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Abstract
This research was motivated by the situation of theological education in Indonesia, which still perpetuates traditional models of education, where learning still tends to be one-way, authoritative, and more focused on cognitive-academic development with “a rote learning approach.” This has left learners (a group of learners) alienated, marginalised, and even feeling pressured in the learning process. This condition makes it difficult to provide theological education that is hospitable and transformative in the lives of learners. Meanwhile, the Bible has shown that hospitality is an important theme in both the Old and New Testaments. God is a hospitable God and offers hospitality to his people. According to the author, hospitality also needs to be presented in theological education in Indonesia. From the theoretical framework of hospitality and theological education, the author analyses Matthew 11:28-30 to find the principles of hospitality relevant to theological education in Indonesia. The author examines various thoughts on hospitality through a literature study. The selected text was studied using an exegetical approach and inductive interpretation. Based on the analysis, it was found that Jesus' learning environment differs from that of the Scribes. Jesus' learning environment is inclusive, liberating and collaborative. The implication is that theological education with hospitality provides a learning atmosphere that is liberating, uplifting, takes into account the uniqueness of the students, and provides a comfortable atmosphere.
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INTRODUCTION

The theme of hospitality is present throughout the Bible, both the Old Testament and New Testament. The motif of this practice is laid on the theological concept that God is a hospitable God who offers hospitality to his people. Jesus is also perceived through a Christian lens as a hospitable teacher who invites and welcomes everyone to come and learn from Him (Mat. 11:28-30). Hospitality also becomes a top priority practice among believers since the early Christianity. It was practiced by early Christian monks and hermits as articulation of Jesus’ “loving others law” and part of their rules of life.

Henri J. Nouwen and Dietrich Bonhoeffer are often referred to when discussing hospitality as a practice of piety in the faith community. Nouwen, in “Reaching Out: The Three Movements of the Spiritual Life,” says that hospitality is not simply opening the door for the guests who are strangers, but it rather than becoming a “stranger to ourselves” to what is lacking and to understand others more. He adds that Christian, as hospitable community should be community of grace and forgiveness. With another viewpoint, Bonhoeffer perceives hospitality as a way of Christian witness in a midst of secular communities. By practicing hospitality, the believers are conveying peace to the problematic and chaotic world.

The theme of hospitality in educational settings often refers to Parker Palmer in his books “To Know as we are Known: Education as a Spiritual Journey,” and “The Courage to Teach.” Substantially, as Freire wrestles with “banking method” education, Palmer criticises “the traditional education” that tend to shape students to a certain mould. According to Palmer, in hospitable education there should be no fear, indoctrination, marginalization, and domination in the process of learning and teaching. Indeed, there is openness, spaces, and welcomes for all regardless students’
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backgrounds and uniqueness. The educational setting that embrace hospitality as the motif would significantly changing the teacher’s pedagogical decisions in interacting with the students. Both educators and learners are receiving each other, acknowledging the struggles, and embracing the new knowledges through experiencing together.

In the light of these theological and theoretical framework, it seems that Christian education and particularly theological education in Indonesia must address this theme as a motif of its educational practices. Regardless to the author’s experiences as a student for Bachelor and Magister theology, the common learning model embedded in theological education was “traditional teaching and learning approach,” where the learning atmosphere tends to be one-directional and authoritative. This approach was the most common model applied whether in general education setting or in theological and religious setting as Yunus, Patimah and others assert. Sianipar expresses similar concerns to the author's experience. He sees the urgency of correcting the role of theological educators who maintain the status quo of requiring students to memorise words, ideas and opinions in the classroom. As a result, the learning success tends to be measured by a student's ability (and willingness) to follow what the teacher says. Meanwhile, students are labelled as less intelligent or even dissident if they are unable (and unwilling) to follow the lecturer's instructions.

