaced by a focus on preparation of clergy for ministry. As such, theological education is only required for those who are entering into the professional ministry. Emphasis shifts from theology as unified understanding of God (Divinity) to a teaching of skills related to professional ministry</p>

“The first sign of specialized, separated divinity occurred when it became customary for the president of the institution to teach divinity, especially in the more specific sense of positive and controversial theology, in a concentrated way in the final year of the student’s college work. This trend finds institutional expression when finally a chair of divinity is instituted, first at Harvard (1721) and then at Yale (1755). With this act, divinity becomes a designated professor’s sole responsibility. He attends to it and not to mathematics, astronomy, or rhetoric. This delimited responsibility anticipates the later fields of expertise. The trend is exacerbated when the schools do what Edinburgh did in 1694, add a second chair of divinity, thereby creating areas of emphasis and expertise within divinity itself.”

The foundation of seminaries is only one part of the displacement of *theologia* as the unified understanding of theology. Farley explains:

“...in the second generation of the founding of the seminaries, something happened which introduced an entirely new model and approach for the education of ministers. Faculty members from the first seminaries (Andover, Princeton) went to Germany to study, and when they returned, they programmatically set out to introduce that model to the American schools. Not only did the seminaries begin to take into account German theological scholarship, the German system itself began to influence the very conception of a program of theological study. Hence, after the middle of the nineteenth century, the standard German fourfold division of theological sciences (Bible, dogmatics, church history, practical theology) was widespread.”

“The shift was not from piety to learning. A learned ministry was never seriously questioned in many of the church traditions. The shift was from one meaning of learning to another, from a study which deepens heartfelt knowledge of divine things to scholarly knowledge of relatively discrete theological sciences.”

Part One: The Displacement of Theologia

This transition in the way learning itself is expressed in three new problems. First was the problem of how theology related to faith. While faith is something all Christians have access to theology became separate. The relationship between these two things was broken.

“...churches have undergone acculturation (which is, in itself, inevitable) in such a way as to lose their ecclesial character. It is this loss or diminution which is at work when theological school finds itself perplexed as to what its education is really about.”

This fragmentation then gets pushed into the second problem area—the institutions of theological education.

“It is a set of problems which attends the way we have been going about theological education in the United States since the early nineteenth century and the origin of the seminary movement. I am referring to the education of Protestant ministers in a postcollege seminary course of three years which offers Bible, church history, theology, and a plethora of practical courses. When we ponder four intertwined features of this (seminary) institutionality as it exists today, the conclusion is all but inescapable that present-day theological schools simply cannot provide *theological* education.”

“We are not making the banal point that the education of ministers today could be better than it is. We are arguing that its typical result is simply not a theologically educated minister.”

How can Farley make such bold claims? They stem from an understanding of the third problem which he calls *Ratio Studiorum*. This is the problem of the unity of “theology” and is the primary concern of the book. Now that we have lost the concept of theology as a unified subject of study, how do we find a way of uniting the independent “sciences”? Stated differently, what is the *telos* of theological education if it is no longer the “study of theology”?

“...the third dimension of the problem of theological school has to do with the study of divinity or ‘the study of theology’. However, the term *divinity* has dropped out of contemporary discourse, and the term *theology* has undergone an unfortunate narrowing and specialization. ...Our subject in other words has lost its language, and this fact itself is indicative of the problem. The very nature of the developments in theological education in the third professionalist approach removes ‘the study of theology’ from the agenda of reform, centered as this approach is on the technical problems of bridging theory to ministerial practice. Accordingly, the content, unity, and rationale for the study of theology are not grasped as a problem or task because the professionalist approach unifies the inherited studies under the category of the ‘academic,’ presupposes these studies as self-evident, and moves the strategic problem of relating such studies to tasks of ministry.”

In other words, the unity is no longer found in the internal goods of theology—a knowledge of divine things that leads to wisdom and *habitus*—but in the external goods of preparing for the tasks of the clergy profession. Because we are on this side of the displacement we do not easily recognize the significance of this problem. Since this shift took place in the mid 1800’s we know of no other type of theological education. It is only when we become aware of our history that the problem can be seen clearly. The question then becomes, how do we resolve it? In Farley’s words:

“...any reform of the theological school which omits the question of the very content, pattern, and goal of theological study must inevitably turn out to be trivial, technological, and cosmetic.”

