Ministerial Formation as Apprenticeship

So prevalent has the collegiate and residential model of ministerial formation become that we forget that much ministerial formation in the past and currently elsewhere in the world adopted a model that emphasizes apprenticeship as its foundational concept. Ministers-in-training learn their trade by working closely with an experienced minister, seeing what they do and how they do it. This has been an important means of formation for Anglican priests for over a century, at least, where much of the skills and habits of ministry—many of the practices, we would say—are learned with a training incumbent who shapes their work in the first three or four years after theological college and ordination as a deacon. The value of this model over the more “distant” concept of mentoring for Newly Accredited Ministers among British Baptists lies in the close proximity between the training incumbent and their assistant curate: they are co-located in the same benefice, even if there are multiple congregations within a group of parishes which that united benefice comprises. There is room for both some independence to develop as well as close supervision of ministry when necessary. By contrast, for Baptists, the mentor, by definition in another church, albeit one normally not too far distant from the newly-ordained minister, can only really see and hear of their mentee’s progress second-hand, and mostly through the medium of what that minister chooses to reveal.

The exception for Baptists is found in those, admittedly few, churches where there are sufficient funds to call more than one minister, and where there is a vision to appoint an inexperienced minister with, at least partly, the purpose of contributing to their continuing formation, and to forego the more immediate value of either an experienced second minister, or, more likely, a specialist in form of a youth minister, evangelist or children and community worker. The traditional training church, which would call a
succession of men and women from college to a three year “curacy” under an experienced and gifted senior minister are now almost extinct. Almost universal, therefore, for a newly ordained Baptist minister is some form of sole charge in a church that probably aspires to a more experienced minister, but lacks the resources or kudos to attract such a one. More often than not, this leads to an unsatisfactory initial experience of continuing formation for the minister concerned, the context lacking the breadth of opportunity to give a wide experience of ministry; or the lay leadership of the church so controlling as to be suspicious of an experienced minister “muscling-in” on their areas of power and control, with unhappy struggles ensuing; or the church lacking the will to embrace change, with the consequence that the minister becomes frustrated at their inability to bring about any meaningful transformation of the life and mission of the congregation.

Even where there has been a deliberate apprenticeship model adopted, the lack of any meaningful training in team work or how to manage trainee relationships has sometimes rendered the opportunity ineffectual, with Regional Ministers or Superintendents called in to resolve tensions between senior and junior colleagues. Unrealistic expectations of equivalence in responsibility on the part of the trainee, and an over-bearing dominance by the trainer out of concern that, since they will continue to lead this church long after their trainee has moved to another church, things need to be done their way, combine to make the value of being in a training context almost overwhelmed by the relational struggles that ensue.

However, even if for Baptists the model is fraught with difficulty (as for the Anglicans also, if truth be told), the value of an apprenticeship model should not too readily be ignored. A week-by-week support in the shaping and delivery of sermons (where the trainee is allowed such frequency of opportunity); reflection upon pastoral cases and missional opportunities; and the freedom to experiment and, perhaps, fail in the attempt, all are of significant value in the shaping and formation of an inexperienced minister in their first pastorate.

The most prevalent context for apprenticeship schemes in ministry lie in gap year models for those exploring full time ministry of some kind. The large evangelical Anglican church in central London, All Souls, Langham Place, offers The All Souls Apprentice Scheme “to provide a more intensive training in gospel ministry for those showing leadership potential.”1 This combination of hands on experience and Biblical and theological training runs for one or two years, September to July and is self-funding. The large independent evangelical church in central Cardiff, Highfields Church, also

