
Religious Pedagogy As an Empirical Science?

Reliģiskā pedagogija kā empīriskā zinātne?

Klaus Kießling, Dr. theol., Dr. psych. (Deutschland)

Religious pedagogy as a practical-theological discipline devotes itself to the scientific reflection and orientation of religious processes of learning. The article approaches the issue of a religious pedagogy from the perspective of empirical methodology. The purpose of the author is to point out that *theological* criteria are needed for understanding empirical evidence. According to the three kinds of relationship between theology and empirical science corresponding models of empirical theology can be formed: multi-, inter- and intradisciplinary models. Religious pedagogy can only become theologically practical and creative when it starts on empirical level and interconnects this empirical knowledge interdisciplinarily, thus triggering changes in the practice of schools, educational process and within society. The author proposes trinity-theological approach as a criterion for interdisciplinary discussion between empirical science and practical theology. Article suggests creation-theological, christological and pneumatological groundings of the interdisciplinary relationship.

Key words: religious pedagogy, practical theology, empirical theology, interdisciplinarity, trinity-theological approach

Religious pedagogy – practical theology – empirical science – interdisciplinarity

1. Religious Pedagogy...

“At this point a... possibility to gain control of the crisis of religious education is outlined: the empirical research. The understanding that it can't be enough to attribute the crisis to an unwillingness of the young people to open up themselves or to the limited skills of teachers or to situations in which faith may be harmed ... is not at last reason enough for me to hint to this point... We have to give up our prejudice against an empirical research in the field of religious education. No one benefits if we continue to ensure that the success of religious education can't be measured empirically, that faith is not a matter of education, that God may also bless even the worst classes at school and that the situation as a whole may be substantially better than it is usually conceived.”¹

These sentences date back to the year 1968: Religious education in Germany is

subject to strong criticism. A number of studies arise where the result, however, is not really doing away the questions of religious education, because the validity and reliability of its outcome is often uncertain. The introducing words call for an empirical turnaround in religious pedagogy, because precise diagnostic is needed in the first place to let therapy swing into action.

What is the aim of an empirical science, or even of religious pedagogy as an empirical science? Is it limited to measurable and methodologically controllable means – those means that just have an intrinsic lack of what really matters? Is it concentrated in calculating outcomes and plotting frequency charts to an extent where theology does not matter at all?

Religious pedagogy as a practical-theological discipline devotes itself to the scientific reflection and orientation of religious processes of learning. Religious pedagogy as an empirical science? An empirical science distinguishes itself by choosing a specific methodological approach and appears in its distinct form: as pedagogy, as psychology, as sociology. Before I shed light on different paths of empirical science I will give an outline of my lecture, which will lead to the debate on established models of empirical theology. I hereby try to point out that *theological* criteria are needed to understand empirical evidence. In order to satisfy the resulting need I suggest trinity-theological approaches to the discussion between empirical science and practical theology that are of an exemplary nature. Finally I will refer to the title question of this report: Religious pedagogy as an empirical science?

...and empirical sciences

I plead for a wide definition of what means “empirical” – for the following two reasons.

On the one hand the attribute “empirical” refers to experience characterizing any vivid theology: Isn’t it a fact that even theological contents which bible and history bear witness to do stem from experience and are in a broader sense based on empirical “ground”?

On the other hand it is important for me to distinguish between empirical research and quantifying research in order to put empirical research in a light where its characteristic referral to experience is highlighted through the use of quantitative *as well as* qualitative methods. In order to receive a successful result the search for adequate research methods for a specific task steers a course between two cliffs: On the one side even advocates of traditionally quantitatively oriented disciplines admit the risk of basing their discipline only on measurable and calculating means; on the other side an orientation towards qualitative perspectives does not exclude the need for quantifications. It can indeed make sense to enter the fields of number-crunching calculations: The choice of a method depends on the object being analyzed, on the matter of interest and the level of research. In practical theology there is no need to reanimate and repeat formerly induced battles or just mock battles between qualitative and quantitative empirical research.