A similar concern is expressed by Panggabean, who considers that this kind of theological education is an alienation of liberating and hospitable education. This model of education not only ignores the role of the student in the learning process, but also “nullifies” the student as an individual, according to Freire. He asserts that the process of “conscientization” is key to successful learning in positioning the student...
as a reasoning being. Thus, theological education should help students as individuals to become aware of their socio-cultural reality. This kind of education will be enlightening education and a catalyst for change in a wider spectrum.

In comparison with these experiences, today’s theological education is not much different. The perpetuation of this model of education seems confirms many authors’ saying: “Teachers teach as they have been taught.” The current Indonesian theological landscape pictured by Sihombing as mostly “rote learning education” model. Much of the student’s learning process involves memorising a set of beliefs or interpretations made by previous thinkers in their own contexts, which may be different from the current student’s context. On the epistemological level, knowledge must be understood in relation to the use and value of knowledge itself. Therefore, what is known must be useful and bring benefits to humanity (public good) and be able to maintain human dignity. Thus, learners should be involved in formulating theological teaching according to their context, rather than simply memorising foreign formulations. Therefore, theological education should not only be a process of “transfer of heads” but rather a transfer of hearts.

Likewise, some current studies in theological education, such as Pongoh and Jatmiko, argue that the scholastic learning of Western philosophy has become a common model in the world of education, including theological education in Indonesia. The orientation of theological education towards the cognitive and academic as the only outcome makes the learning process rigid and technical. The role of theologians is also reduced to knowledge operators rather than hospitable host helping students grow,
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as Palmer thought. As a result, a process of dehumanisation is taking place in the theological learning environment if the perpetuation of this model of learning continues.

Such a model of theological learning not only dehumanises but also alienates some groups of learners. In fact, students who come to theological campuses in Indonesia come from different regions with vast disparities in the quality of primary to secondary level of education. As a result, the cognitive abilities of theological students vary widely. In this situation, Blodgett criticises theological education with a “one size fits all” approach, where cognitive-academic aspects are used as the sole indicator of learning success. This approach will naturally alienate students or groups of students with weak cognitive abilities. They will feel inferior and become “strangers” in the classroom. In this situation, the study of theology will no longer be a joyful experience, but rather a challenge and a burden for certain students.

Based on the background of the problem, the authors perceive the importance of conducting a study on theological education models in Indonesia. Although various studies have been conducted on this subject, the authors see the gap in the need for a textual study from the theoretical perspective of hospitality in education in relation to theological education in Indonesia. Therefore, in this article, the authors aim to find the principles of hospitality that apply to theological education in Indonesia. The research question to be answered in this article is: “What is the hospitable approach of theological education in Indonesia based on Matthew 11:28-30?”

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This research is a descriptive qualitative study that focuses on describing and interpreting the phenomenon that is the subject of research. Using a library research approach, the author examines thoughts on hospitality in the context of education from various authors, particularly Henri Nouwen and Parker Palmer. This theoretical framework on hospitable education is used to understand Matthew 11:28-30. The exegetical study is carried out by analysing the lexicon, syntax and context of key words, phrases
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and sentences from the text. The results of the interpretation of Matthew 11:28-30 are then presented descriptively. The results of this analysis then lead to ideas for a theological education that is hospitable and responsive to the needs of theological education in Indonesia.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Hospitality in Matthew 11:28-30

Matthew 11:28-30 shows a glimpse of Jesus’ hospitable heart. His invitation, “Come to me… learn from me, because I am gentle and humble in heart,” expresses that Jesus intentionally creates space for others to come to Him. Although contemporary interpreters often see this verse as Christ’s invitation to those who are physically and psychologically oppressed, the focus on the context of the passage is closely related to the learning environment (the legalistic interpretation and teaching of Torah) of that time.22 This verse shows that Jesus’ invitation and promise (Mat. 11:25-30) precedes the theme of the Sabbath, the most emphasized subject in a legal teaching setting. The phrase en ekeiō tō kairō (in that time) in Matthew 12:1 ties the Sabbath controversies stories to the previous pericope.