runs a small apprenticeship scheme. Its pastor, Dave Gobbett, served as an apprentice at Christchurch Mayfair, while completing the Cornhill Training Course prior to working with UCCF and followed this with ministerial training at Oak Hill Theological College. At Christ Church, Mayfair, London (an evangelical Anglican church planted in 2001, with its roots in the St Helen’s Bishopsgate stream of conservative evangelical Anglicanism) the apprenticeship scheme lasts for two years and seeks to develop godliness of character, skills in ministry and knowledge of Scripture. It is part of the 9:38 scheme associated with Cornhill Training Course, The Proclamation Trust and Oak Hill Anglican theological college: all of which are conservative in their evangelicalism. Other large churches within this stream that have run similar apprenticeship schemes include Chessington Evangelical Church; Duke Street Baptist Church, Richmond (a church, despite its name, that is actually rather Presbyterian in character); Dundonald, Wimbledon (another Anglican Evangelical church plant from 1990 that works outside the parish system); International Presbyterian Church (IPC), Ealing; St James Muswell Hill and St Nicholas Sevenoaks. It does not take too much research to discover that the location of these large evangelical congregations have a similarly wealthy catchment, and some would hold to an understanding of the faith with which I would not wish to be too closely associated. For instance, it is hard to find women on their staff fulfilling roles other than “Women’s ministry facilitator” or PA to the lead pastor (none of these churches seem to have teaching or leading women ministers: IPC Ealing has no women elders, for instance, and all of St James’ Muswell Hill’s vicars are male, while women administrate, run under-fives’ work or work as PAs; and a similar distribution of roles is present at St Nicholas, Sevenoaks—four clergy, all male, and women serving as pastoral or parish assistants). A very full description of the apprenticeship scheme (called Associates) run by the conservative evangelical Anglican church, Lyonsdown, New Barnet, in North London gives a flavor of the work, the training and the theology of the typical context of these apprenticeships. Both Hebrew and Greek are taught, the devotional structure requires the use of the M’Cheyne daily Bible reading course, “all staff and associates are encouraged to set aside a fixed daily period for serious reading of a ‘heavy’ theological book (for example by writers such as Jonathan Edwards or John Owen)” and the close proximity of Oak Hill and St Helen’s Bishopsgate colors the theological

2. As Holy Trinity, New Barnet it controversially refused to pay any of its Parish Share to the Diocese of St. Albans in 2004 in protest at the appointment of Dr. Jeffrey John as Dean of St. Albans, simultaneously not expecting the Church Commissioners to pay for the Vicar’s stipend.

perspective. The website in 2015 indicated that all five of this church’s current staff team were former Associates. This clearly indicates the success of bringing younger people through a system that shapes them for ministry of a certain character, but also perhaps a narrowness of theology and paranoia about the wider Church of England that is characteristic of this strand of Anglicanism.

There is also a cultural familiarity with the concept of this kind of apprenticeship. Many of the members of these churches who work in professional contexts would be very familiar with internships, with which these apprenticeships have a good deal in common.

Aware, then, that this apprenticeship model is widely adopted by large, conservative evangelical churches in affluent areas of the South East of England, with a church polity that I believe devalues the ministry of women, and a theology that would no doubt reject some of my beliefs as unbiblical, it might seem an unpropitious model to advocate. However, the fact that this stream of churches has enthusiastically adopted the model should not prevent the wider church from also exploring it, without adopting wholesale the theology of these churches.

Furthermore, it is sympathetic to a rediscovery of the value in apprenticeships after decades of relentless widening of access to universities, with the result that some who have pursued a less-than rewarding undergraduate degree, because there was little else to choose from, might have been better suited to a skilled apprenticeship that fitted them with skills and work-experience. Gaining a skill that is in high demand, while earning an income (albeit a low one as befits a trainee) and finding work as a result, looks altogether better than studying for a degree whilst incurring high levels of debt with only unskilled work in the service sector of the economy as a prospect after graduation. Other European economies, and Germany in particular, have valued highly-skilled workers who have been apprenticed in a way that in Britain has been rare. The resulting imbalance in skills and the shortage of, for instance, skilled engineers or IT specialists in the British economy has now been recognized and a fresh drive to establish and recruit to apprenticeships has been evident in recent years.

The kind of apprenticeship model suited to ministry needs to encompass an equally high level of understanding and cognition: a simple apprenticeship model where essentially a set of skills is acquired is unsuited to the intellectual challenge of ministry that this book argues is essential. The tasks of pastoral care, apologetics and exposition of Scripture and faith all require high levels of understanding, but much of the skills element of ministry formation—skills in listening and accompanying, in administration and organization, in leadership and both self-awareness and the understanding
of human dynamic—all might be aided when learnt not only in the classroom but also through observing the skilled ministry of a more experienced practitioner.

Let us explore this strand of formation through three of the lenses that have run through this book: Scripture, personal story and art.