From here Farley begins an in depth but brief historical overview of the study of theology from the early Christian centuries to the present. There is no way to do justice to this part of his argument in this brief overview so I will only highlight a small portion of his overall argument with some selected excerpts. He provides a brief exposition of the two premodern senses of theology (theology/knowledge and theology/discipline) and each one is traced through their related histories.

The Early Christian Centuries

“...a salvifically oriented knowledge of divine being was part of the Christian community and tradition long before it was named theology.”

“The door through which classical learning and classical literature entered monastic education was reading, memorizing, expounding, and meditating on Scripture.”

“Whatever the term, there was in this early period, in addition to knowledge of God (the cognitive act, the illumined mind), the effort of discerning and setting forth the truth given to the world by God through Jesus. This effort had primarily the character of exposition, the interpretation of the received text from Scripture or council. The truth of the revealed texts could be assumed, hence the task was to discern and properly formulate its meaning.”

From the Middle Ages to the Enlightenment

“The distinction between theology as knowledge and theology as discipline becomes sharpened. And as theology as discipline grows in the school, it is also opposed by those who see theology as a salvific knowledge.”

“The meaning of *theologia* was not just a reflection of differences between one strand of medieval thinkers and another. Those like Thomas who thought of *theologia* as a discipline, a theoretical science, did not abandon the notion that it was also a cognitive state. The following definition attempts to capture the standard meaning of theology throughout this second period, from the twelfth through the seventeenth centuries: *theologia* is a state and disposition of the soul which has the character of knowledge. There were, of course, many debates about this throughout the period: between Thomists and Augustinians, Thomists and nominalists, Catholics and Protestants, Lutherans and Reformed, but these issues turned on what *kind* of knowledge (habit) theology was. And if there was a dominant position, it is that theology is a *practical*, not theoretical, habit having

the primary character of wisdom. ...in the second period theology characteristically refers to a practical, salvation-oriented (existential-personal) knowledge of God. It is not an easy point to grasp, since this usage of the term has been long absent from the Christian community, its churches and its schools.”

“With the second period and the coming of the universities, this earlier learning, teaching, and exposition continued, but a great change took place in how they were conceived. Along with law, medicine, arts (including philosophy), ‘theology’ names a faculty in a university and some ordered procedures which yield knowledge. It was not simply the direct cognitive vision of something given to it, a cognitive *habitus* of the soul, but a deliberate and methodical undertaking whose end was knowledge. Promoted especially by Thomas Aquinas and the schoolmen, theology in this sense became a discipline.”

“The coming of Aristotle to Christian learning may have been the decisive catalyst for the precipitation of the new theological science, but it was not the only stimulus. The use of classical learning had long been accepted, even in the monastic schools. Such learning may have entered the schools as a servant, but it held the seeds of the independence later asserted in the Renaissance and Enlightenment.”

“Needles to say, there was enormous fallout from the rise of theology as an Aristotelian, university science. The very fact that it occurred in universities and not in institutions presided over by bishops or abbots created a new distance between theology and the church.”

From the Enlightenment to the Present

“The third period covers roughly the seventeenth century to the present. In this period the two genres of theology continue but undergo such radical transformation that the original senses of theology as knowledge (wisdom) and as discipline virtually disappear from theological schools. Theology as a personal quality continues (though not usually under the term *theology*), not as a salvation-disposed wisdom, but as the practical know-how necessary to ministerial work. Theology as discipline continues, not as the unitary enterprise of theological study, but as one technical and specialized scholarly undertaking among others; in other words, as systematic theology. These developments are the outcome of theology’s long career. They are peculiarly modern and, to some degree, even distinctively North American.”

“The third period, therefore, is united not by one single type of institution but rather by two types, related to each other by somewhat contradictory agendas and goals: the ideal of theological scholarship (the post-Enlightenment continental university) and the ideal of the practically trained minister (the twentieth-century Protestant seminary).”

“Once the theological school and the course of theological study is thought of as a plurality of sciences, theology as a single science (discipline) is lost. It becomes an aggregate term for a family of scholarly pursuits. Furthermore, a secondary usage arises. Theology becomes *one* of the specialties along with biblical studies, ethics, pastoral care, etc. And in any given course of study, theology in this specialty sense may be required as one of several important areas of study or regarded as a merely technical and therefore dispensable pursuit.”