The topic of teaching-learning in this passage is shown in the phrase “the wise and the learned” (Mat. 11:25). This expression naturally refers to the opponents of Jesus, the Pharisees and the Scribes. They were well versed and taught the Torah but unreceptive of God’s revelation through Jesus’ life and words.23 In contrast to the first group, Jesus refers to “little children” (Mat. 11:25), who are privileged to receive the special revelation (Mat. 11:27). This metaphor indicates the receptiveness and humbleness of people who have responded to Jesus’ call. Jesus extends hospitality to those who are “weary and burdened” under the legalistic teaching of Pharisees and the Scribes. Compared to the learning environment under the Teachers of the Law, learning from Jesus is different. The learning environment under Jesus is inclusive, liberating, and cooperative.

Inclusive

Jesus offers an inclusive invitation to learn from Him. In verse 28, Jesus says, “Come to me all who are weary and heavy-
laden.” This invitation utilizes an imperative tone and inclusive language. Jesus opened space for people to come and learn from Him, which was intentional, relational, and personal.

![Intentional Learning Process](image)

The phrase “Come to me” (Deuté pros mé) expresses Jesus’ desire for the listeners to come to Him physically during the learning process. The word “deute” is an imperative particle of incitement with a solid appeal to the will of another. This expression shows Jesus’ intentional and fully compassionate for the audience to get closer to Him physically and relationally. The preposition “to” (pros) expresses close intimate fellowship. The same expression is used in John 1:1 in the clause “the word was with (pros) God.” Scholar Joseph L Angel argues that the preposition “with” emphasizes an intimate personal relationship rather than just proximity. M. Dods adds that preposition pros mean more than meta or para and are regularly employed in expressing the presence of one person with another. While the personal pronoun “me” emphasizes the unique approach of Jesus as a person.

Jesus does not invite people to come to the title, system, or teaching given, but to Himself. This expression is different from the general invitation of the Pharisees that says, “do as we say, obey our system.” Jesus’ invitation is not to any teachings or religious systems but himself as a person. This phrase emphasizes Jesus’ willingness to create space for others to come to Him in a more personal relationship. In addition, the desire of the great teacher is expressed in the imperative mode in his invitation.

The inclusiveness of Jesus’ invitation is also reflected in who it is addressed. Jesus extended this invitation to “all who are weary and heavy-laden.” Cho argues that the word “all” expresses the univer-
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sality of Jesus’ invitation. This word translates the word *pantes* (plural of the word *pan*) which means all, any, every, the whole. The encouragement to come to Jesus is given to all those who listen to Jesus, and no one is excluded. The condition of the “weary and heavy-laden” object does not limit who may come to Jesus but, on the contrary, emphasizes that Jesus’ invitation is open to anyone. The word *pantes*, according to Taylor, points to the universality of this invitation. Jesus’ invitation is not an exclusive, partial, and segmented invitation to a specific group. It contrasts with the Rabbis of that time, who strictly chose those who could come and learn from them.

**Liberative**

Jesus offers liberating learning in his invitation. The context of this verse shows the pattern of oppressive and burdensome education atmosphere found at that time. Jesus’ words about “weary and burdened” (NIV); “laboured are heavy laden” (KJV) describes the situation of the people who studied on Jesus’ day. To borrow Freire’s term, they are people who learn under oppression. The invitation to learn with Jesus favours those who need relief from burdens. Jesus gives an invitation and promises that everyone who comes to him will have their burden lightened and find rest in him.

Jesus extends a welcome to his audience, who are exhausted and burdened. The words *kopiōntes* and *pephortismenoi* are imagery to express the situation of the audience Jesus has in these chapters of Matthew. The word *kopiōntes* (labour, toil, be wearied) is a present active participle that indicates action coinciding with the action of the main verb. It means that at the moment Jesus invites them to come to Him, the listeners were weary and burdened with heavy loads. This situation is confirmed by adding the word *pephortismenoi*, derived from the verb *phortizō* (load; to burden). The usage of perfect tense for this word indicates action happened beforehand but still
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affects the present. While the passive participle functioning as an adjective. Thus, *pephortisma* can be translated as burdened, loaded, or heavy-laden. In the merit to perfect tense used in verse, it can be understood that Jesus’ listeners had been oppressed by heavy laden for some moments.

