

## EDUCATION FOR MINISTRY SINCE VATICAN II

T. HOWLAND SANKS, S.J.

*Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley*

WHEN POPE John XXIII announced the convocation of an ecumenical council on January 25, 1959, it was certainly unexpected but it was not without preparation. Although not foreseeing a council, theologians, historians, Scripture scholars, and liturgists had been researching and writing on issues long before they came to fruition and explicitation in the documents of Vatican II. The very first document completed by the Council, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, articulated the felt needs and the insights of a vigorous liturgical movement which had been growing for decades before the Council. We need only recall the work of such scholars as Josef Jungmann, Virgil Michel, Gerald Ellard, and Martin Hellriegel to remind us of the contributions of the liturgical movement to the resultant document of Vatican II. Similar background work had been done in other areas such as Scripture, historical theology, ecumenism, and religious freedom.

This being the case, why do we look back after twenty years and see the Second Vatican Council as the beginning of an era? Because, even though the major themes and emphases of Vatican II may have had their origins prior to the Council itself, the adoption by the Church universal of these themes and their official articulation served to legitimate the results of prior movements and thereby gave a huge impetus to their practical implementation. The rapid introduction of the vernacular in the liturgy (although it had been called for by liturgists for some time) took place only following the promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, and it was followed by a general liturgical reform far more massive than the leaders of the liturgical movement could have foreseen or hoped for. This legitimating function of official documents should not be underestimated. Vatican II is a landmark, therefore, because it initiated many and dramatic changes in the life and practice of the Roman Catholic community. Perhaps one of the areas most significantly affected by the Council has been that of the education and preparation for ministry in the Roman Catholic Church.

### NEW EMPHASES OF VATICAN II

1. The very fact of summoning a council whose purpose was not to define new dogmas or defend old ones but to foster the renewal and *aggiornamento* in the Church was itself a significant shift from a closed

and defensive posture to one of *openness* and willingness to listen and learn. This emphasis is perhaps most obvious in *Gaudium et spes*, where the Council urges the "duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times" and "to hear, distinguish, and interpret the many voices of our age."<sup>1</sup> Instead of repudiating the modern world, the Council now emphasizes dialogue with and participation in the "world."

2. A second theme which pervades the Council documents and has had great implications for theological education is the new emphasis on *ecumenism*. This, of course, is most explicit in the Decree on Ecumenism, but it is found throughout the conciliar documents. For the preceding four centuries the Roman Catholic Church had not been willing to admit (as this Council did) that "men of both sides were to blame" for the separations that had rent the seamless garment of Christ. Vatican II accepted "with respect and affection as brothers" those whom it had previously regarded as heretics and schismatics and as adversaries to be refuted in theological manuals.<sup>2</sup>

From the viewpoint of education for ministry, this ecumenical emphasis was most explicit in urging that

Instruction in sacred theology and other branches of knowledge, especially those of a historical nature, must also be presented from an ecumenical point of view, so that at every point they may more accurately correspond with the facts of the case. For it is highly important that future bishops and priests should have mastered a theology carefully worked out in this way and not polemically, especially in what concerns the relations of separated brethren with the Catholic Church.<sup>3</sup>

3. A third emphasis, allied with and implicit in the previous two, was the recognition of the need for *continual reform and renewal* within the Roman Catholic Church itself. The Council admits that there have been "deficiencies in conduct, in church discipline, or even in the formulation of doctrine (which must be carefully distinguished from the deposit itself of faith)" and begs "pardon of God and of our separated brethren."<sup>4</sup> In *Gaudium et spes* the Council fathers recognized that, although the Church has always been the sign of salvation on earth,

still she is very well aware that among her members, both clerical and lay, some have been unfaithful to the Spirit of God during the course of many centuries. In the present age, too, it does not escape the Church how great a distance lies

<sup>1</sup> *Gaudium et spes* 4, 11, 44 (tr. in Walter M. Abbott, S.J., ed., *The Documents of Vatican II* [New York: America, 1966] 201, 109, 246).

<sup>2</sup> *Unitatis redintegratio* 3 (*Documents* 345-46); *Lumen gentium* 15 (*Documents* 33-34).

<sup>3</sup> *Unitatis redintegratio* 10 (*Documents* 353); *Optatam totius* 16 (*Documents* 453).

<sup>4</sup> *Unitatis redintegratio* 6, 7 (*Documents* 350, 351).

between the message she offers and the human failing of those to whom the gospel is entrusted.<sup>5</sup>

This recognition of failure in the concrete historical experience of the Church in conduct, discipline, and even the formulation of doctrine authorizes change in all these areas. This issue of legitimate change and development was, as John Courtney Murray remarked in his introduction to the Declaration on Religious Freedom, the "issue that lay continually below the surface of all the conciliar debates."<sup>6</sup>