“The pluralization and specialization of theology comes to resemble a new scholasticism. And it was a scholasticism with a much more severe problem than those inherent in medieval and seventeenth-century scholasticisms. In those times there was at least one unitary science to pursue and it was correlative with an individual *habitus*, wisdom. But with its pluralization into sciences, theology as a disposition of the soul toward God simply drops out of ‘the study of theology’. Furthermore, there is no unitary science but an aggregate of disciplines whose unity is their pertinence to the task of ministry.”

“If the transformation of theology as a discipline into a plurality of disciplines was primarily the work of the post-Enlightenment, continental university, the transformation of theology/knowledge into strategic know-how is primarily the work of the twentieth-century seminary.”

“It is not too strong to say that the theological school will make little progress in understanding its present nature and situation if it overlooks the disappearance of the very thing which is supposed to be its essence, agenda, and telos.”

From here Farley goes into a detailed examination of the period of time beginning in the eighteenth century that gave rise to a genre of literature known as Theological Encyclopedia. This is a more detailed look at the displacement of the older understanding of theology and the establishment and universal acceptance of the fourfold pattern. There is a lengthy section exploring the contributions of Schleiermacher and others in this historic shift. Through this transitional period of fragmentation of theology there was also a new problem that emerged:

“A final set of issues has to do with theology’s (the faculty of theology’s) place in the university. Clearly, this is a new problem. In the medieval university, theology is the very apex of the sciences because this *habitus*, the knowledge of God, founds and determines the principles and content of all other knowledge and sciences. After the Reformation many universities and *Hochschulen* of Europe were either appropriated or specially founded for confessional purposes and the training of Protestant clergy. But with the Enlightenment and the rise of ‘modern’ universities like Halle and Gottingen, not only the reigning place but the very existence of theology began to become problematic. In Germany the traditional four faculties (philosophy, medicine, law, and theology) made up the university. But theology’s right to be there was to some by no means self-evident. ‘Science’ (*Wissenschaft*) was the new self-understanding of these universities.”

Farley concludes his summary of the Theological Encyclopedia period with the statement that the legacy of this period is the acceptance by the theological education institutions of the triumph of the Fourfold pattern. This then, is the current context of theological education in the United States.

“Although there are occasional attempts to think of theological studies along other lines than the inherited fourfold pattern, it appears to be not only the dominant scheme, but a scheme with even more institutional reinforcement now than it had in the nineteenth century. Two very powerful social forces are at work in this reinforcement. The first is that the graduate schools themselves have been organized along the lines of the fourfold pattern or of specialties within that pattern such as ethics, various periods or regions of church history, or Old and New Testaments. Some of these programs are part of universities for which the unity of the graduate program in religion cannot be grounded in the inherited Christian, clergy-oriented encyclopedia of disciplines. These schools have begun to organize their studies through categories which suggest a departure from the fourfold pattern. In fact, the result is a disguised form of the fourfold pattern to which studies in world religions are added. The second major force follows from the expertise begun in the graduate school. It is the social institutionalization of the scholarly specialties which creates a community specialists, stage regular conferences, sponsor long-term research projects, sets lines of identity and loyalty, and fixes the categorical world in which all this takes place. The fourfold pattern with its layers of presuppositions may or may not be intellectually self-evident today. But it remains in force as the major way in which theological study is classified and conceived.”

“It may not be too strong to say that twentieth-century theological schools in the United States simply have no material or substantial concepts of the unity of the theological disciplines. What this leaves is the external-teleological approach, the clerical paradigm, as the one and only way of understanding that unity. In other words, the only thing which studies of Scripture, theology, history, and pastoral care have in common is their contribution to the preparation of the clergy for its tasks.”

Part Two: Issues and Elements for a Reform-Oriented Conversation.