It needs to be said that my own sense of being formed for ministry has a strong apprenticeship element to it. Leaving a happy four years as a schoolmaster with a renewed sense of God’s call to serve him in pastoral ministry (a call that was first sensed as a teenager in the Anglican parish where I grew up), I did not go straightway to theological college, but was called to the staff of Streatham Baptist Church (everyone referred to it as Lewin Road after the location of its buildings) as a “full-time elder.” This was a church in the throes of charismatic renewal, where an eldership had been established in the late-1970s, and to which I was elected in 1980 aged twenty-four years old (which seems to me now, inordinately young—except that we also have ordained ministers at that age elsewhere). With two years watching its minister, Douglas McBain, from the perspective of being on that eldership while working full-time as a schoolmaster, I was thrust into the hurly-burly of full-time ministry as he left the pastorate for a wider “apostolic” ministry: one that evolved into the Baptist Union’s Metropolitan Superintendent covering the London Baptist Association a few years later.

Douglas kept a watchful eye on this raw young pastor and living still in the vicinity he often offered good advice, and when it came to my first funeral, took it with me to show me the ropes. Nine months later, the church called Douglas’s replacement, and Mike Wood became the senior minister. Once again, the formational process was largely in an apprenticeship model, Mike giving me both close oversight when I needed it, and plenty of space to do and be my own person when not. Thus, when I started at Spurgeon’s College after two years as an unaccredited pastor, initially simply to engage with theological education as an independent student, I already had some experience of pastoral leadership and ministry. The following year I became a Baptist Union ministerial student, having succeeded in candidating for accredited ministry through the London Baptist Association, completed the Cambridge Diploma in Religious Studies (the only alternative Spurgeon’s College offered to the BA in Theology) and started pastoral studies (such was the structure of training at Spurgeon’s in the mid-1980s.) As one of the first couple of church-based students, with my placement at Lewin Road, of course, I continued to learn apprentice-wise under Mike Wood while studying at college.

Such a pattern is far more common today than it was thirty years ago, and the apprenticeship element more common, although by no means
ubiquitous. As we saw earlier, my experience of training as a junior member of a team has become increasingly rare, although there are still churches that will call a young man or woman from its membership, and essentially form them from within its own life. The dangers that such formation will be imbalanced or eccentric are profound, with the character of ministry constrained by the emphases of that church and its practices. At Lewin Road I pretty quickly discovered the necessity for engaging in deliverance ministry following a visit from John Wimber and his team at the end of August 1982. Almost as quickly I discovered that most of my older, more experienced, and trained Baptist minister colleagues from surrounding churches seemed to know even less than I, and were sending their cases to me! Only later did I find out that Douglas McBain had been quietly engaging in this ministry for some years while in pastorate, and so his oversight and experience in the background created the safe space for me to learn by experience and some reading. In other regards, Lewin Road was no different to many other churches: there was routine pastoral visiting to do, committees to chair, sermons to write, evangelism, pastoral counselling and management to fulfil. Much was learned at college in all of these areas, but I was essentially already a practitioner (albeit very unskilled) by the time I arrived at college, and so had experience to draw upon and reflect upon.

I do not suggest that this story should become normative for all. I arrived on staff at Lewin Road with two assets that are not available to every ministerial candidate: transferable experience in both Christian leadership (I had led the Youth Fellowship at my Anglican parish church while a sixth-former, and the Christian Union at school also, followed by leadership, including presidency, at the Christian Union at King’s College London as an undergraduate) and in my previous career as a teacher; and I had an enquiring mind. To be formed in this way does require a certain innate ability, I think, and perhaps the most successful of people who train in this way will probably do well in a fully college-based mode also. Mixed-mode formation (part college, part participant-church context) is not for the faint-hearted, for it makes huge demands upon the minister-in-training, and there are two groups who will probably benefit from a college-based course: those who are less able pastorally, and those who are very academically able: the mixed-mode formation does not lend itself easily to an academically outstanding outcome. Those who deliberately have set their sights on an academic strand to their ministerial career would be well-advised to be full-time at college.

