

SPIRITUALITY AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY: TRAJECTORIES TOWARD REENGAGEMENT

Randy L. Maddox

Theological discussion over the last three decades has been frenzied and diverse, and it has taken some turns that could not have been easily predicted on the basis of dominating trends in the first half of the twentieth century, particularly in the North Atlantic context. For example, there was little to suggest that spirituality would become an issue of focal interest in both popular culture and the churches, leading to a reconsideration in Roman Catholic circles of the classic discipline of Spiritual Theology and—even more surprising—a broad reversal of the longstanding mainstream Protestant suspicion about focusing on spirituality (either as an indicator of one’s individual Christian life or as a theological resource/topic).¹ Neither was there much hint of the ferment that has emerged over redefining the discipline of Practical Theology, seeking to reclaim for it a role more central to the overall task of Christian theology.²

The mere fact that these two developments emerged simultaneously raises the question of how they might be interrelated. But there is broader warrant for pursuing this question. Studies putting each of the developments in historical context quickly overlap, because both embody reactions to the course of earlier developments in Western Christian theology. This was a course in which Christian spirituality and Christian practice were turned into compartmentalized special topics, and these topics were marginalized from the defining task of “real” theology. The current discussions are driven by the desire to reclaim Practical Theology and considerations of spirituality as truly part of theology.³ Some might go even further, arguing that ultimately *all* theology is (or should be) practical theology, or *all* theology is (or should be) spiritual theology.⁴

When these two agendas intersect the question becomes: In what sense is Practical Theology concerned with spirituality? Or, in what sense is spirituality concerned with practice? The goal of this paper is to bring greater clarity to these questions. I will first provide a summary of the historical developments in Western theology that constitute the backdrop and stimulus for the present interest in reengagement. Next, I will survey the trajectories of the recent discussions of spirituality and Practical Theology that have brought them toward reengagement. Finally, I will identify the most promising fronts of the developing reengagement.

Historical Background to the Present Reengagement⁵

The current discussions about spirituality/Spiritual Theology and Practical Theology are both usually cast in terms of counteracting aspects of the historical development of theology as an academic discipline in the West. In this framing of the discussion there is typically a conviction that the practice (and implicit conception) of theology in the earliest church manifested an integration or holism—if only by default—that was lost in the later process of professionalization and specialization in theology, and that should now be recovered (albeit in a self-conscious and more sophisticated manner, *à la* Ricoeur’s “second naivete”). Such appeal to the precedent of the ancient church for reconsidering the understanding of theology today is hampered by the fact that they rarely applied the term *theologia* to materials or activities that would today be designated “theology.” But reflection on their practice reveals recognition of (and characteristic concerns about) five distinct dimensions of the overall theological enterprise.

The first, most foundational, dimension of theology evident from the earliest days of the church is their assumption that a *basic worldview* should orient believers’ lives. As Paul put it, Christians will perceive things rightly and act appropriately only when they have the “mind of Christ.” That this involves holistic dispositions, not merely intellectual convictions, is evident by Paul’s parallel emphasis on Christians nurturing the “fruit of the Spirit.” The orienting “mind of Christ” fosters an inclination toward loving service of others (Phil. 2). Importantly, through its first centuries the Christian community equated “spirituality” with such living of everyday life in the world in accordance with the Spirit of Christ.

The recognition that a developed orienting worldview is not divinely implanted at Christian conversion lies behind the second dimension of the theological enterprise evident in the practice of the early church—the *pastoral⁶ task of forming/reforming this worldview*. Since the worldview in question was ho-

listic, this task included a variety of activities aimed at invoking and shaping beliefs, affections, and character dispositions. It gave prominence to careful crafting of such materials as hymns, liturgies, catechetical orations, and spiritual discipline manuals.