4. This legitimation of change and development was made possible by another new theme of Vatican II which has had great implications for theological education: the shift from what Murray referred to as the "classical mind" which was preoccupied with immutable essences and unchanging truths to a *historical consciousness* which recognizes the historical location and context of Scripture, discipline, and doctrine. This was the fruit of the historical and scriptural studies which had been going on unnoticed since the early part of the 20th century. This historical awareness led to the distinction made by John XXIII in his opening address to the Council and incorporated in the documents between "the substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith" and "the way in which it is presented."<sup>7</sup>

5. Closely allied to this historical consciousness was the new emphasis in the Council on *pluralism, diversity, and differences* of discipline, liturgy, and governance within the Church and the churches. The Council recognized the legitimate diversity of the Eastern churches and of other Christian communities, saying that "the heritage handed down by the apostles was received in different forms and ways, so that from the very beginnings of the Church it has had a varied development in various places, thanks to a similar variety of natural gifts and conditions of life," and that this "diversity of customs and observances only adds to her comeliness, and contributes greatly to carrying out her mission."<sup>8</sup> This pluralism is recognized not only with regard to customs but also in the "theological elaborations of revealed truth." This is quite a shift from the position that customs, liturgies, and theological elaborations developed in Rome and Western Europe were the only legitimate ones and must be normative for all other cultures and places.

6. Another new emphasis which has had a direct impact on theological

<sup>5</sup> *Gaudium et spes* 43 (Documents 245).

<sup>6</sup> J. C. Murray, S.J., "Religious Freedom" (Documents 673).

<sup>7</sup> Pope John XXIII's Opening Speech to the Council (Documents 715), and *Gaudium et spes* 62 (Documents 268-69).

<sup>8</sup> *Unitatis redintegratio* 4, 14, 15, 16 (Documents 349, 357-60), and *Lumen gentium* 23 (Documents 46).

education was that of *collegiality*—the collegial nature of the priesthood, collegiality among bishops, among priests, and of priests with their bishop, and of individual churches with the universal church.<sup>9</sup> Although not denying the hierarchical nature of the Church, Vatican II does redress the imbalance left by the incomplete treatment of this subject occasioned by the forced suspension of Vatican I.

7. A seventh emphasis pertaining especially to the education for ministry in the Church is that leadership in the Christian community is not to be thought of in terms of domination or merely the exercise of jurisdiction but rather in terms of *service*. That mission which the bishops as successors to the apostles receive from the Lord “to teach all nations and to preach the gospel to every creature” is “a true service, and in sacred literature is significantly called ‘*diakonia*’ or ministry.”<sup>10</sup> This service is characteristic of all levels of office in the Church, not only of bishops, and the service of ministry is directed not only to Catholics but to non-Catholics and nonbelievers as well.<sup>11</sup> The function of ministry is not confined only to those who hold office in the Church; the laity have their own share in the service of the Church.

These seven new emphases of the Second Vatican Council—openness to the world, ecumenism, reform and renewal, historical consciousness, pluralism and diversity, collegiality, and service—have led to dramatic changes in the way people are educated for ministry in the Church.

In addition to these general emphases found throughout the conciliar documents, the Council did issue a decree specifically on Priestly Formation. This document applies the general spirit of Vatican II to the preparation of ministers in the Christian community. It recognizes the pluralism and diversity of cultures and geographical areas<sup>12</sup> and recommends that seminary training be decentralized and adapted to local needs. The theme of service, not domination or honors, is again stressed.<sup>13</sup> A better integration of philosophy and theology is urged, and philosophy is not to be confined to the *philosophia perennis*, but “students should also be conversant with contemporary philosophical investigations, especially those exercising special influence in their own country, and with recent scientific progress.”<sup>14</sup> The ecumenical theme is repeated in urging a “more adequate understanding of the Churches and ecclesial Communities separated from Rome,” as well as a knowledge of other world religions.<sup>15</sup> There should be a strong pastoral emphasis throughout the

<sup>9</sup> *Lumen gentium* 22, 23 (Documents 42–46).

<sup>10</sup> *Lumen gentium* 24 (Documents 46–47).

<sup>11</sup> *Lumen gentium* 28 (Documents 54–55).

<sup>12</sup> *Optatam totius* 1 (Documents 438).

<sup>13</sup> *Optatam totius* 9 (Documents 446).

<sup>14</sup> *Optatam totius* 15 (Documents 450).

<sup>15</sup> *Optatam totius* 16 (Documents 453).

training offered, and advantage should be taken of "the helps which pedagogy, psychology and sociology can offer."<sup>16</sup> Some practical pastoral experience should be gained even during the course of studies in a methodical way and under the guidance of experienced pastors.<sup>17</sup> The decree concluded with a mandate for the continuing education of ministers beyond the seminary course of studies. Since this document was promulgated near the end of the Council, it *consciously* reflects and applies the spirit and emphases of Vatican II to theological education for ministry.<sup>18</sup>

This brief summary of the themes and emphases of Vatican II gives an idea of, and a program for, the reform and renewal which the Council envisioned for theological education. I turn now to a description of what has in fact happened in the United States in education for the ministry since that time. I will first give some summary statistical data and then describe the changes which have taken place over those 20 years in two fairly typical institutions as concrete examples of what has occurred.