One great advantage of the apprenticeship model is its dominical precedent. Jesus of Nazareth seems to adopt this model almost exclusively in forming the Twelve, and Mark’s Gospel might be described as the story of
the apprenticeship of the first disciples as much as it is a passion narrative with an extended introduction. Similarly, Paul seems to have taken younger colleagues under his wing, and in Timothy we have advice to a younger pastor (or is that bishop?) from his mentor, Paul. Certainly, the Twelve seem not to have had prior experience of rabbinical study (unlike Paul, under Gamaliel, before his conversion) nor any kind of “professional education” as religious leaders. Their education and formation was through being with Jesus, seeing what he did, how he did it and then trying this for themselves. In Mark 3:13–19 Jesus chooses the Twelve “to be with him” (3:14) and to be sent out, and following ministry and healings in Galilee, he sends them out two by two (Mark 6:6–13), reporting back to Jesus in Mark 6:30. In the ensuing chapters there is continuing ministry by Jesus, and we suppose, by the disciples, as well as personal formation. For instance, nearing the end of Jesus’ ministry, Mark recalls the embarrassing argument over who is the greatest (Mark 10:35–45) and Jesus instructions about servanthood and humility, “whoever wishes to be first among you must be slave of all. For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many.” (Mark 10:44–45)

Timothy is a protégée of Paul who joins him at Lystra (Acts 16:1–3) and is the son of a Jewish woman who was already a believer and a Greek father. He accompanies Paul through Phrygia and Galatia until they reach the western coast of Asia Minor where they cross into Macedonia and Philippi. There Paul and Silas are imprisoned (Acts 16:16–40) while Timothy seems to have remained free. Further uproar in Thessalonica and a calmer welcome in Beroea until the troublemakers from Thessalonica turned up, led the church to send Paul on his way alone, while Timothy and Silas remained, joining him later in Corinth, recorded in Acts 18:5. Paul stayed in Corinth for eighteen months, and, we assume, Timothy stayed too. We do not hear of Timothy’s movements, but we may well assume he travelled with Paul to Jerusalem (Acts 18:22) and then through Galatia to Ephesus. Here, again, Paul stayed for two years (Acts 19:10) and Timothy is mentioned as one of the two helpers who he sends to Macedonia ahead of his anticipated journey to Rome (Acts 19:21–22) while he remains in Ephesus alone. The remainder of Luke’s account focuses upon Paul and his last, troubled journey, and we hear no more from Luke in Acts about Timothy.

However, whenever Romans was written, Timothy’s greetings are included, he being described as “my co-worker” (Romans 16:21). The context for the writing of Romans is disputed, but the consensus, such as it is, locates the place at Corinth during the period recorded by Luke in Acts 18, “immediately before departing on the final trip to Jerusalem to deliver the
offering from the Gentile churches.” He is also mentioned as a coauthor of Paul’s earliest two letters, 1 and 2 Thessalonians (I Thess 1:1 and 2 Thess 1:1); of Second Corinthians (2 Cor. 1:1) and the three prison epistles to the Philippians and Colossians (Phil 1:1 and Col 1:1) and to Philemon.

The first two Pastoral Epistles are written to this junior partner in the team, but the authorship is widely contested. Assuming it was Paul who wrote to Timothy, by now acting as bishop in Ephesus, then they are very personal late writings of Paul from Rome shortly before his death (2 Tim 4:6–18), continuing the mentoring role at some distance. If they are pseudonymous writings, then they are not written to Timothy, but are intended for some later context for which “Timothy” stands as a cipher for a later church. For many the work of Harrison is decisive, concluding that Paul was not the author of the Pastoral Epistles, and a small cottage industry has arisen from this scholarly question, the details of which need not concern us here. However, I. Howard Marshall, setting out the options, concludes that the question cannot be definitively settled at present. That Timothy was an “apprentice” of Paul is not in question, whether or not he emerges to leadership without Paul’s proximity later, and if we allow that perhaps Paul did write to him, the close affection and concern Paul has for this man, one of his closest companions, and his continuing role as guide and mentor, can be discerned.

Turning from personal story—a form of narrative theology—and Scripture, with its emphasis upon apprenticeship of necessity as the model of leadership formation in the earliest years of the church, we move to another work of art. We will look at John Everett Millais’ The Return of the Dove to the Ark elsewhere, but now we turn to his Christ in the House of His Parents, or The Carpenter’s Shop. It was signed and dated 1850, and exhibited at the Royal Academy that year and bought by the Tate gallery in 1921. It was controversial at the time of its exhibition and remains so today, as witness Waldemar Januszczak reviewing the 2007 Tate Britain retrospective in The Sunday Times, describing it as “a lurid, wild-eyed and ludicrous religious hallucination made up of heightened states”, with the observation that

7. Its title at the RA was a quotation from Zech 13:6, “And one shall say unto him, ‘What are these wounds in thine hands?’ Then, he shall answer, ‘Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends.’”
8. “This was probably the most notorious image produced by a member of the Brotherhood. The picture aroused such widespread comment that it was removed from the exhibition and brought to Queen Victoria for a special viewing.” Smith, Millais, 46.
"John the Baptist looks as if he is about to be sick." Janusszczak's conclusion is that Millais cannot turn off the sentimentality. I disagree.