The production of such “first-order” theological materials inevitably spawned “*second-order*” *theological debates* (a third dimension of the overall theological enterprise). That is, it sparked debates both over the adequacy of particular practices for forming the Christian worldview and over alternative conceptions of that basic worldview and its implications. A good example would be the early debate over whether it is appropriate to address prayers directly to the Holy Spirit. Reflections on this liturgical practice led quickly into the range of issues about the Christian understanding of God.⁷ The point that must be emphasized is that debate over these issues in the early church was not limited to exegetical or philosophical concerns. A central focus of reflection was the “practical” or “spiritual” implications of alternative refinements of the basic orienting Christian worldview.⁸ Moreover, just as it drew from spirituality/practice in reaching its decisions, such second-order reflection was ultimately geared to readdressing spirituality/practice by means of first-order theological activities. It could take very formal expression in conciliar creeds, but its fruitful outcomes were never intended to be restricted to this expression.

The dimensions of the theological enterprise considered so far are primarily formative, focusing on those who have embraced (to some degree) the Christian worldview. The fourth dimension evident in early Christian circles is more apologetic in aim, shifting the focus to *engaging self-consciously those who question or reject Christian beliefs and practices*. But even here the formative element is not entirely absent. In the first place, dialogues with critics often helped to clarify aspects and implications of the Christian worldview. More importantly, the questions that outsiders articulated were typically gnawing at insiders as well, and their resolution served to enable a deeper appropriation and integration of the Christian worldview by believers.

The final dimension of the overall theological enterprise evident in the early church is the concern to *train new generations within the community of believers to carry out the formative, normative, and apologetic dimensions* of this enterprise. Through the early centuries this training took place largely by mentoring. As such, it did not tend to generate distinctive forms of theological expression. Rather one learned how to engage in first-order, second-order, and apologetic activities under the guidance of a practicing bishop/pastor, abbot, catechist, and so on.

The various dimensions of theological activity remained directed primarily toward daily Christian praxis through the first millennium of the Western church, with the result that theology as a whole was typically considered a “practical discipline” (*scientia practica*). The most notable divergence growing in theology during this time was between those who focused on shepherding Christians in their daily lives in the world and those who specialized in directing the daily pursuit of holiness by monastics. The monastic emphasis on withdrawal and asceticism gradually fostered a redefinition of “spirituality” in more dualistic terms.⁹ It moved from being the whole of life empowered and guided by the Spirit to being that form of life—or that aspect of life—that most contrasted with physical (spiritual versus material) or ordinary (spiritual versus temporal) reality.

The impact of this redefinition was accentuated in the thirteenth century as cathedral schools spun off into free-standing universities in the Christian West. This change in social location affected the (fifth) training dimension of theology dramatically. The task of introducing new generations to the theological enterprise moved from mentors, who were actively engaged in theological shepherding of communities of believers, to academic specialists, who were freed from other tasks to concentrate on theological argumentation and teaching. With the more intentional nature of instruction in the academy, the “standard” form of theological expression switched from such first-order materials as liturgies and spiritual guides to systematic codifications of the conclusions of second-order theological dispute. While the best teachers worked to maintain some connection to daily Christian life, the impetus pushed toward redefining theology as a speculative discipline (*scientia theoretica*) that was primarily intended for, and accessible to, an intellectual elite. The most vigorous criticism of this development came from monastics (particularly Franciscans), another group of elites who championed an alternative “spiritual” or “practical” theology that focused on prescribing the path to mystical union for those dedicated to denying worldly ends and pursuing this goal. Neither elite theology had much concern for—or impact upon—the typical Christian layperson. The assumption that the first dimension of theology (basic orienting worldview) was the touchstone for the other dimensions was clearly fading.

The scholastic theology that came to characterize the medieval universities is noted for its drive for comprehensiveness. Thus Thomas Aquinas eventually incorporated the central concerns of monastic theology (guidelines for pursuing a Christian’s spiri-

tual end) into the final section of his *Summa*—which detailed the creature’s response to God’s outflowing grace. As this placement became standard this subsection of theology attracted the label “Practical Theology,” since it was devoted to Christian *practice*, as distinguished from “Theoretical (or Speculative) Theology,” which dealt with Christian *beliefs*. With the decreasing sense of the dimension of theology as a basic orienting worldview this distinction served more to frame the crucial question than to answer it: How are Christian beliefs related to Christian practices?