A question known by roughly every German who watches the news on public television is: “What political party would you vote for if parliamentary elections were held next Sunday?” This question is one of quantitative social research. Such a survey is only done to measure people’s present preferences of political parties. If it is not, however, sufficient to calculate responses, i.e. if a pilot-study is set up in a field that has

not been subject to any research before; a qualitative social research is usually applied. Qualitative social research aims at discovering coherences, for example qualities of religious education and their first findings in scientifically undeveloped areas. Therefore characteristics of these main orientations of empirical science are indicated: A primarily *qualitative* approach proves to be the method of choice when a weak state of research implies open questions for small sample sizes in order to start the generation of hypotheses. *Quantitative* research, however, is used in cases where theory-building is developed to a level that so-called items can be operationalized. These items can then be used in a questionnaire where they will be applied in a large, probably representative sample size in order to prove the hypotheses just being established.

Empirical sciences² distinguish between data collection, data preparation and data evaluation. The creation of data – mainly numbers and texts – is accomplished by oral examinations such as interviews to gain insight into biographies or enquiries on the telephone; or by written examinations, for instance questionnaires and statements; or by observations, i.e. purposeful perception of social situations and developments; or by other methods, such as creating sociograms to gain knowledge of the interrelation of members of a group.

The way data are *collected* has specific implications of preparation and evaluation. Data *preparation* in case of interviews is done in transcripts and protocols, processing quantitative data, in contrast, is usually done in computerized data sheets. The *evaluation* occurs in *quantitative* examinations in a descriptive way. This is established by characteristic identification numbers and graphs with frequency distributions, average values and variances or with a statistical correlation, i.e. the relationship of two criteria such as religiousness and mental health. In contrast to descriptive statistics inference statistics aims at drawing conclusions of a sample in favor of a basic population, for example “the Germans” or “the Latvians”. In *qualitative* examinations the analysis of text is established by content analysis³ and in grounded theory-building⁴ which starts with the collection of data as well as in other hermeneutical and phenomenological procedures⁵.

Religious pedagogy as an empirical science? The following models are based on an hermeneutic-empirical discipline⁶.

2. Models of empirical theology...

These models pave the way for an empirical theology. Three kinds of relationships between theology and empirical sciences can be classified: multi-, inter- and interdisciplinary models.

In a *multidisciplinary* model more than one scientific discipline shed light on one particular object to be examined. As a consequence we receive a two-phase model – in the sense that an empirical science collects, prepares and evaluates data; the outcome of these steps will then be subject to theological discussion. But how can we analyze the relationship between the two phases? Does the preceding empirical science act as a lens for us to see theological matters in a new perspective? This picture cannot be kept up because every science, even an empirical science has its own perspective with its own characteristic options for its contents. It can't be reduced to the collection of data in a state where it is important what *is*, contrary to theology's normative state of what *should be*. Rather the transition between these two phases leaves behind an epistemological “break”⁷ of the two sciences.

In contrast to the multidisciplinary model the *interdisciplinary* model is based on a mutual relationship between its participating sciences, for example in favor of converging options⁸. We have to ask ourselves, however, how such a dialogue between them bearing the same rights can work out if the chosen methods and normative requirements *diverge*.

Can theology only become capable of holding dialogues when it expands its spectrum of methods beyond those provided by literature studies, science of history and philosophy? The *intradisciplinary* model is based on the assumption that theology itself becomes empirical: “Therefore the intradisciplinary model does what theology has done throughout its existence: a rational adoption and processing of new methods and techniques created in other scientific areas in favor of a theological task fulfilled by a theologian himself”⁹. Here several questions arise.

...and their consequences

An intradisciplinary model may be limited to theological reception of non-theological *methods* and *techniques*. But even this methodological “toolbox” itself is equipped in contact with concrete *contents*, and this model can apply its toolbox only in the context of specific – from now on theological – coherences. The intradisciplinary model does not have “free” access to this toolbox if empirical sciences are furthermore seen as not being value-free, even in the way they define themselves¹⁰. Rather practical theology pays large tribute to this toolbox: it finds itself in the role of an ancilla of empirical sciences – not however, because an empirical discipline played the role of a domina, but: rather it appears to me that the colonial master is part of the theological decision-making body while theology not only receives but also makes colonial decisions – maybe, because theology believes empirical data could be a “value-free” input for it, without touching normative contents; maybe, because theology develops more confidence in empirical research than it has in its own theological competence.