The picture depicts a scene in Joseph's workshop, dominated by a long work-bench that fills the central foreground like some monumental altar. Around it are gathered six figures: to the left an unnamed assistant; while central and behind the bench, St Anne proffers some pincers towards the nail that is, we assume, the offending item that has wounded the young Jesus. She looks directly at Jesus and her daughter, her hands swollen with age. To the right of the bench stands Joseph, reaching across it to touch Jesus on his shoulder with is right hand, and hold the fingers of the wounded hand with his left. An anxious-looking John the Baptist, visibly a little older than Jesus, and already sporting a camel hair loin-cloth that covers his thighs, carefully carries a bowl of water to wash the wound. Central and in front of the bench are the figures of Mary (in her customary blue robe) and Jesus: she kneeling and facing to the right of the picture tilts her head so that the standing figure of Jesus might kiss her cheek, and Jesus standing at an angle shows us his wounded hand (the one Joseph holds) while supporting its arm with the other that together make a gesture redolent of benediction. Stacks of wood stand in the background of the house, while the floor is covered in wood shavings and on a ladder (tall enough to reach the top of a cross, no doubt) a dove rests, looking at the unfolding drama. Outside, beyond the fenced garden and to the left of the background a flock of sheep look in at the scene, on the horizon a wooden structure that is a well pump, that might double for some form of gibbet.

Millais used a mixture of exacting realism (Millais slept in a carpenters' shop in Oxford Street in order to paint there in December 1849 and January 1850\(^9\)) with a genuine Hebrew cloak around the waist of the assistant reflecting historical accuracy, and contemporary elements: Joseph appears to be wearing a modern jumper and over-shirt. The mixture of realism and its subject constituted one dimension of its offending nature. A similarly imagined scene by Millais' contemporary John Rogers Herbert, Our Savior Subject to his Parents at Nazareth, was altogether less radical: Mary, cloaked in blue looks untouched by age or circumstance, Joseph is typically bearded while Jesus himself is beautiful and immaculate. By contrast every toe in Millais' picture, including Jesus', has ingrained dirt under its nails, while Jesus as depicted by Millais has red hair, to suggest ancestry among Ashkenazi Jews.\(^{10}\) This also offended mid-Nineteenth Century English taste, for whom Jesus' obvious and biblical Jewishness was largely downplayed (he should

instead have been drawn from the playing fields of Rugby or Eton, perhaps). One anti-Semitic reviewer noted the “studied vulgarity of portraying the youthful Savior as a red-headed Jew-boy.”

Charles Dickens took great exception to the picture, and attacked the picture in his essay *Old Lamps for New Ones* in the 15 June 1850 issue of *Household Words*. His comments only serve to undermine his reputation as Victorian England’s greatest polemical novelist, for they are rank with anti-Semitism and condemnations of realism, threatening as it did the humanity of Christ. This is the work of a closet Docetist (if Dickens understood that at all, which I doubt). It reflects a kind of religious sentimentalism that Millais and the other members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood were themselves exposing, and remains the predictable response of the secular press to this day when it encounters any dimension of Christianity that cannot be domesticated and mythologized. The furore indicates something other than simply the actual work, or the offence of its realism, it implies the threat of Roman Catholicism to an Anglican hegemony that was supposed to lie behind this work and movement (although the actual painting is very far from expressing Catholic sentiments) and in particular the depiction of the Virgin Mary is far from the Mariolotry of popular Catholic art in her haggard expression. It comes as no surprise then to remember that the picture, sold to the dealer Henry Farrer prior to its exhibition, was subsequently sold to the prominent Nonconformist collector in Leeds, Thomas Plint.