Another distinction that proved unavoidable in Roman Catholic scholasticism was between ordinary Christian practice and the practice of those pursuing spiritual vocations. This led to a subdivision within Practical Theology: an opening section was devoted to clarifying the ethical expectations incumbent upon all Christians (under the title “Moral Theology”); then a second section (designated “Spiritual Theology”) detailed the course toward the highest Christian calling for the spiritual elite. This latter section was itself eventually subdivided into “Ascetical Theology,” which studied the life of perfection up to the beginning of passive mystical experience; and “Mystical Theology,” which studied that life from the beginning of passive mystical experience to its culmination in the most perfect union possible this side of the Beatific Vision. This solidified a process through which “spirituality” had moved from being the characteristic of *all* Christian life to being an *optional* commitment for a Christian elite, and “spiritual theology” had moved from being a possible characterization of all theology to being a highly specialized topic within the scholastic compendium.

The structural division of moral and spiritual theology in Roman Catholic scholasticism (and the subtle subordination of the latter to the former) left Moral Theology focused on acts, rules, and casuistry, with little consideration of the need for (or means of) forming inclinations and dispositions to moral action.¹⁰ Ironically, reaction to Roman Catholicism pushed Protestant scholastic theologies in the same direction. Their rejection of any distinction between ordinary and elite Christians, combined with their worry about the danger of “works-righteousness,” led them to strip the subsection of Spiritual Theology from the section on Practical Theology, leaving it comprised of moral theology alone. Topics such as prayer and scripture study, if they appeared in a scholastic compendium, were thereby typically recast within a collection of the “duties” of the Christian life. It is small wonder that Protestant scholasticism was soon under attack by “pietists,” who echoed the earlier critique of the emerging university model of theology by defenders of an alternative “spiritual theology.” The rhetoric of the critique only reenforced mainstream Protestant uneasiness with “spirituality,” leaving pietists with little choice but to set up alternative schools for nurturing (everyday) Christian piety.

Over time many of these pietist schools quietly appropriated the structures and assumptions of scholastic theology. Meanwhile all schools—Protestant and Roman Catholic alike—were adopting the specialization that was reshaping the modern Western university. In the beginning it was assumed that the knowledge (*scientia*) pursued in the university was a unified whole. This single subject matter was what purportedly united the various disciplines. However, the proliferation of knowledge, with its resulting specialization, undermined this unity. The eventual result was that the university became an aggregate of sciences, distinguished by their differing subject matter while (supposedly) united by their method. Academic theology mirrored this move, with the subdivisions of the scholastic compendium becoming now a set of discrete subject-defined disciplines—most typically: Biblical Theology, Historical Theology, Systematic Theology, and Practical Theology. From the beginning Systematic Theology laid claim to being “theology” in the most proper sense of the term, calling into question the nature of the other disciplines.¹¹

When it first acquired discrete disciplinary status, Practical Theology’s subject matter was identified as general Christian life. Its task was to formulate norms for this life. In other words, it was Moral Theology (with a subdivision of Spiritual Theology in Roman Catholic treatments, for those seeking the praxis of perfection). This identification changed during the nineteenth century. On one side, Kant’s analysis of practical reason had the affect of restricting Practical Theology’s task to merely *applying* to current practice theories that were developed independently by Systematic Theology. (This proved not to be too large of an assignment, since Systematic Theology in the modern age was increasingly preoccupied by the apologetic dimension of the theological enterprise.) On the other side, after Schleiermacher’s theological encyclopedia gained influence the subject field of Practical Theology was progressively narrowed: first, to ecclesial practices; and then, to the practices of clergy. That is, Practical Theology became Pastoral Theology—a discipline aimed at preparing clergy to handle the technical aspects of their profession. In the process both Moral Theology and (in Roman Catholic circles) Spiritual Theology were granted greater independence.