#### WHAT HAPPENED

##### *Population*

When the Second Vatican Council convened in fall of 1962, there were 134 Roman Catholic theological schools enrolling 8,480 seminarians in the United States. According to a study by William L. Baumgaertner and Francis K. Sheets,

By 1972, 67 schools had closed or merged and the student body had fallen by 35%; these 5,804 seminarians resulted in an average size student body of 87 students. By 1978-79 there were 54 theology schools enrolling 4,327 students for an average enrollment of 80. Approximately one-third of these seminarians were members of religious communities.<sup>19</sup>

The CARA statistics for 1983-84 list 58 theological schools with 4,244 enrolled as candidates for the priesthood. In the post-Vatican II period, therefore, the most obvious change has been the dramatic drop in the

<sup>16</sup> *Optatam totius* 20 (Documents 455).

<sup>17</sup> *Optatam totius* 21 (Documents 455).

<sup>18</sup> The reaffirmation and specific application of this spirit and these emphases for the United States may be found in *The Program of Priestly Formation*, 3rd ed., Nov. 30, 1981 (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1982) no. 837.

<sup>19</sup> William L. Baumgaertner and Francis K. Sheets, "A Study of USA Catholic Theological School Financing, 1975-79—Findings and Recommendations," *Seminary News* 20, no. 3 (March 1982) ii. Statistics on the number of theological schools and their enrollments during this period are surprisingly difficult to come by. CARA seems to be the most reliable source, but its data do not go back to 1962, and ATS only began to include Roman Catholic schools in the late 1960's. I am indebted to Kevin Quinn, S.J., for collating the statistical data from various sources for use here.

*number of students* preparing for the priesthood and even more the drop in the *number of institutions* listed as theological schools.

This, however, does not tell the whole story of the change in population. Although we have no statistical data for 1962 on this issue, it is safe to bet that there were practically no laypersons (or people not preparing for priesthood) in the seminaries. But, as Baumgaertner and Sheets also point out, since 1975-76 "enrollment by persons not studying for priesthood rose 35% in terms of full-time-equivalent students (FTE). Summer school enrollment rose 42% and enrollment in various non-degree programs rose 57%. . . . In 1979 we had almost 3,000 people studying graduate theology in our Catholic seminaries, colleges and universities, but *not* for ordination."<sup>20</sup> According to the *ATS Fact Book* for 1984, in the 49 Roman Catholic schools in ATS there are 2,905 students studying theology but *not* for ordination.

Of those studying in the Roman Catholic institutions which are members of ATS, 22% were women in the 1983-84 academic year. Most of these were not in the preordination programs, although women did comprise about 4% of the preordination students. This increase in women students, however, is not peculiar to Roman Catholic schools. In an assessment of theological education done by the ATS in 1981 it was reported that

The number of women students, especially in preordination programs, has increased dramatically in recent years, and, since 1977, has offset the decline in the number of men enrolled in preordination programs. (Enrollment of women grew by 976 between 1977 and 1980 while that of men declined by 773).<sup>21</sup>

This same report indicates that, in addition to the increase in women students, there has been an increase in the average age of students, although no accurate data exists. This is certainly true in the two case studies below.

The diversification of student population has been paralleled by a somewhat less dramatic diversification in the faculties of Roman Catholic seminaries and theological schools. At the beginning of the Second Vatican Council, it is safe to say, there were virtually no women on the faculties of seminaries. In 1971 there were 14 women faculty members of the Roman Catholic schools which were then members of ATS, and by 1981 there were 106 or 11.9% of the faculty.<sup>22</sup> According to the *ATS Fact Book*, there are 72 women full-time faculty members (15%) and 137

<sup>20</sup> Baumgaertner and Sheets, *Seminary News* v-vi.

<sup>21</sup> Jackson W. Carroll, "Project Transition: An Assessment of ATS Programs and Services," *Theological Education*, Autumn 1981, 61.

<sup>22</sup> Marvin J. Taylor, "A Theological Faculties Profile: 1981 Data Compared with the 1971 Study," *Theological Education*, Autumn 1982, 120.

women part-time faculty members (22%) in the 1983–84 academic year.

A second factor in the diversification of the faculty has been the increase in the number of faculty with doctorates and the diverse places from which they were obtained. According to the recent ATS study, in 1971 53.7% of the faculty had doctorates, but by 1981 the figure was 61.5%. The actual numbers reflect this change even more clearly. While masters holders remained virtually constant, doctorates rose from 399 to 549—up 37.6% in just ten years. Perhaps more significant for the ecumenical consequences is the fact that at the beginning of our period almost universally the doctoral training was done in Roman Catholic institutions, with the Gregorian University and the Catholic University of America being the most prominent sources for degrees for faculties in the United States. Although no figures are available for 1962, the ATS figures show that in 1971 there were 102 doctorates from the Gregorian and 71 from Catholic University, and only 69 from other North American schools, while in 1981 there were only 56 from the Gregorian and 56 from Catholic University, while 236 were from other North American schools.<sup>23</sup> Although we should not conclude that “other North American schools” were all Protestant or nondenominational, a large percentage of the degrees were taken in such institutions.