The picture, however, has a background in the High Church Tractarianism that was itself so controversial at the time. Millais probably heard Pusey preach a sermon in Oxford in the summer of 1849 for he lived in Oxford then. Pusey linked the text from Zechariah, which was its original title, with the passion of Christ, echoing the resulting painting in the imagery with which it prefigures the passion, following the interpretation of the medieval mystic Rupert of Deutz’s commentary. The wooden tools and the ladder prefigure the making of the cross, the sheep the sacrificial lamb; the water carried by John the Baptist and the well-head pump echoes the water of baptism, the work-bench the altar of Communion, and both the nail that has cut Jesus’ hand and the hammer that Joseph grips whilst at the same time gently touching Jesus shoulder in comfort, the tools of crucifixion. Mary, care-worn and rather plain (it is untrue to say she is ugly, as Dickens did) kneels like a supplicant at the Mass, or the figure at the foot of the cross, while John, the older boy, comes to serve Jesus, the younger. All is quietly observed by the dove, symbol of the Spirit, which perches where the cross

will be made. Above all, the central figure of Jesus, at this stage an apprentice carpenter, stares past Mary and out of the canvas, and seems to be caught up in some sudden presentient moment of realization that the wound in his palm, dripping blood onto his foot, foretold the manner of his death. The expected kiss by Jesus on Mary’s proffered cheek (had she already offered her kiss, and was waiting for its reciprocation) is stalled by this awareness, and the resulting gesture looks like a benediction. Indeed, the passion, of which this a prescient moment, is God’s most profound blessing upon a work-a-day world in all of its sweaty and grubby reality.

What does this have to say about apprenticeship? Jesus is the apprentice here, learning his trade the hard way in his father’s workshop. He is not at Nazareth College of Further Education learning his trade from books and carefully organized lessons, but in the reality of the family business. Apprenticeship applied to ministry is similarly lived out in real world pastoral and missional situations, learning the craft of ministry by working alongside those who know the trade. It is accompanied by the generations of Christians, those both older and younger, amongst whom ministry is exercised, and watched from outside (by those “sheep that are lost.”) Ministry can be wounding, and this is best learned early on, in the apprenticeship, lest for too long false hopes of glamour and success grow until, when shattered, much else is lost. What happens in ministerial apprenticeship echoes what will take place routinely and unguarded in the future, but for the time being with the close support of those whose love protects and comforts, and gives meaning to the wounds. Is it too fanciful to see in this picture a vision of ministerial apprenticeship? The senior colleagues with whom one works (Joseph and the assistant carpenter) and who get on with real, local congregation ministry while the apprentice observes and helps; the wisdom of an older generation, not necessarily in ministry (St Anne), who lean in to offer support and encouragement; and fellow apprentices (John the Baptist): all are present, while those closest to us, be they spouse or parents, are ready to give and receive the kiss of benediction. All is overshadowed by the cross and the Spirit, and worked out through sacrament and Word.

Millais worked hard to represent real, laboring life. The body of St Joseph was based upon a Holborn grocer, in his search for a genuine working-class musculature, and so this is no idealized depiction of human anatomy, but real muscles, veins and sun-burnt flesh. “The picture is replete with a Pre-Raphaelite approach to observed reality.”\textsuperscript{12} Apprenticeship as a model of ministerial formation is replete with attention to lived reality, to the actual ministry itself.

\textsuperscript{12} Rosenfeld, \textit{Millais}, 45.
Like the infamous exhibition of *Olympia* by Manet in 1865, itself a source of scandal for very different reasons, Millais is exploding the sentimental conventions of art that served to distance the observer from the harsher realities of life. Manet’s nude is no classically inflected source of hypocritical fantasy, but modeled by an infamous courtesan (probably familiar to many of the bourgeois habitués of the Salon) and without a doubt a prostitute, from her name to her slippers—she wears nothing else besides. Manet is saying, if you want to see a nude, here is a real one, not a fantasy figure from supposed antiquity. Millais is saying, if you want to depict Christ, then see it for the reality it is, not a saccharine version devoid of pain. If apprenticeships in ministry can do the same for the fantasies about serving Christ with which some approach formation, and, dangerously, then seek to perpetuate in their characterization of ministry, then it will have served a good purpose beyond an effective means of learning skills. It will have contributed to the formation in practices, which themselves, when properly ordered to the *telos* of Christ-conformity, shape both character and ministry in the virtues.

We now turn from those perspectives upon formation in ministry to the first of two parts that explore specific areas of formation viewed through the lens of virtue ethics. The first, which follows, takes a broad view of intellectual formation, spiritual formation, and the formation of character and practice. The second part explores in greater detail the practices summarized in the final chapter of this next section: the formation of the liturgist, the pastor, the spiritual guide, the missioner or evangelist, preacher and leader.