I – and I’m not left alone¹¹ – get the impression that the unavoidable implicit normativity of any empirical knowledge can, in a theological context, reach a dominance that theology itself can probably not surpass. Obviously *theological* criteria are needed to handle empirical knowledge. It is decisive to mention that not only today’s practical applications, which have to be examined empirically, prove to be of theological weight, but also vice versa that theology plays a major role in practice of today and in the future through its generative strength. A theology that does its research empirically backs the – at least, but nonetheless – selective perception of today’s practice, often even articulating the motives and goals pushing Christians in practice. Practical theology can only become practical, when it starts on an empirical level; but it becomes practical just in case it doesn’t stop at the point where it gains empirical knowledge stabilizing only existing conditions, but where it interrelates this empirical knowledge interdisciplinarily, thus inducing a change in practice in schools, communities, families, media and society. For this reason I do consider the differentiation of *empirical* and *conceptual* theology to be highly recommendable¹².

What alternatives, what theological criteria for dealing with empirical knowledge can be developed on grounds of this?

3. Theological alternatives ...

The Second Vatican Council (1962 – 1965) tells us in its Pastoral Constitution

unmisleadingly: “Through its existence alone (..) each and every reality has (..) its own legal framework and its own rules that we have to respect – thereby accepting sciences and techniques in their specific methods”¹³. Especially the “fundamental ideas of Christian education shall (..) be added with the help of recently gained knowledge of a healthy psychology and pedagogy”¹⁴, however leaving unanswered what turns psychology or pedagogy into a healthy one. The well-known German Council theologian and Jesuit Karl Rahner (1904 – 1984) gives support claiming that sciences “not only where they make empirical statements (..) but also where they become normative, have to accept that theology confronts them with questions concerning their image of man and woman”¹⁵. Rahner assumes that – despite pluralism of sciences and their autonomy – each of them refers to “a common uniquely human focus”¹⁶, maybe in an unacknowledged way, but indispensable to any science’s life. This common human focus administers each science, but cannot be administered by science – and eventually plays a bridge-building role in the interdisciplinary dialogue. Therefore this dialogue depends on criteria that are sufficient to explain and justify the participating sciences in their autonomy and right to exist, but also on criteria spanning bridges between different sciences: we call these disciplines *independent to each other*. Apart from criteria that have or have not already been mentioned above, I additionally suggest a trinity-theological approach in dealing with empirical sciences.

...on trinity-oriented grounds

We are not only in danger of not having our own theological criteria needed for dealing with empirical knowledge and therefore failing to resist non-theological sciences in their colonial impact. We are also in danger of building a wall against non-theological sciences – while loosing the fruitful chance of interdisciplinarity. For this reason we ask ourselves if empirically measurable knowledge can be displayed in the context of theological hermeneutics, if this can be accomplished, and how strong theological hermeneutics is in conflict with empirical plausibilities. On the one hand protecting the autonomy of empirical knowledge is important. On the other hand the question is if and how empirical knowledge can be understood in a theological framework. The grounding of the relationship between theology and empirical sciences has to honor the autonomy of empirical knowledge in a creation-theological way. But what if the heart of Christianities’ faith lies in the commitment to the trinity of God? The interdisciplinary relationship then also needs christological and pneumatological groundings – that come straight out of the middle of the trinity-structured center of our Christian faith.

A *creation-theological* approach deals with autonomous processes of human beings and other creatures, even with the creation of “profane”¹⁷ sciences and their developments. This approach points out that all these processes are borne by the Creator. Therefore a creation-theological hermeneutics is needed to let both of them – the creatures as well as the Creator – do their own part and happen their own processes. At this point we come to what Karl Rahner¹⁸ proposes when he introduces the term of an *active self-transcendence* of the created and when he understands the momentum of the created as a self-motivated momentum inspired by God. In the sense of the creation-theological hermeneutics empirical sciences have to be simultaneously honored in their autonomy as well as theologically understood as a reality that is being protected and supported by God.

With respect to the *christological* grounding of the relationship of theology and

“profane” sciences I refer to the Council of Chalcedony (451). It defends itself against monophysitical tendencies by carrying the attribute “unmixed”. According to these tendencies humanity and deity of Christ form only *one* nature leading to an exclusive appreciation of the divine nature and disregard of the human nature. The attribute “unseparated” stands against the Nestorian tendency to separate the understanding of Christ in two beings. By attributing “profane” sciences to theology we receive a double analogy. In the sense of the Council of Chalcedony a monophysitical determination of this relationship is not permitted as it overpromotes mixtures allowing every other science to interfere with theology, to lose its profane autonomy and finally to merge in theology; at the same time the Council disapproves splitting up in two completely separate disciplines and the breaking off of interdisciplinarity as a Nestorian act.