Whatever the benefits of this freedom, it posed the danger of further obscuring possible intercon-

nections between spiritual experience/formation, moral sensitivity/inclination, and Christian worldview convictions. This was particularly the case when Kant also persuaded contemporary ethicists to appropriate an “intellectualist-decisionistic” moral psychology, while Schleiermacher was teaching those concerned about personal religious sensitivities to understand the affections on an “experiential-expressivist” model. In the former case, there was little sense of the need for nurturing affectional dispositions to (moral) action. In the latter case, worldview convictions were understood more as derived from “feelings” than as grammars for helping shape appropriate affections.¹²

Trajectory of Recent Renewed Emphasis on Spirituality

The preceding historical sketch provides helpful perspective for discerning the trajectory of the recent North Atlantic interest in spirituality. The term and topic of spirituality remained largely submerged in Protestant circles through the first half of the twentieth century. Most Protestants, if pressed, would likely have identified spirituality with observing traditional practices of congregational religiosity. Meanwhile in Roman Catholic circles it continued to be identified primarily with the practices of those pursuing religious vocations. As such, when cultural interest in spirituality began to emerge in the late 1960s it took reactionary forms. There was high interest in the spiritual practices and emphases of other religions, and in the spiritual dimension of idealist philosophies and humanistic psychologies. Even appeals to specifically Christian spirituality were usually framed in direct contrast with typical middle-class religious practices and dogmatic definitions of religious life. As one might expect, the product of such ferment has been diverse—some of what has been paraded as “spirituality” borders on narcissistic emotional masturbation; much seems less dangerous, but fails to rise above “spirituality lite”; yet there is also evidence of openness to the Divine and willingness to draw from the breadth of Christian wisdom concerning spiritual disciplines.¹³

This character of the current discussion helps explain why recent attempts to present and account for Christian spirituality often start by defining spirituality in generic terms. For example, Sandra Schneiders focuses spirituality in the experience of consciously striving to integrate one’s life in terms not of isolation and self-absorption but of self-transcendence toward the ultimate value one perceives; while Michael Downey identifies two constants to any spirituality: (1) an awareness that there are levels of reality not immediately apparent; and (2) the search for personal integration because of fragmentation and depersonalization.¹⁴ In both cases they proceed to argue that it would be inappropriate to summarily rule out religious beliefs, religious traditions, or religious community in seeking this integration.

The flip side of such defenses of the legitimacy of a religious spirituality has been the critique of the forms of spirituality that dominated Christian communities into mid-century. This is particularly the case in Roman Catholic settings where standard complaints include the elitism, individualism, otherworldliness, and theoretical nature of classical Spiritual Theology.¹⁵ In Protestant settings the more typical complaint has been about the neglect of traditional practices and the tendency to divorce personal piety from all relationship to theological convictions.¹⁶

What alternative is recommended? As one of the leading figures in the renewed focus on Christian spirituality, Sandra Schneiders can again serve as representative. She argues that there has been a progressive widening of the horizon that is assigned to spirituality. For some in the contemporary discussion (at least in its early stages) Christian spirituality had to do mainly with *prayer*. A second group assigned spirituality a slightly wider parameter, embracing not just prayer but an intensified *faith life* within the whole of daily experience. A third group moved the horizon wider yet, defining spirituality to include not only obvious “faith” dimensions of life but the *whole of one’s personal experience*—including particularly one’s bodily and emotional experience. And the final group that Schneiders identifies broadened the horizon of spirituality to include (indeed, focus on!) the implications of Christian commitments for *social and political life*.¹⁷

It should be apparent that the trajectory Schneiders is tracing here is broadly a reversal of the historical developments sketched above. The dualistic tendency to focus spiritual concern away from everyday physical and social realities is being overturned. Christian spirituality is being redefined from something pursued by only an elite to something central to any person’s life. And spirituality is being recognized to involve more than “mere” feelings, it is being reclaimed as a holistic worldview that orients one’s life in the world.