The word *pephortisma* is rooted in the word *phortion* used in Matthew 23:4 to describe the burden of the Pharisaic interpretation of the Torah. Miller and others describe that the learning process under the Jewish Rabbi was often burdensome. Obeying the instruction derived from the interpretation of the law is the same as carrying heavy loads or burdens. They must live under the *halakhic* (Jewish religious law) authority, consisting of 613 legalistic commands that the Pharisees required them to obey. In the context of this oppressive learning environment, Jesus offered a liberating learning environment that uplifted learning, accommodated the uniqueness of the learners, and provided a pleasant learning atmosphere.

Jesus’ invitation was an uplifting invitation for those bearing heavy burdens. The phrase “I will give you rest” (v. 28) is translated from the word *anapausō*. Matthew reemphasizes this in the next verse with the word *anapausin* (intermission, cessation of any motion, business labour, rest, recreation). LXX often used the term *anapausin* to translate “Sabbath” (Ex. 23:23; Dt. 5:14). However, the meaning of the Sabbath has shifted due to the legalistic law they have to obey. There are 39 categories of work that are prohibited under Sabathical Law. In this context, Jesus, as a true “Sabbath,” invites His audience to enjoy rest (*anapausin*) with him.

The words *anapausō* and *anapausin* are rooted in the word *anapauō*, to cause to rest, soothe, and refresh. In Greek, the syno-
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nymous word with this word is *pauō* (to cause to pause, or cease, restrain, prohibit, e.g., 1 Pet. 3:10). As contrasted with *pauō*, the word *anapauō* refers to temporary rather than permanent cessation labourer. It especially connotes the refreshment of the body and soul obtained through such rest. Thus, here is not that those who respond to Jesus will have no more portion to carry in the learning process, but that Jesus will give them rest and uplift their spirit to be fit for another “yoke” of learning from Jesus.

In exchange for the Pharisaic yoke, Jesus offers the listeners another yoke (*zugon*) and burden (*phortion* (v. 29) that fit learners and accommodates their uniqueness. Jesus contrasts His “yoke” to the Pharisees, which brings loads and bondage and steals the joy of learning.38 Jesus doesn’t force one sized yoke to be carried by all learners, but He promises that the yoke He offers is fit for one’s need. The word “easy” is translated from *chresto* (from *chraomai*, furnish what is needed).39 Jesus’ yoke is well-fitting and tailor-made for each believer and their needs. It accommodates the uniqueness and specialty of the learner. It means that Jesus’ yoke can be used and is good, suitable, serviceable, kind, benevolent, worthy, valuable, virtuous, and pleasant.

In addition to offering a suitable and fit yoke to be carried, Jesus also promises a light load to bear. The word “light” is translated from the word *elaphros* means light in weight, quick, agile.40 Jesus states that His load is not heavy, easy to bear, not burdensome, not difficult to maintain, has little weight, and easy to be lifted. The words “easy (*chresto*)” and “light (*elaphros*)” have almost the same meaning. Bates alludes to an odd impression when these two words are used together in the same verse because both can be translated as “easy.”41 However, France sees that these two ideas were an ideal combination. *Chresto* is concerned with the fit (shape, size, model – comfortably fitting), while *elaphros* are concerned with the weight (lightness). Jesus uses these words to explain that His teaching is easy to be kept and pleasant.

Collaborative

The invitation to experience collaborative learning as a style of hospitality in education is reflected in words, “Take my yoke upon you and learn from me.” This
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imagery shows a different learning model from the learning under the Pharisees and Jewish teachers. Everyone who comes to Jesus will not only learn from Him but will also learn together with Him. Jesus made His character the guarantee that learners would experience collaborative learning. Jesus is a Teacher who does not impose His will nor pride himself so that He looks down on the learner.