In contrast to a creation-theological approach basing its concepts on empirical grounds and asking for their theological dignity, a *pneumatological* approach occurs vice versa, as it states the spirit of love, faith and hope – a Holy Spirit able to accept human knowledge in its autonomy as well as to radicalize it with respect to its final goal and fulfillment. By perceiving both of these approaches, we are neither in danger of only extending profane-scientific concepts into the area of theology and leaving theology as a hollow, empty construct, nor in danger that theological assumptions solely go back to those profane-scientific concepts which just confirm theological decisions taken long before empirical sciences are consulted – with one-sided interest only for those scientific results which come in handy and can easily be taken away from a quarry of empirical knowledge, while leaving behind theologically challenging knowledge which is too big and too heavy to carry away.

The autonomy of profane-scientific knowledge and regularities is not exposed to theologically motivated threat while founding the interdisciplinary work on trinity-theological criteria, but rather to its own theological grounding; at the same time these criteria provide a grounding of this interdisciplinary relationship in terms of interplay of creation-theological, christological and pneumatological hermeneutics. More matters of concern are finally related to this¹⁹.

4. Pleading against methodological monocultures...

By integrating empirical research in theological hermeneutics and an understanding of theology as a critical authority dealing with empirical research it is clear that it is not sufficient for me exclusively to talk about empirical knowledge, i.e. it can't be sufficient, because empirical data collection is by definition integrated in various ways of hermeneutic processes: for example with the construction of questionnaires, when I early in the process have to check if the target group understands the questionnaire; when interpreting statistics, for instance the correlation between religious and mental development that shows possible simultaneities, but does not lead to statements on causalities; when evaluating interviews where the persons being interviewed are finally asked to see for themselves if they feel represented in the empirical results or not; when there is a constant interaction of quantitative and qualitative studies: After having generated hypotheses they can be operationalized and put into a quantitative survey; this process of research itself has to be critically analyzed if it allows to draw conclusions concerning the hypotheses made earlier.

Empirical research without hermeneutics is in danger of positivism; uncritically accepted research sometimes provokes consequences and ways of reception that can

hardly be understood. Methodological monocultures do not prosper. Not only do they methodologically lead to a corner, but they also significantly reduce the potential of applying a creative form of research.

...for a theological culture of empirical research

You can't attribute theological dignity to a process of empirical research only when a theologian devotes himself to it. To support this I outlined the creation-theological reasons, but also referred to pneumatological reasons, especially to Pauline charismas, that make faith in everyday life become the faith that is filled with the Holy Spirit and the Christian message²⁰. It is the people with their charismas and their sense of faith²¹ themselves what makes them to experts in faith. The empirically supported reconstruction of this living faith and faithlessness has to be taken serious as far as its theological importance is concerned: As the church and theology are there to take care of the hopes and fears of the people in need, it is necessary to highlight these experiences, but also the social background that brings forward these experiences. Only by taking into account all theological disciplines can we draw conclusions – for instance with respect to Christian education – from an empirical study to religious didactics and pastoral care. Another need of evaluation can then arise from this engagement. Attempts of paving ways from empirical knowledge to its understanding within theological hermeneutics transform themselves into ways of renewed theological understanding and acting, which itself finds access in further empirical research processes.

For this reason empirical science appears to be qualified theologically, but the introductory question does not focus on a theological culture of empirical research. The question is not: "Empirical science as religious pedagogy?" but rather vice versa: "Religious pedagogy as an empirical science?" I understand religious pedagogy as a theological discipline based on empirical research, and – after having been in disputation with questions of interdisciplinarity – it comes to a point where it critically deals with empirical research in an hermeneutic sense, neither idolizing nor demonizing it. "We do not help anyone when we continue to ensure that the success of the religious education is empirically not measurable"²², is what we got to know in the beginning. The importance and the seriousness of this task oblige us to look for fruits of practical-theological work – also for fruits that are within reach (Mt 7, 16-20) – while we put trust in the fact that religious processes of learning and their attendance go far beyond the limitations of an empirically measurable momentum – unfortunately maybe in a scientific sense, but fortunately in a Christian sense.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Wegenast, K. (1968) Die empirische Wendung in der Religionspädagogik. In: *Der Evangelische Erzieher* 20, S. 111 - 125, 118.
- ² Atteslander, P. (1993) *Methoden der empirischen Sozialforschung*, 7th edition, Berlin.
- ³ Mayring, P. (1993) *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse*, 4th edition, Weinheim.
- ⁴ Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1996) *Grounded Theory*, Weinheim.
- ⁵ Langer, I. (2000) *Das Persönliche Gespräch als Weg in der psychologischen Forschung*, Köln.