Trajectory of Recent Debate over Practical Theology¹⁸

The recent debate around redefining the discipline of Practical Theology has followed a trajectory that is

remarkably similar to the progressive broadening of the horizons of spirituality. Under the model of Pastoral Theology, which reigned through mid-century, the subject-field of this discipline was restricted to the range of practices involved in pastoral ministry (preaching, liturgy, pastoral care, and so on). Discontentment with this restriction sparked the recent debate. The first foray used the argument that ministry was the task of the whole community of faith to enlarge the subject-field to include the internal practice of the entire church (and reclaimed the title “Practical Theology” in the process). Before long most moved to embrace a significant nuancing of this broadened identification. They still focused the discipline on the church as a whole, but now with a special emphasis on the placement of the Christian community in the world, and our resulting outward mission. On these terms, discussion of even “internal” topics such as worship takes on a consideration of how they prepare for, encourage, or express Christian practice in and to the world. One senses here a renewing of the close association of Practical Theology and Moral Theology. This association is even stronger for the group who are currently championing a broader identification yet of the subject-field of Practical Theology: religious/moral practice in the world. While the church is part of this subject-field, it is not programmatically identified as the center of all God's work in the world. Rather, attention is directed to the moral/religious dimensions of general human culture. The goal of Practical Theology then becomes development of a “public” account of proper practice in the world; i.e., an account that is not confessionally-dependent upon the church.

The initial attempts to return from Pastoral Theology to Practical Theology by enlarging the subject-field of the discipline to include the whole church retained, by and large, the restricted understanding of its task as applying theories previously developed by Systematic Theology to the practice of the church. Most participants more recently have advocated a more integral role for Practical Theology in the overall theological project of correlating Christian truth with the present situation. For example, some assign Practical Theology the task of *analyzing* the current situation in its subject-field, drawing all the help it can from the various human and social sciences. This information is then fed into the larger theological enterprise. While the descriptive task is clearly important, other participants question the limitation of the task of Practical Theology simply to one of description, arguing that it should also involve a step of *critical reflection*. Of course, the crucial question then becomes: “Where and how does Practical Theology obtain the norms by which to undertake a critique of its subject-field?” For some these norms are apparently understood to emerge from the consideration of the subject-field itself. In other words, these folk construe the task of Practical Theology as clarifying the *implicit* theological convictions of contemporary ecclesial practice (or, general religious practice) and then critiquing that practice in light of its immanent norms. Concern to critique present practice by more than just its own fallible internal norms has led most participants in the current debates to articulate the task of Practical Theology as instead the *correlation* of critically-appraised theological theory with critically-investigated practice.

The move to define the task of Practical Theology in this broader fashion has been viewed by some in the theological academy as an inappropriate blurring of disciplinary boundaries. I see it instead as a long-needed effort, struggling within the constraints of the modern theological academy, to reclaim the primacy of the first dimension of the theological task identified above. It locates the defining expression of theology not in apologetics, or in second-order doctrinal reflection, but in Christian *praxis*—i.e., in Christian activity that arises from orienting convictions and gives rise in the process to reflection on the adequacy of these convictions.

Reengaging Spirituality and Practical Theology

The key thing to notice in the trajectories just sketched of the recent discussions of spirituality and Practical Theology is their convergence in reclaiming a focus on the role of orienting worldview convictions within Christian life. This convergence raises the question of what each discussion might add to the other. What might an explicit consideration of spirituality add to present understandings of Practical Theology? And how might current forms or understandings of Christian spirituality be enriched by distinctive emphases of Practical Theology?