In that context, a yoke is a wooden device used to harness the working power of an animal (such as an ox). It can be made for a single animal or to link two or more animals together. Linked by the yoke, the two oxen could work collaboratively to pull the burden attached to the collar. This habit is carried out for several purposes; farmers used to train young animals (such as oxen) to plow by yoking them with older, stronger, and more experienced ones. The older animal will guide the younger while learning by following the same direction and keeping pace with the teacher animal. Secondly, the ox will not be overloaded with the burdens and objects they pull. With this collar, the load is equally distributed between the two yoked animals. The older animal carried most of the weight and understood the commands of the plow driver.

Jesus promises that He will not oppress those who come to learn from Him by using two adjectives “praus and tapeinos.” The word praus mean easy, mild, or soft. Here, Jesus contrasts his own character with the Scribes and Pharisees’ teachers, who are harsh, proud, and arrogant. The gentleness is presented in the contrast to the idea of violence and vengeance. Klein adds that the word carries the idea of “openness” or “receptivity.” The meekness makes Jesus not abuse His power and authority for his interests, especially with violence and an iron fist. Jesus promises that whosoever comes to learn under Him will be well treated and not be oppressed. He welcomes those who want to come to Him with acceptance and openness in a relationship characterized by hospitality.

The word “tapeinos” means low, not high, downcast, not rising far from the ground. It describes one’s condition as lowly or of low degree. The word is related to the verb tapeinoō means to humiliate, humble, and to make ashamed. Holman states that the word and its associated words were continuously used in a negative sense. In the ancient Greek context, to be lowly and hum-
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ble was considered a vice. However, the Bible elevates the words to the status of virtue. Paul uses tapeinoō to describe the concept of incarnation (Php. 2:8). Peter and James say that God gives grace to those who practice such humility (1 Pet. 5:5; Jms. 4:6). In other passages, Jesus uses the words to warn those who promote themselves (Mat. 23:12; Luk. 14:11; 18:14). So, in the context of Jesus’ invitation, this word expresses the noble character of Jesus, who is not arrogant and boasts about himself. Jesus’ humble heart guarantees that everyone who comes can learn from Jesus and learn with Jesus.

Towards Hospitable Indonesian Theological Education

Based on the reflection on the theological education situation in Indonesia in encounter with Jesus’ invitation, in this last session, the author tries to propose a theological education approach that promotes hospitality in the learning process. This section will try to answer the challenges of learning during the propagation of traditional model where learning tends to be more authoritative, rote-learning, and cognitive-academic oriented. On a practical level, several things can be considered in realizing a hospitable theological education with a more inclusive, liberating, and collaborative learning approach.

The biggest challenge in achieving hospitable learning climate is the “traditional education” model generally applied in theological education. This situation is closely related to Indonesian national education roadmap. This is also recognised by the government with various efforts to revise the curriculum and national education policy toward better educational landscape. The question is, what can theological education institutions do to be a counterbalance to these efforts? The author argues that it is necessary for every theological administrator, educator, and practitioner to get involved in changing the pattern of teacher-student relationships, teaching-learning approach, and education atmosphere to be more hospitable to every learner.

Based on textual study, a more inclusive approach will address theological education which tends to be one-directional and authoritarian. Inclusive education is characterized by changes in the relationship between teachers and students. The theological learning model in Indonesia generally places the teacher as the central intellectual authority in the classroom. With this posi-
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tion, the teacher always becomes an expli-
cator or transmitter of knowledge while stu-
dents are positioned as recipients who tend
to be inferior and passive. Ranciere sees that
the function of education is not indoctri-
nation and merely transferring knowledge li-
mited by the classroom walls. Inclusive pe-
dagogy emphasizes self-education as an
egalitarian process. In this setting, teachers
only work as attention guards.\textsuperscript{46} Thus, the
student is an active subject concerning the
orientation towards autonomy and individu-
al freedom as a thinking subject.