#### *Accreditation and Location*

If there has been a dramatic shift in who is studying theology on the graduate level, there has been an equally remarkable shift in the social location of Roman Catholic theological education in the United States. The *Directory of Theological Schools* (ATS), 1966 edition, lists no Roman Catholic members, but the next biennial edition (1968) lists 15 associate members, and, as just mentioned, the 1984 *Directory* lists 49 member schools (42 accredited, 3 associate members, and 4 candidates for accreditation).<sup>24</sup> Roman Catholics represent about one fourth of the current member schools of the Association of Theological Schools, and a Roman Catholic was elected president of the organization at the 1982 biennial meeting.<sup>25</sup> This same phenomenon of accreditation allowed a good number of Roman Catholic seminaries to begin granting degrees in their own name. This had previously been done only by those schools which were affiliated with a college or university otherwise accredited (this is exemplified in the two cases which follow).

Another significant shift occurring during this period was the merger and relocation of a good number of seminaries from isolated rural settings

<sup>23</sup> Ibid. 141–42.

<sup>24</sup> Figures gathered from various directories and the 1984 *ATS Fact Book* 60–64 by Kevin Quinn, S.J.

<sup>25</sup> Vincent Cushing, O.F.M., president of the Washington Theological Union.

to cluster or consortia arrangements in urban areas. Examples are found in the formation of the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley in 1962 (with Roman Catholics first joining in January 1964), the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago (a merger formed by five religious order seminaries in 1967), the Boston Theological Institute in 1968, the Washington Theological Union in 1969, and the Toronto School of Theology in 1970. Currently, of the 49 Catholic theological schools in ATS, 19 are in cluster or consortium arrangements, enrolling 2,328 students, or 37.7% of those studying theology on the graduate level.<sup>26</sup> This change in the social and geographical context of theological education for ministry, although obviously not *caused* by Vatican II, was certainly given impetus by the ecumenical emphasis of the Council and by the openness to the "world" and the need to learn from the experience of others in the secular sphere. The move to more ecumenical and urban environments was motivated by a desire to carry out in practice what Vatican II had preached in the documents. The change in social context is bound to effect a change in the theology taught and learned in these contexts and in the attitude toward ministry in the Christian community. The consequences of training for ministry in these contexts have yet to be seen.

### *Curriculum*

The changes in the curriculum during this period can perhaps best be illustrated by describing the experience of our two concrete examples, but before doing that I believe some generalizations are possible. In fall 1962, *Veterum sapientia* was issued by the Vatican, requiring that all major courses be taught in Latin. This was merely a reiteration of a long-standing requirement which had gradually been falling into desuetude, but it was indicative of the level at which the Sacred Congregation for Seminary Education was concerned. More substantive issues about seminary curriculum reform were not yet being addressed. Even if *Veterum sapientia* was fairly generally ignored as far as teaching was concerned (there were various attempts to nod in its direction), the basic required texts and the examinations in dogma and moral theology were still in Latin in a number of seminaries. Dogmatic theology dominated the curriculum and was taught according to the "tract" system, i.e., *Tractatus de Deo uno et trino*, *De ecclesia*, etc. The required readings were from basic Latin texts in use in the Roman colleges and universities, and these same texts were used as well in countries of quite diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and traditions. Even prior to Vatican II, however, in addition to the required texts, books in the vernacular and by a variety of authors, some non-Catholic, were being assigned and, though fre-

<sup>26</sup> 1984 ATS Fact Book.



quently treated as *adversarii*, other viewpoints at least were being presented. The shift in the way in which Scripture was being taught would vary from place to place, but in general the biblical scholarship of the past fifty years made its way into Roman Catholic seminaries only as newly-trained professors came on to the faculties. In the United States, the graduates of the Biblicum in Rome and of Johns Hopkins University (the so-called Albright school) led in introducing the historical-critical method in the teaching of Scripture. Lamentably, priests who finished their seminary training before 1959-60 were still taught in a rather ahistorical mode.

Prior to Vatican II, less emphasis was given to the pastoral skills needed for ministry. Courses in homiletics, pastoral counseling, spiritual direction, and liturgical practice were almost completely absent from the curriculum of most seminaries. There was no such thing as clinical pastoral education or field education, although in some places the students did voluntarily participate in what we would now call "field placements."