- ⁶ van der Ven, J. A. (1990) *Entwurf einer empirischen Theologie*, Kampen, S. 21 - 22.
- ⁷ Boff, C. (1986) *Theologie und Praxis*, 3rd edition, München, S. 77.
- ⁸ Mette, N. & Steinkamp, H. (1983) *Sozialwissenschaften und Praktische Theologie*, Dusseldorf, S. 164 - 176.
- ⁹ van der Ven (1990), S. 103 - 104.
- ¹⁰ van der Ven, J. A. (1999) Praktische Theologie und Humanwissenschaften. In: *Handbuch Praktische Theologie*, Volume 1: Grundlegungen, edited by Haslinger H., Mainz, S. 267 - 278, 271.
- ¹¹ Fuchs, O. (2000) Wie funktioniert die Theologie in empirischen Untersuchungen? In: *Theologische Quartalschrift* 180, S. 191 - 120.
- ¹² Fuchs (2000), S. 209 - 210, note 58.
- ¹³ Gaudium et Spes 36 (= Rahner, K. & Vorgrimler, H. (1985) *Kleines Konzilskompendium*, 18th edition, Freiburg, S. 482 - 483, 482).
- ¹⁴ Optatum Totius 11 (= Rahner & Vorgrimler (1985), S. 302 - 303, 302).
- ¹⁵ Rahner, K. (1972) Die Theologie im interdisziplinären Gespräch der Wissenschaften. In: *Schriften zur Theologie*, Volume 10, Zürich, S. 89 - 103, 102.
- ¹⁶ Rahner (1972), S. 93.
- ¹⁷ Peitz, H.-H. (1998) *Kriterien des Dialogs zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Theologie*, Innsbruck, S. 127, note 4.
- ¹⁸ Rahner, K. (1976) *Grundkurs des Glaubens*, Freiburg, S. 185 *et seq.*
- ¹⁹ Klein, S. (1994) *Theologie und empirische Biographieforschung*, Stuttgart; Hunze, G. & Feeser, U. Von der Normativität zur Generativität des "Faktischen". Plädoyer für empirisch-kritische Denk- und Arbeitsweisen innerhalb der Theologie. In: *Religionspädagogische Beiträge* 45 (2000), S. 59 - 68.
- ²⁰ Rahner, K. (1984) Offizielle Glaubenslehre der Kirche und faktische Gläubigkeit des Volkes. In: *Schriften zur Theologie*, Volume 16, Zürich, S. 217 - 230, 223.
- ²¹ Lumen Gentium 35 (= Rahner & Vorgrimler (1985), S. 165 - 166, 165).
- ²² Wegenast (1968), S. 118.

Reliģiskā pedagoģija kā empīriskā zinātne?

Kopsavilkums

Rakstā aplūkota reliģiskā pedagoģija kā praktiskās teoloģijas disciplīna, kas nodarbojas ar kristīgās mācības procesa vadīšanu un zinātnisku refleksiju par to. Galvenā uzmanība vērsta uz reliģiskās pedagoģijas empīriski pētnieciskā rakstura problemātiku. Empīriskās zinātnes atšķiras ar noteiktas metodoloģijas izveidi, un autora nolūks ir parādīt, ka empīrisko faktu interpretācijai ir nepieciešami teoloģiski kritēriji.

Izejot no triju veidu attiecībām, kuras saista teoloģiju un empīriskās zinātnes, veidojas atbilstoši trīs empīriskās teoloģijas modeļi: multidisciplinārais, intradisciplinārais un interdisciplinārais jeb starpdisciplinārais.