The Roles of Spirituality in Practical Theology

Let me begin with Practical Theology. While they have debated over the boundaries for their subject-matter, recent proposals for redefining Practical Theology have broadly agreed on the character of this subject-matter—they focus on overt practices or actions, and their demonstrable implicit principles. This focus is heavily dictated by the university setting of most North Atlantic theological education, and the expect-

tation to defend the “scientific” status of disciplines operating in this arena. Those developing and defending models of Practical Theology have taken as their exemplars the social sciences and critical theory (i.e., the *handlungswissenschaften*) with their orientation to “objective” practices and actions. But this focus also reflects the continuing influence of the classic equation of Practical Theology with a Moral Theology that had been specifically distinguished from Spiritual Theology (which we noted above had left Moral Theology focused on acts, rules, and casuistry).

A few voices in the recent debates over Practical Theology have decried the dominant focus on “external” practices and actions, arguing that the discipline should also devote attention to such human experiences/emotions as doubt, joy, anxiety, and hope.¹⁹ Since attention to such emotions is classically central to spiritual formation, this argument could be characterized as a call to reintegrate Moral Theology and Spiritual Theology within Practical Theology. The need for such reintegration becomes all the more evident as we break out of the long dominant Kantian intellectualist moral psychology, appreciating anew the contribution of motivating inclinations to all human actions and how these inclinations are often *affects* (i.e., awakened responsively by our attunement to impinging realities—including realities above the level of the immediately evident).

This suggests that a Practical Theology aimed at provoking critically-reflective Christian life cannot succeed without taking spirituality seriously. In the first place, in Sandra Schneiders’ terms, it must recognize that what provokes and funds theological reflection (i.e., the relevant material of its subject-field) is holistic spirituality, not just overt practices.²⁰ And, as William Spohn argues, when attention turns to the goal of effecting new critically-reflective action it must take advantage not only of moral injunctions but particularly of the holistic and transformative impact of classic spiritual disciplines.²¹

The emphasis on transformative disciplines suggests one other way that consideration of spirituality could enrich recent work in Practical Theology. While this work has recovered an emphasis on the first dimension in theological activity, it has not paid as much attention to the second dimension—the importance of first-order formative activities. This deficit is understandable, in that the goal of recent work has been to break out of the Pastoral Theology model that limited attention to such topics as homiletics and catechetical training. But reflection on spirituality will serve to remind us of just how important such formative activities are, and call us to engage these activities in new ways that are not bound within the limits of the clerical paradigm.

The Role of Practices in Spirituality

Ironically, the contribution that Practical Theology can make to the current emphasis on spirituality in North Atlantic culture will be heightened precisely to the degree that it reclaims an appreciation for and creative engagement in such classic formative spiritual activities. This is because the renewed emphasis on spirituality has been so reactionary in character and has carried implicit in its core Schleiermacher’s emotional-expressivist assumptions. In his perceptive study *After Heaven: Spirituality in America Since the 1950s*, Robert Wuthnow aptly characterizes the dominant forms of spirituality through the last three decades as a “spirituality of seeking.” Without denying the authenticity and benefits of these forms, he argues that time has demonstrated that they were too fluid to provide individuals with the social support they need or to encourage the stability and dedication required to grow spiritually and to mature in character. They have tended to encourage a spirituality of “dabbling” rather than one of depth. Against this background Wuthnow argues that what is needed in our churches and culture at large is recovery of the ancient wisdom of a practice-oriented spirituality (by which he means a spirituality that emphasizes formative practices/disciplines).

The receptivity to attempts like that of Kathleen Norris to articulate anew this ancient wisdom lends warrant to both Wuthnow’s diagnosis and his prescription.²² And it leads me to conclude that the lesson emerging from the two discussions we have been tracing is that just as a truly Practical Theology must engage spirituality, a true spirituality must engage those formative practices that “free” us for Christ-like life in the world.