Once Farley presents his case for the current condition of theological education he is ready to begin his critique. His critique is going to be focused on the fourfold pattern and the concept of theological education being equated with preparing people for clergy ministry. The fourfold pattern results in a loss of unity in theology. The clerical paradigm emphasizes this fragmentation and makes one part of the fourfold pattern more important than the others. "Practical theology" (ministry related skills) becomes more important than Bible, Church History and dogmatics because it alone can help people function in the role of clergy. This in turn changes how we define ecclesial leadership and ecclesial structures. In a sense it institutes a proprietary system between theological education and professional ministry. Our churches are designed to create places for the educated minister to practice and perfect the skills he has learned. Once this relationship is formed it becomes increasingly difficult to bring reform. The church and the theological education institutions cannot bring correction to each other because they are too dependant on each other for their continued existence. Farley illustrates this as follows:

"...the *problem* which functionalism and the professionalist approach would alleviate is, ironically, intensified. This is to say, the alienation between theological studies and the needs and tasks of the church's leadership is promoted, not reduced, by the functionalist attempt to make the tasks of ministry themselves the criteria, subject matter, and end of theological study. The reason is that the public tasks and responsibilities of clergy (preaching, counseling, managing, organizing, teaching, evangelizing) represent altogether only a formal, sociological description of a minister or priest. They pertain to the social duration of the Christian community as it would be *sociologically* described. Passed over is the Christian community in its essential, defining, ecclesial aspect of being a redemptive community, with a leadership whose tasks center in the corporate and individual occurrence of redemption.

In other words, the education of leadership for a redemptive community cannot be *defined* by reference to the public tasks and acts by which the community endures (a formal approach), but rather by the requirements set by the nature of that community as redemptive. Defining ministry by its community tasks ignores the community's own redemptive nature, its received tradition, its truth convictions. The very thing that makes theological education important to and related to the church and to the church's leadership, which calls for the various public tasks and sets criteria for their exercise, is absent. Accordingly, the more the external tasks themselves are focused on as the only *telos* of theological education, the less the minister becomes qualified to carry them out. This is why the functionalist form of the clerical paradigm promotes and worsens the problem with which it is concerned."

I do not think it is possible to underestimate the claim Farley makes in these two paragraphs and its impact on the current "emergent" conversation. There are several issues identified here that we are forced to wrestle with. Perhaps most important is understanding exactly how much the "clerical paradigm" of theological education controls the language and sets the context for the "emergent" conversation. On the one hand, "emerging" thinkers speak often of creating "new" theologies, a "new" gospel, "new" forms of leadership, and "new" types of ecclesial communities. On the other hand there are those who look at "emerging" ecclesial structures and observe that it is simply a repackaging of older forms of community contained in what some are calling new "sociological wrappers". There is a lot of talk of deconstructing preaching, paid pastoral staff, organization, etc. What no one seems to notice is that the central topics of all these discussions is that they focus on those things that fall within the one emphasized area of the fourfold division, "practical theology"(professional ministry).

If the argument of Farley's book is correct, there will be no reform (or "emergence") until we are ready to abolish the fourfold system and make a unified concept of theology the context of our conversation. Unfortunately, there are many things that make this difficult. First is the reality that current churches are designed by and led by those who are fully entrenched in the fourfold pattern and the clerical paradigm and are not even aware of it. These churches and their leaders, whether "modern" or "postmodern", have a place of power and privilege that they cannot easily give up on. Their very existence depends on the complete structure's continued existence. Towards this end, they illustrate the fact that Farley makes throughout the book. Without taking the whole system into account any change or reform is merely

cosmetic. Thus the fragmentation of the conversation continues. While some are more than willing to create a “new” gospel, many are not willing to discuss or rethink ecclesial leadership, ecclesial structure, and perhaps most importantly, theological education itself.

Farley will continue his critique by showing the impact the fourfold pattern and clerical paradigm outside the immediate context of theological education and in the church. Consider the following quotes:

“This ‘clericalization’ of theology is so much the air we breathe that it is very difficult to imagine a time when it was any other way. In chapter 2, the case was made that theology at one time meant a disposition and knowledge which resembled wisdom, and as such had no clerical restriction. It was simply the sapiential knowledge which attended the Christian life. This is not to say that a lengthy and rigorous clergy education was lacking. It does mean that that education as the ‘study of theology’ was thought of as an education in something which attended Christian life as such, something shared in by non-clergy.’

“Prominent are three rather pervasive results of this clericalization of theology. The first is the unfortunate way it has influenced the interpretation of Christian or church education in both Protestant churches and their seminaries. The negative premise of this approach is that education in the churches, whatever it is, cannot be ‘the study of theology.’ This is necessarily the case insofar as the study of theology *means* a pedagogy for ministerial education.”