I have already suggested that curricular changes began before and during Vatican II. It would be inaccurate and simplistic to trace all changes in the seminary curriculum to Vatican II. The other movements (liturgical and ecumenical) which preceded the Council and prepared for it were already being felt in the seminaries, but the themes and emphases we have delineated did give some further encouragement and impetus to these stirrings. To illustrate this, let us now turn to two specific examples: first, a seminary sponsored by a religious order on the West Coast, the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, and second, a diocesan seminary on the East Coast, Immaculate Conception Seminary (Darlington) in Mahwah, New Jersey.<sup>27</sup>

### *Two Cases*

The Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley had been founded by the California Province of the Society of Jesus in 1934 under the name of Alma College in the hills of Los Gatos, south of San Francisco, for the purpose of training the members of the order in theology preparatory to ordination to the priesthood. In 1957 it affiliated with the University of Santa Clara as its School of Theology and conferred its degrees through that university. In 1966 it joined the recently formed Graduate Theolog-

<sup>27</sup> I have selected these two as representative examples because one is West Coast, the other East Coast; one is sponsored by a religious order, the other by a diocese; one is now in a consortium, the other is a "free-standing" seminary; and, practically speaking, because the factual data on each is available to me. I am indebted to Edward J. Cuiba, president/rector, for his help and co-operation in supplying information on Immaculate Conception Seminary (Darlington) in Mahwah, N.J.

ical Union in Berkeley, and in 1969 moved from Los Gatos to Berkeley and changed its corporate title to the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley. It is, therefore, a typical example of a school sponsored by a religious order which followed out the ecumenical thrust of Vatican II by joining a consortium and subsequently relocating in a more urban area to make the ecumenical relationship more practicable and meaningful.

As late as the 1964-65 academic year, the *Kalendarium* (the closest thing to a catalog then in use) is in Latin and the course listings are in the form of the "tract" system mentioned above. All students in the same program take the same courses. The following academic year, the *Calendar* is now in English, the courses have numbers and English titles, and the teachers are listed by academic titles. In 1965-66 there are listed more courses in ecclesiastical history and seminars on Protestant theology. By 1969-70 there is a regular academic catalog for the School of Sacred Theology of the University of Santa Clara, and in 1970-71 there is a combined catalog with the other schools of the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. Since there is open cross-registration with all the member schools of the GTU, the course offerings available to students in the Jesuit School include all those listed for that academic year taught by professors from many denominational backgrounds. The individual student can choose courses with the help of a faculty advisor. In 1984 there are more than 250 courses offered each semester in the GTU, and the students of the JSTB register for about one third of their courses outside of their own school.

With this wide variety of course offerings and the pluralism and ecumenism it represents, the curriculum is still structured along somewhat traditional lines, i.e., there are requirements in Scripture, historical and systematic theology, as well as moral theology, liturgy, and canon law. Now, however, there is also a requirement in field education (which first appears in the 1971-72 catalog), and courses are offered (though not required) in homiletics, pastoral counseling, and spirituality. Clinical pastoral education is not required, but many students do it sometime during their preparation. 30% of the courses required for the basic (Master of Divinity) degree are electives.

Documenting the changes in the *content* of courses is more difficult, both because of the variety of courses available in any one area and because of the specific detail which would be required to illustrate the shifts which have occurred, but I would like to give one sample by juxtaposing the summary statements (theses) in the area of ecclesiology which were the basis for the final examination in theology at Alma College in 1963, and the questions from the Syllabus for the comprehensive examination for the Master of Divinity program at JSTB in 1983. The 1963 statements read:

Divinae revelationis depositum custodit atque authentice infallibiliterque explicat Ecclesia a Christo per modum verae societatis instituta, quae quidem hierarchica est et perpetua. Huic Ecclesiae Iesus Christus praefecit Petrum eiusque successores, qui super universam Ecclesiam primatu iurisdictionis gauderent. Successores autem Petri in hoc primatu sunt iure divino Romani Pontifices, ut constat tum via exclusionis tum via historica; qui, cum ex cathedra loquuntur, ea infallibilitate pollent, qua divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definienda doctrina de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit. Ecclesia est corpus Christi mysticum, quod Spiritus Sanctus instar animae vivificat.

The 1984 Syllabus reads:

(1) How does the community of faith which is the Church come to self-understanding in a situation of pluralism within the Christian community and in relation to other religions or other worldviews? (2) In what sense does the Church as primordial sacrament express herself primarily in the proclamation of the Word and celebration of the Eucharist? (3) How did the biblical images of election, covenant, people of God, body of Christ, and creation of the outpoured Spirit form the consciousness of the primitive Church as the true Israel? (4) What is the role of Sacred Scripture in the formation and development of the Church? What is the significance of the canon? (5) How did the emergence of offices and structures both express and transform the understanding of the Church, especially in the tension between conciliarism and papal authority and, more recently, in the development of papal infallibility? (6) Since Vatican II used the word "Church" to refer to both the local community and a universal reality, how is the mission of the Church to the world to be understood? How is this mission affected by the diversity of cultures in the world? (7) How is Mary considered to be model of the Church (cf. Vatican II, *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, Chapter 8)? (8) Within the Church what is the function and relationship of ordained and non-ordained ministries? (9) What is the role, function, and content of the Church's teaching authority on such questions as human rights, economic interdependency, world hunger, and disarmament?

Both of these paragraphs summarize what the student was expected to know about the Church, yet the tone and tenor are significantly different. Similar contrasts exist in the other areas of theology.

