

SECTION I

THE SPIRITUALITY FACTOR



Each of the essays in this section considers ‘spiritual **and** religious’ as an alternative to the increasingly popular presumption of ‘spiritual **but not** religious’. It could be argued that keeping spirituality **and** religion connected both in practice and in reflection on practice is necessary for integration against the fragmenting impulses of this time. If there is one central question, it might be this: Is it possible that learning to be ‘spiritual **and** religious is a way to integrate both head with heart and public with private for the sake of social transformation? One aim of the journal *Reflective Practice*, like the purposes of formation and supervision, is to further the integration of future religious leaders and the practices of ministries in many forms and contexts. Kathleen A. Cahalan defines integration this way:

In general, integration refers to the bringing together of distinct entities or parts and in the process the creation of something new, a wholeness that exceeds the sum of its parts...Integration refers to: the vocation and the processes of student learning in which being, doing and knowing intersect; the elements of teaching, including pedagogy and curriculum and the school’s culture; and the goal of prudent and wise practice within the profession of ministry that exists for the sake of leading communities of faith.¹

Integrating spirituality **and** religion brings together distinct entities for the common good. Like connecting head and heart or theory and practice, integrating is a way to wholeness. It is, however, a paradoxical way that depends on tolerating ambiguity and holding two things both to be true and necessary for life and ministry: spirituality and religion.

The first essay explores some questions, old and new, about the influence of spirituality on the practices of formation and supervision. Anderson identifies eight questions that might be asked to determine the durability of the spirituality of future religious leaders. The essay concludes with some questions from an earlier volume of *The Journal of Supervision and Training in Ministry* that might still be relevant in this time. ‘Renewing spirituality’ in all its meanings is still a necessary process and an impossible goal.

Relational Spiritual Formation by Steven J. Sandage and Mary L. Jensen is an important contribution to *Reflective Practice* because it introduces to the readership to comprehensive research on the relationship between personality development and spiritual formation in a seminary context. Sandage and Jensen explore how *relational* spirituality is affected negatively and positive-

ly by personality development. Secondly, how might spiritual formulations that tend to be idiosyncractic provide a framework to help people make critical life decisions? This is particularly important in a hospital context because chaplains and spiritual providers are often members of a bioethics committee charged with the task of adjudicating complex medical dilemmas that are at the same time laden with religious/spiritual convictions or perspectives.

James Green brings a distinct perspective as an author for this journal. He has dual training and dual vocation as an anthropologist and a spiritual care giver. Green begins his essay by examining some definitions of spirituality and religion. Like Sandage and Jensen, he suggests that religious experience is more than subjectivity—it is also relational. Green introduces the terms ‘lived religion’ or ‘everyday religion’ to challenge the simplistic bipolarity of all claims of “spiritual but not religious.” The clinical task, then, is to create opportunities for diverse “religiosities” to be voiced without forcing them into “spiritual” versus “religious” boxes.

NOTE

1. Kathleen A. Cahalan, “Integration in Theological Education,” in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Practical Theology*, Bonnie Miller-McLemore, ed. (Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 386.

Herbert Anderson
Editor