“...it is the case that the Protestant churches have not yet seriously considered the viability of theological education as *church* education. Hence, the minister as theological educator is not an idea which disposes and guides present-day church education. If a church did embrace the ideal of theological education for its constituency, it would have to incorporate into its educational program something of the structure of theology itself.”

So in many ways the church, as a congregational gathering of laity, becomes important only in the sense that it allows ministers a place to exercise their clerical skills. While it is important to approach the Scriptural texts as data to be mined for relevant “applications” to the congregations there is no serious attempt to actually educate the laity theologically. It has already been accepted that theological education is only relevant to professional ministry. All other vocations simply need to be recipients of the skilled work of the minister. Since the currently accepted and privileged ecclesial structures have one, or a small group of professional ministers to do this task, there is no clear idea of exactly what the laity’s role is to be, other than to finance and provide resources for the work of the professionals. This economic facet of the problem is one that I wish Farley would have touched on. It is difficult to anticipate any serious attempt at reform of this system when those who lead it are dependant on it as their source of income.

Farley concludes the book with a challenge to reclaim the concept of a unified understanding of theology. He suggests ways in which this unified theology could work in the many matrices of ecclesial life today in a way that would adequately minister to the matrices and retain its unity and *telos*. This will bring not just changes in the content of the subject matter of the faith but real changes in the way we think about and define things. For example, we not only need to teach leaders new things, we need to rethink what *leadership* itself means. Additionally, we need to come to a new understanding of theological education that allows it to take place at every level of the church. Obviously this will be a huge task. And it will be a task that must begin by restoring *theologia* to clergy education.

“The ‘minister-as-professional’ literature tends to permit church leadership to be defined by a variety of tasks set for the minister by a parish or specialized ministry. This is clearly a nontheological approach to church leadership because it permits a set of negotiations or unstated expectations between minister and congregation to determine the leader’s nature, task and responsibilities. Leadership, then, is defined by the exercise of these negotiated responsibilities. This approach is closely bound up with the view that the education of the church leader and the education of the believer have utterly different goals and subject matters. The (ordained) leader does things which the believer does not do (preach, administer sacraments, manage the

organization, counsel) and must know things the believer need not know (church history, exegesis, pastoral psychology, and so forth).”

Any serious attempt to reform theological education, ecclesial leadership and the ecclesial institutions responsible for theological education must include a restoration of a unified concept of theology. We must, as a community, seek to embody a theology that leads all members of the community towards a lifelong quest for divine wisdom that forms our faith and produces a life of Christian habitus. The goal is not the complete deconstruction—or destruction—of our institutions but rather redemption. If we, as the body of Christ, are to fulfill our calling of participating in God’s redemption and re-creation of our world let it begin with our own institutions. In Farley’s closing paragraphs he reminds us:

“It is, therefore, time. The accumulated and unexamined presuppositions of theological education have enjoyed their dark corners long enough. They are moldy and outworn, and they have exercised hidden control too long. The institutional structures they created are too often oppressive, irrelevant, and ineffectual.”

I will leave it to those interested enough to get the book to read the six recommendations Farley proposes to close the book. For the rest, I hope this summary has challenged you to examine the content of his argument in the contexts of your own ecclesial structures and come up with your own proposals. With redemption as your goal, leave no part of your institutions, structures and underlying theological assumptions immune to your own faithful inquiry.

Conclusion

I am well aware that my interpretation of Farley and my selection of quotes from his book will reflect my own perspective as one who stands outside of the institutions of theological education. It is easy for me to be overly critical of these institutions because I do not benefit from participating in their privileged place. But my goal in this summary is not to be critical. In fact, I envy those who are able to participate in seminaries. My only hope is that those who do benefit will begin to take a critical look at their institutions and realize that reform needs to come. It is my belief that this reform will not take place within the systems themselves because those involved are too invested in its continued success. But neither do I believe it will be reformed from those outside the system who do not have access to the many wonderful resources of scholarship and privilege. Instead, it will take a collaborative effort of those both in and out of the system, working together, open to correction and reflection from one another, and seeking to stay reconciled. If we really believe that God as given us all gifts that can be used for edification and redemption in the community of faith we will need to create places where all sides can participate in the ongoing conversation among friends.

*“We must not be afraid to dream the seemingly impossible
if we want the seemingly impossible to become a reality”
--Vaclav Havel*

Your Fellow Ecclesial Dreamer,

James Mills
enviare

Missio Dei

www.knowtown.com/missio