the teaching profession and educational enterprise might be modified in order more consistently to pursue and put into practice the slogans used to describe an institution’s mission.

Slogans and Distinctives is a delightful read. Even if one does not share the authors’ evangelical Christian perspective, the questions posed about the use of slogans and their role cannot be ignored, especially if the tasks of higher education are going to be pursued with integrity.—Darwin K. Glassford is Associate Professor of Bible/Christian Ministries at Montreat College in Montreat, North Carolina.


In writing the publisher’s introduction to this collection of essays, James Michael Lee is obviously uneasy with the book’s premise. Lee postulates that the most foundational issue in religious education is its relation to theology on the one hand and to the social sciences on the other hand. Is religious education a branch of theology or a branch of social science? How one answers this question, Lee claims, is absolutely pivotal to how we conceptualize and enact our work as religious educators. I agree. Lee’s position is well known. His trilogy is a testament to religious education as a social science.

In commissioning this volume, Lee has invited Randolph Crump Miller to assemble a rich array of essays to explore this perplexing relationship. Miller has been the most consistent and prolific advocate of the theological approach to religious education for the latter half of the twentieth century. In his 1950, The Clue to Christian Education, Miller asserted that theology is the clue to understanding and doing religious education. It is the background and presupposition of any curriculum. This has become the normative position in religious education theory and practice in the United States. The authors assembled for this volume are aligned with this norm. Religious education is assumed to be a sub-set within practical theology.

The thirteen chapters in the volume faithfully and comprehensively lay out the content in major contemporary theologies, and 2. delineate how each particular form of theology generated specific instructional procedures. The book falls neatly into three parts: church theologies, philosophical theologies, and specific theologies.

In part one (church theologies), Sara Little, Mark Heath, Kenneth Gangel, Christy Sullivan, and Constance J. Tarasar examine Reformation theology, Scholastic theology, Evangelical theology, and Orthodox theology, respectively. Each chapter is a fine piece of scholarship. Less successful, however, are attempts to link content to instructional processes. The educational significance of liturgical practices in the Russian Orthodox Church are richly documented by Constance J. Tarasar.

Part two turns to philosophical theologies. Three in particular are examined: process, empirical, and existential theologies. Helen Goggin links process thought to learning within the interrelatedness of human experience. Randolph Crump Miller deals with the empirical method and its approach through experience and value in religious education. David White and Frank Rogers creatively affirm the existentialists for having brought passion back into the act of knowing and shifting the emphasis from subject matter to the subjective level of the agent.

The final section picks up on more particular theologies. Elizabeth Dodson Gray insists that feminist theology calls for a recasting of our religious symbol system and an education away from dominating patriarchy. Mary C. Boys traces the rise and fall of Kerygmatic theology and its untenable assumptions with regard to Judaism. The educational value of story, particularly parable, is illuminated by Jerry H. Stone under the canopy of narrative theology. The volume concludes with some of the richest material on liberation theology, black theology, and ecological theology explicated by Daniel S. Schipani, Grant S. Shockley, and R.C. Miller, respectively. Again, the educational linkage in each specific content is drawn out.

Within its own frame of reference and assumptions, this is a fine collection of essays. But I’m left with a set of questions. Are there theologies of religious education? Can any theology lead to a distinctive theory and practice of religious education? Can theology directly offer insight with regard to the method, structure, and institutional forms of religious education? Is theology the clue to religious education? Does it supply all the content? In response to all of the above, I respectfully answer no. Theology, in all its diverse forms, should take its rightful place within religious education, become a humble contributor, and so free religious education to emerge as a respectable social science.—Kieran Scott is a Visiting Professor at Fordham University in the Graduate Religion and Religious Education Department in Hawthorne, New Jersey.