Notes

1. A good sense of this interest in spirituality and its impact both within culture at large and on Roman Catholic and Protestant theology can be gained from comparing three recent books: Michael Downey, *Understanding Christian Spirituality* (New York: Paulist, 1996); Diogenes Allen, *Spiritual Theology: The Theology of Yesterday for Spiritual Help Today* (Boston: Cowley, 1997); and Robert Wuthnow, *After Heaven: Spirituality in America Since the 1950s* (Berkeley, CA: University of California, 1998).
2. See the survey of this discussion in Randy L.

- Maddox, "Practical Theology: A Discipline in Search of a Definition," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 18 (1991):159–69.
3. I will capitalize "Practical Theology" and "Spiritual Theology" when I am referring to specialized disciplines within scholastic theologies and the present academic curriculum, leaving them in lower case when they are intended more to denote the character of theology as a whole.
 4. Cf. the concluding sections of Randy L. Maddox, "Recovering Theology as a Practical Discipline: A Contemporary Agenda," *Theological Studies* 51 (1990):650–72; and Roch Kereszty. "Theology and Spirituality: The Task of a Synthesis," *Communio* 10.4 (1983):314–31.
 5. For more details and bibliographical support for this summary see Maddox, "Recovering Theology"; Sandra M. Schneiders. "Theology and Spirituality: Strangers, Rivals, or Partners?" *Horizons* 13 (1986):253–74; and Mark O'Keefe, *Becoming Good, Becoming Holy: On the Relationship of Christian Ethics and Spirituality* (New York: Paulist, 1995).
 6. I am using this term to describe the nature of the task, not to delimit who might engage in it. The tendency (at least in the Western church) to restrict such formative work to clergy is regrettable and unjustified.
 7. Cf. Basil's *On the Holy Spirit*.
 8. This point has been emphasized most recently by Ellen Charry, in "The Moral Function of Doctrine," *Theology Today* 49 (1992):31–45; and *By the Renewing of Your Minds: The Pastoral Function of Christian Doctrines* (New York: Oxford, 1997).
 9. Early stages of mendicant orders like the Franciscans directly challenged this emerging dualism, but over time it influenced even their practice—and found expression in their published materials.
 10. Cf. William C. Spohn, "Spirituality and Ethics: Exploring the Connections," *Theological Studies* 58 (1997):109–23.
 11. Cf. Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1983).
 12. The topic of moral psychology is a recently recovered focus of scholarly discussion. For a typological sketch of options and reflection on their implications, see Randy L. Maddox, "Reconnecting the Means to the End: A Wesleyan Prescription for the Holiness Movement," *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 33.2 (1998):29–66, esp. 33–38. For more of Schleiermacher's "experiential-expressivism," see George Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster, 1984).
 13. For more on this, see Wuthnow, *After Heaven*; Paul C. Vitz. *Psychology as Religion: The Cult of Self-Worship*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994); Bradley Holt, *Thirst for God: A Brief History of Christian Spirituality* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1993); and L. Gregory Jones, "A Thirst for God or Consumer Spirituality?" *Modern Theology* 13 (1997):3–28.
 14. See Schneiders, "Theology and Spirituality," 266; and Downey, *Understanding Christian Spirituality*, 23.
 15. E.g., Schneiders, 264–65; Downey, 58–59.
 16. E.g., Allen, *Spiritual Theology*, esp. 153–61.
 17. Schneiders, "Theology and Spirituality," 254.
 18. For bibliographical examples see Maddox, "Practical Theology."
 19. Two early examples are Eilert Herms, *Theologie—eine Erfahrungswissenschaft* (Munich: Christian Kaiser, 1978); and Volker Weymann, "Gegensatzerfahrungen: Zum Praxisbezug praktischer Theologie," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 82 (1985):455–76.
 20. Schneiders, "Theology and Spirituality," 270.
 21. Spohn, "Spirituality and Ethics," 112.
 22. See esp. Kathleen Norris, *Dakota: A Spiritual Geography* (New York: Ticknor & Fields, 1993); and Norris, *The Cloister Walk* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1996).