Multidisciplinārā modelī pētāmais objekts tiek izgaismots no vairāku zinātnes nozaru puses. Rezultātā iegūstam divu fāžu modeli tādā nozīmē, ka empīriskā zinātnē savāc, sagatavo un novērtē datus, uz kuru pamata tiek veikta teoloģiska diskusija kā nākamais solis. Taču pāreja starp abām fāzēm atstāj neaizpildītu epistemoloģisku “pārrāvumu” abu zinātņu starpā. Intradisciplinārais modelis, balstīts pieņēmumā, ka teoloģija pati par sevi var kļūt empīriskā. Inter- jeb starpdisciplinārais modelis izriet no abu iesaistīto zinātņu mijiedarbības principa, piemēram, vienojoties par saskanīgām izvēles iespējām (opcijām). Taču problemātisks paliek jautājums: kādas ir iespējas attīstīties dialogam starp divām vai vairākām līdzvērtīgām disciplīnām, ja to izvēlētas metodes un normatīvās prasības ir atšķirīgas? Praktiskā teoloģija tikai tad var kļūt praktiska, kad tā sāk darboties no empīriskā līmeņa; bet tā kļūst īsteni praktiska, neapstājoties tajā vietā, kur tiek iegūtas empīriskas zināšanas, kas vērstas uz esošā stāvokļa stabilizēšanu, bet tur, kur šīs empīriskās zināšanas tiek starpdisciplināri sasaistītas tādā veidā, ka izsauc praktiskas sekas skolās, cilvēku kopienās, ģimenēs, masu saziņas līdzekļos un visā sabiedrībā. Šādai starpdisciplinārajai pētniecībai izvīrzāmi teoloģiski kritēriji attiecībā uz empīriskām zināšanām.

Vācu teologs Karls Rāners (1904 – 1984) uzskata, ka – neskatoties uz zinātņu pluralitāti un autonomiju, – visām ir kopējs unikāls fokusējums uz cilvēka būtību. Varbūt šis antropoloģiskais aspekts netiek eksplīcīti formulēts, taču šāda nostādne ir absolūti nepieciešama katras zinātnes pastāvēšanai. Kopējais fokusējums uz cilvēku nosaka katras zinātnes nozares saturu, un tam ir arī vienotājelementa loma starpdisciplinārajā dialogā. Šī iemesla dēļ dialoga sekmes atkarīgas no kritērijiem, kuri ir pietiekami, lai attaisnotu attiecīgo zinātņu autonomiju un tiesības pastāvēt līdzās kritērijiem, kuri nodrošina “tiltu pārmešanas” iespēju starp dažādām zinātnēm.

Kā starpdisciplināritātes kritērijs tiek piedāvāta Trīsvienības teoloģijas pieeja saistībā ar empīriskajām zinātnēm.

Veidojot teoloģijas un empīrisko zinātņu attiecības tā, lai tiktu ievērots empīrisko zināšanu autonomijas princips, parasti tas notiek, balstoties uz Radīšanas teoloģijas nostādnēm. Taču kristīgās ticības būtība rodama pārliecībā par Trīsvienīgo Dievu, tātad starpdisciplinārajām attiecībām nepieciešams arī kristoloģisks un pneimatoloģisks pamatojums – tam jānāk tieši no Trīsvienībā strukturētās kristīgās ticības pašas centrālās daļas.

Radīšanas teoloģija nodarbojas ar cilvēku un citu radīto būtņu autonomajiem procesiem, pat darbojoties “profāno” zinātņu ietvaros. Šāda pieeja uzsver, ka visi procesi atrodas Radītāja pārziņā. Šī iemesla dēļ nepieciešama Radīšanas teoloģijas hermeneitika, lai abas puses – radība un Radītājs darbotos tā, kā tas izriet no viņu būtības. Tas sasauca ar K. Rānera tēzi par radītās pasaules aktīvo sevis transcendēšanu, skaidrojot to kā radības spēku, kā sevī motivētu un Dieva inspirētu radošu enerģiju. Radīšanas teoloģijas hermeneitikas izpratnē empīriskās zinātnes tiek vienlaicīgi atzītas par autonomām un teoloģiski aplūkotām kā tādas, kuras sargā un atbalsta Dievs.