The shift in student and faculty population is also well illustrated in this concrete example. When the school relocated to Berkeley in 1969, there were 90 students and 15 faculty, all members of the Society of Jesus. By 1984 there were approximately 200 students, more than half of them not Jesuits, and 32% of them women. There are now 21 full-time faculty, three of whom are women. The diversification in faculty backgrounds is indicated by the fact that, in addition to doctorates from the Gregorian University and the Biblicum in Rome, faculty have degrees from Johns Hopkins, Yale, Institut Catholique in Paris, University of Chicago, University of St. Michael's College in Toronto, Fordham Uni-

versity, Vanderbilt University, and the University of California at Berkeley.

This diversification in the background and training of the faculty is matched by the diversity in background and training of the students. About one third of the students at the Jesuit School are in continuing-education programs and they come with years of ministerial experience not only in the United States and Canada, but also from Africa, Latin American, Australia, and the Philippines. Even in the M.Div. program, the average age of the entering class in 1984 was 30.6, and represented graduate-level backgrounds in mathematics, school administration, accounting, art history, counseling psychology, and Latin American studies, in addition to philosophy and theology. The current M.Div. student population includes a medical doctor, a lawyer, an M.B.A., a Ph.D. in Latin American history, a Ph.D. in philosophy, a Ph.D. in psychology, and many other graduate degrees. This illustrates the more general phenomenon of students deciding to pursue ministerial training later in life and frequently as a second career. Such diversity requires flexibility in the curriculum and variety in the level of course offerings. This is not to suggest that there was no diversity of backgrounds in 1962, but rather that it has increased and it is now taken into consideration in curriculum planning in a way that it was not formerly.

With some significant differences, similar patterns of change can be seen in our other concrete example, Immaculate Conception Seminary (Darlington) in Mahwah, N.J. Founded in 1861 by the first bishop of Newark as the seminary for that diocese, the seminary was located on the campus of Seton Hall College in South Orange, N.J. Because of expanded student population and "encroachment of urban life," it moved to a "more extensive and secluded location," its present site in Darlington, in 1927.<sup>28</sup> The affiliation with Seton Hall was maintained until 1972, when the seminary was independently incorporated. It was licensed to grant degrees in its own name in 1974 and was accredited by ATS in 1977. Plans have been made to relocate the seminary back on the campus of Seton Hall University by fall 1984.

When the Second Vatican Council opened in 1962, Darlington had 180 theologians and 126 philosophers in residence. In 1983-84, they had 100 theologians (i.e., those preparing for ordination to the priesthood). In addition, Darlington now provides graduate education in theology for those not seeking ordination (an M.A. in theology, and an M.A. in pastoral ministry) as well as some programs for continuing education of clergy. According to the *Self-Study and Evaluation* of January 1982, "The two hundred and five students enrolled at Darlington for the fall semester

<sup>28</sup> *Bulletin of Information, 1962-62, Immaculate Conception Seminary, 12.*

of 1981 included forty-four sisters, two brothers, fourteen laymen, twenty-six laywomen, sixteen priests, three deacons and one hundred diocesan and religious seminarians representing eleven dioceses and six religious orders."<sup>29</sup> Thus, in a "free-standing" seminary there has been diversification of student population just as in the consortium model.

The *Bulletin of Information* for Immaculate Conception Seminary for the 1962-63 academic year was in English, and the divisions of the theology curriculum indicate a somewhat more pastoral orientation than was seen in the case of JSTB. There are courses in homiletics, liturgy, ascetical theology, pastoral theology, and sociology, in addition to the usual courses in canon law, dogmatics, moral theology, and Scripture (although there are only four courses in Scripture offered for the entire four-year curriculum). All of the courses are required for each theologian. The *Bulletin* lists the textbooks for that year, and again we find that the texts for dogmatic and moral theology are Latin manuals. The texts for Scripture are only *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (Nelson, 1952) and privately printed notes, so it is not possible to know what the methodology was.<sup>30</sup>

In contrast, the current *Bulletin* lists the requirements for the M.Div. degree as

Forty-eight credit hours in biblical, historical, ethical and doctrinal studies. Twenty-four credit hours in courses designed for pastoral ministry. Twelve credit hours for field education placements in professionally supervised programs designed to offer a maximum field experience in a variety of ministries.<sup>31</sup>

Within each area there are further specifications of the distribution requirements, but a wide variety of choice is possible in each area. The field-education program began about 1972-73, but a full-time resident director was appointed only in 1974.

In 1962 the faculty at Immaculate Conception was all male, all Roman Catholic, and all clerical (with the exception of a part-time layman in sacred music). Of 19 regular full-time faculty, nine had doctorates, all from Catholic institutions, mainly the Gregorian and Catholic University. According to the *Self-Study* of 1982,

There are sixteen full-time faculty engaged in teaching, formation and administration. Seven of the twelve resident faculty formally involved in teaching have

<sup>29</sup> *Immaculate Conception Seminary Self-Study and Evaluation*, January 1982, 65.

<sup>30</sup> For dogmatic theology the text was J. M. Herve, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* (Berche and Pagis, 1952), and for moral theology, D. M. Prümmer and J. Overbeck, O.P., *Manuale theologiae moralis* (13th ed., Herder, 1958), and T. A. Jorio, S.J., *Theologia moralis* (D'Auria, 1954); see the *Bulletin of Information*, Immaculate Conception Seminary, 1962-63, 29.