In the particular diverse context such
in Indonesia, inclusive theological educa-
ton is significantly needed. Davina Soh says
that hospitality and humility are needed in
theological education in a multicultural con-
text.\textsuperscript{47} Inclusive education welcomes diver-
sity to acknowledge the limited and provi-
sional perspective. In the context of Indo-
nesian multicultural society, Susanto says
that theological education must prioritize
democracy, humanism, and pluralism, which
is not in line with authoritarianism, which
controls and oppresses humans to free-
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favourite schools (most of them come from cities in Java) will tend to be winners in the class competition. Meanwhile, students who do not meet these qualifications will be marginalized. This situation is often a burden and intimidation for students who do not have adequate academic competence. Therefore, the standard of learning success should not only be represented by the intellectual dimension but must touch the holistic area of the students. In the context of theological education in Indonesia, Jatmiko proposes standards for achieving authentic learning: spirituality, character, competence, cognition, and connectedness. This educational model will narrow the disparity among students from various regions in Indonesia with the diverse academic quality of education.

Liberative theological education can also be realized by implementing emancipatory learning. Mezirow argues that emancipatory learning sees the learner in an equal and independent position. In other words, learning is carried out regardless of differences in background, gender, ability, and various other disparities. This approach places students as unique individuals with potential and demands to be treated as whole human beings. The role of the lecturer in this approach is to facilitate the process of coaching, mentoring, and developing the potential and competence of stewardship possessed by each student. All students are given the same opportunity to speak, express opinions, and explore according to their interests and talents. The dialogue approach can be chosen to allow students to find the truth together from the results of joint contributions. Emancipatory education will help realize a relationship-oriented education. Thus, the learning environment is no more an ample space with exclusive boundaries but becomes a learning community that complements and enriches each other. The teacher acts as a learning facilitator to provide positive affirmations and feedback to create a conducive and enjoyable learning atmosphere.

Finally, theological education must make diversity a strength and not a weakness in creating hospitable learning atmosphere. Managing class in divers and plural context would be challenging. Pluralism, on the other hand will be an advantage and a positive thing when able to collaborate. Based on the reflection on Jesus’ invitation, theological education in Indonesia needs to
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prioritize education with a more collaborative style and not competition. Loes and Pascarella mention that collaborative learning fosters the development of critical thinking through discussion, clarification of ideas, and evaluation of others’ opinions. \(^{52}\) Ghavifekhr echoes the same argument; collaborative learning emphasizes the importance of social interaction between individuals in groups to build understanding or knowledge of each group member. \(^{53}\) Collaborative learning enables students to work, build, learn, change, and improve together. From some of the definitions above, it can be concluded that the collaborative learning model is a group learning model, where students in groups are encouraged to interact and learn together to improve each other’s understanding.

At the practical level, collaborative theological education can be implemented using a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach. Learning can be done in groups to encourage interaction with the material or problems presented to be solved together. Students can also learn with an interactive approach in the form of discussion, asking each other and expressing opinions or arguments. In this process, the lecturer will only facilitate the course of the group discussion by asking questions or encouraging students in the group to convey their ideas, ask each other questions, answer questions, and argue. \(^{54}\)

CONCLUSION

Jesus Christ, the Great Teacher, provides an example of how to provide hospitable and life-changing learning. The pattern of learning used by Jesus can be used as a reference point for institutions of theological education to provide a more hospitable process of learning. In line with the purpose of this paper, the author concludes that hospitable theological education based on Jesus’ invitation in Matthew 11:28-30 can be achieved by creating a learning environment that is inclusive, liberating and collaborative. This kind of theological education will make a significant contribution to a more hospitable climate for learning. Hospitable theological education will lead to changes in the pattern of teacher-student relationships, innovate different approaches to learning, and create a learning atmos-

phere that is more conducive and supportive of the student's growth as a whole person. In practice, this principle can be implemented with the commitment and creativity of stakeholders, administrators and teachers to present a more concrete learning atmosphere (not just concepts in the realm of cognition), to provide space for dialogue and to accumulate learning space as a learning community that encourages each other.
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