Teoloģijas un “profāno” zinātņu savstarpējo attiecību kristoloģiskais pamatojums meklējams Halcedonas koncila (451. g.) nostādnēs par Kristus divu dabu – dievišķās un cilvēcīgās – attiecībām, kuras raksturojot, koncils lieto atribūtus: “neatdalītas” un vienlaikus – “nesajauktas.” Analoģiski to attiecinot uz starpdisciplināritāti, jāsecina, ka netiek pieļauts tāda veida zinātņu “sajaukums,” kas dotu iespēju jebkurai citai zinātnei iejaukties teoloģijas kompetencē vai arī – pazaudēt savu profāno autonomiju un “izšķīst” teoloģijā. Tajā pašā laikā koncila nostāja vērsta pret zinātņu nodalīšanu

pilnīgi atšķirīgās disciplīnās, liedzot starpdisciplināritātes iespējas.

Atšķirībā no pieejas, kas balstīta Radīšanas teoloģijā, kuras koncepti aizgūti no empīriskās puses, cenšoties tiem piešķirt teoloģisku nozīmīgumu, pneimatoloģiskā – Svētā Gara doktrīnā balstītā – pieeja, gluži otrādi, apstiprina mīlestības, ticības un cerību nostādni. Svētais Gars spējīgs pieņemt cilvēka zināšanas gan to autonomijas režīmā, gan radikalizējot tās galējo mērķu un piepildījumu ziņā. Apzinoties šīs abas pieejas, pastāv iespēja izvairīties no divām galējībām – vai nu pilnīgi iekļaut “profāno” zinātņu konceptus teoloģijas novadā un tādējādi padarīt teoloģiju par tukšu, bezsaturīgu konstrukciju, vai arī pieļaut, ka teoloģiskie iepriekšpieņēmumi tiek attiecināti tikai uz tiem “profāno” zinātņu konceptiem, kuri apstiprina teoloģiskās nostādnes, kādas pastāvējušas jau ilgi pirms vēršanās pēc padoma pie empīriskajām zinātnēm. Šajā gadījumā vērojama vienpusīga interese tikai par tām zinātniskām atziņām, kas izrādās noderīgas teoloģijai un viegli atdalāmas no empīrisko zinātņu depoziāta, nepievēršot uzmanību teoloģiski kontraversālām zināšanām.

Ja starpdisciplinārie pētījumi tiek balstīti Trīsvienības teoloģijas kritērijos, šie kritēriji nodrošina pamatu starpdisciplināro attiecību veidošanai.

Līdz ar to reliģiskā pedagoģija tiek izprasta kā teoloģiska disciplīna, kas balstīta empīriskā pētījumā un – izejot cauri disputam par starpdisciplināritātes jautājumiem – noved pie atziņas, kas kritiski aplūko empīrisko pētījumu no hermeneitikas pozīcijām.

Autors kritiski izvērtē pastāvošo tēzi par to, ka reliģiskā izglītošana nepakļaujas mērījumiem. Referātā paustā starpdisciplināritātes nostādne liek lūkoties pēc reliģiskās pedagoģijas praktiskās darbības augļiem – arī tiem augļiem, kuri pieejami novērošanai (Mt. 7:16-20). Tajā pašā laikā autors pauž pārlicību, ka mācīšanās reliģiskie procesi un to sekmes sniedzas tālu pāri empīriski izmērāmiem spēku laukiem. Varbūt tas nav iepriecinoši, raugoties no tradicionāli izprasta zinātniskuma perspektīvas, bet tieši tā tas ir no kristīgās audzināšanas viedokļa.



Dr. theol., Dr. psych., prof. **Klaus Kiessling**

Director of the Institute of Pastoral Psychology & Spirituality and of the Seminar of Religious Pedagogics, Catechetics and Didactics at Sankt Georgen Graduate School of Philosophy and Theology, Faculty of Theology, Frankfurt, Germany

Pastorālās psiholoģijas un garīguma institūta, kā arī Reliģiskās pedagoģijas, katehētikas, un didaktikas semināra direktors, Sankt Georgenas Filozofijas un teoloģijas aspirantūra, Teoloģijas fakultāte (Frankfurte, Vācija)

Address: Offenbacher Landstraße 224, D – 60599 Frankfurt

Phone: (+49) 69 6061 274

E-mail: klaus.kiessling@st-georgen.uni-frankfurt.de