<sup>31</sup> *Bulletin No. 32*, Immaculate Conception Seminary, 1981-83, 27-28.

earned doctorates, two are doctoral candidates, three have appropriate Master's degrees plus additional earned second level degrees. All other members of the faculty involved in formation and administration have appropriate Masters degrees. . . . There are eighteen adjunct faculty members: eight with earned doctorates and ten with appropriate Master's degrees.<sup>32</sup>

Although the *Self-Study* does not distinguish by gender, the current catalog lists nine women members of the faculty: three regular members and six adjunct. The first non-Catholic joined the faculty in 1975.

Both of the cases cited illustrate the diversification of purposes, diversification of student populations, and increasing heterogeneity of the faculty backgrounds. Both are examples of the changing social location of Roman Catholic theological education for ministry insofar as they are participating in the larger theological scene represented by ATS. One has relocated in an urban and ecumenical environment; the other is about to return to a university campus and closer affiliation with the university where it was originally located. The ecumenical possibilities are obviously greater in a consortium than in a free-standing situation. They are only possibilities, however, and mere physical collocation does not tell the full story.

Both illustrate also the changes which have taken place in the curricula of theological education for ministry since Vatican II. Although the structure of the curriculum has not changed all that dramatically, with the exception of the addition of field education, the content and the variety of possible choices have. Instead of a manual in Latin for a particular dogmatic or moral-theology course, one is likely to have a series of texts and readings representing a variety of viewpoints on a given topic, and most likely including some non-Roman Catholic perspectives. When so many of the faculty have been trained in non-denominational settings, the ecumenical perspective is incorporated in the way in which the individual faculty member will treat theology as well as in readings selected.

Some significant differences between the consortium model and the free-standing model should be noted. The most obvious is in the resources available in each situation. The Immaculate Conception Seminary lists a library of 69,000 volumes, whereas the Graduate Theological Union, of which the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley is a part, lists 353,000 volumes. A similar pluralism of faculty and courses results from the same coming together of nine different schools in a consortium arrangement which no one free-standing school can duplicate. The social context is also going to differ when students from nine different schools can be in the same classroom together, worship together, and recreate together.

<sup>32</sup> *Self-Study and Evaluation*, January 1982, 36.

There is no substitute for this sharing of common experiences.

The consortia or theological unions tend to have less connection or contact with the local Church. This is due partially to the fact that such theological centers are sponsored mostly by religious orders, whose students come from the entire nation and are likely to return to their work in their own geographical provinces rather than in the local Church, but also because very few seminarians from the local diocese enroll in such consortia but attend (or are sent to) the diocesan seminary or other free-standing seminary.

### *Summary*

We can see from these two case studies, as well as from the general statistical data preceding them, that at least some of the emphases of Vatican II have had an impact on theological education for ministry during these last 20 years. Moving from secluded rural environments to urban situations affiliated with great universities and with other denominational schools of theology has certainly carried into practice the emphasis on *openness to the world* and *ecumenism*. The consortium arrangement as well as the diversification in faculty training and the diversification of student population have all furthered the emphasis on *pluralism and diversity*.

The emphasis on *reform and renewal* is not easy to document, although the more historical and developmental approach to moral and systematic theology cannot help but make the historical fact of constant reform and renewal obvious. The experience of change within the life-history of those studying theology today does not allow them to think that "this is the way it always was" and is not reformable. Although the battle between the ahistorical mind and the historical approach is not over, at least within theological education in the United States, the historical approach is clearly dominant.

Some things, however, which the Second Vatican Council urged have not occurred. Looking at the structure of the curricula in our two case studies, we see little or no attention being paid to the natural or social sciences which the Decree on Priestly Formation urged, nor is there evidence of any greater "knowledge of other world religions." In at least one instance in Europe, the Centre Sèvres, the Jesuit faculty of theology and philosophy in Paris, there are sections of its regular curriculum on the "History and Sciences of Man" which include psychology, anthropology, sociology, economics, and politics, and on "Religions and Cultures" which include courses on Judaism, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam.<sup>33</sup> The understanding of ecumenism in the U.S. theological schools

<sup>33</sup> Centre Sèvres, *Programme 1982-83* 20-24.

seems to remain almost exclusively an *intra-Christian* affair.

Some things which the Second Vatican Council *did not* intend have happened. Surely the Council did not intend or anticipate the sudden and dramatic drop in the number of candidates for the ordained ministry. Surely the Council fathers did not anticipate the growth in interest among the laity, especially among women, in theological education, even though the Council urged greater participation of the laity in the mission of the Church.

Education for ministry is not confined to the academic curriculum, however, nor can the full range of the impact of the Council be conveyed without some comments on the spiritual-formation aspect of this preparation, to which we now turn.

#### NONACADEMIC FORMATION

Two other emphases of Vatican II which we noted above, *collegiality* and *service*, although they may be stressed in courses on the Church or on ministry, are more likely to be conveyed in the lived experience of those preparing for ministry than in course work. "Spiritual formation" has always been considered an integral part of the educational process for ministry, but in 1962 it was quite different than in 1984. To turn to the example of Immaculate Conception Seminary, for example, the 1962 Bulletin says only that

The purpose of this Seminary is the ecclesiastical preparation of candidates for the holy priesthood who will exercise their ministry as members of the diocesan clergy. *The periods of retreat, therefore, are an integral part of the program of training, and are required of all.*<sup>34</sup>

But the daily order listed in the back of the *Bulletin* includes morning prayers and meditation, Mass and thanksgiving, particular examen and spiritual reading, Rosary and night prayers, all at stipulated times for all seminarians. The practices of piety listed were uniform for all and were enforced because they were externally observable (e.g., all went to chapel at the same time, usually with assigned places, so absence was easily noted). Physical collocation was the index of community, and "collegiality" was not in the vocabulary.

By contrast, the current *Catalog* says:

At the heart of a candidate's training is spiritual development. Prayer, community life and worship help develop the qualities of a minister of the Gospel formed by the Spirit of Christ. The Eucharistic Liturgy holds a central position in daily worship. In addition, the program calls for scheduled hours of prayer in common, periods of personal prayer, weekly spiritual conferences, participation in reflection groups, recollection days and retreats. Spiritual directors and resident faculty

<sup>34</sup> *Bulletin of Information* 1962-63 12.



members are available to all students for purposes of spiritual guidance and counseling. Such direction takes into account the individual diversity of student experiences and situations, making room for personal creativity and openness. Voluntary small group devotions and prayer groups are also encouraged. Such prayer in common can be a great help in future ministry.<sup>36</sup>

Without putting too much faith in catalog statements, there is a clear difference in the tone of the program of "spiritual formation" between these two catalogs. Recognition of diversity, small group prayer, and individual spiritual direction are stressed in the later edition and there is no mention of a daily routine. Praying together, working together, and taking account of the diversity of individual backgrounds and experiences are more likely to foster collegiality and service than the previous rigid and external forms of piety.

Although the catalog would not describe it, the changes in formation at a religious-order school in a consortium such as our other example, JSTB, are even more striking. Although "spiritual formation" for members of religious orders usually begins in the novitiate and continues for some years before theological studies begin, we are interested here only in the changes during the period of theological education. Again, there is concern with the diversity of individuals' backgrounds and experiences and less expectation of uniform external forms of piety. There is much greater emphasis on the students' responsibility for one another, both on the spiritual and the material level. The students are more likely to live in small communities where they serve one another and learn to rely on one another. Interpersonal relations are stressed much more than uniformity or conformity to some external norm. Spiritual direction is emphasized much more than it was 20 years ago, and much more attention is paid to the integration of all aspects of one's life. The old assumption that the regular and repeated performance of assigned "spiritual duties" would by itself develop the students' spiritual life has been replaced by a much greater sense of personal responsibility for oneself and for others and the awareness that spiritual growth depends not only on one's relationship with God but also on our relationships with other human beings.

All of these shifts in spiritual formation tend, I believe, to foster a sense of *collegiality* and *service*. How this will be seen in the practice of ministry is not yet fully realized.

#### CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

It should be clear that there have been major changes in theological education for ministry since Vatican II and that the Council, though not

<sup>36</sup> *Bulletin No. 32* 14-15.

the origin or sole cause, was certainly a major impetus and source of legitimation of these changes. In the United States, however, most of the changes described have been met with approval and have been incorporated into the Program for Priestly Formation approved by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education on November 30, 1981.

Not everyone is equally enthusiastic, however, about what has been happening in theological education in the United States.<sup>36</sup> The very emphases on openness to and dialogue with the "world," the ecumenical thrust, and the need for continual reform and renewal have led some, especially those who had completed their seminary training before Vatican II, to suspect that the substance of the Roman Catholic tradition is not being adequately preserved or presented. Although this is a danger, I have seen no evidence that it has happened. If anything, the heightened historical awareness and the ecumenical opportunities (particularly in the consortium or collaborative models) have led to the recovery of a fuller Catholic tradition. The awareness of the need for continual reform and renewal have led some to fear that the seminaries and theological centers have sought change merely for the sake of change. Again, this is a danger, and the atmosphere not only in the seminaries but in the educational institutions in the late 60's and early 70's fostered a great deal of experimentation. The quest for "relevance" which dominated academic institutions during that period was felt in the theological centers also. The various attempts to integrate practical experience with theology in field education and theological reflection born of this quest are still ambiguous in their goals and expectations, and this confusion is reflected in much writing about these attempts.<sup>37</sup> I doubt that anyone would claim that the attempt to integrate theory and practice in theological education has yet been successful. This has been a long-standing problem, however, for education in other "professions" such as law and medicine as well, and so we should not expect that theological education would succeed any more rapidly.

Some would argue that it is not only theory and practice that are not integrated, but that theological education as a whole lacks any integration or unity. In a recent critique of theological education, Edward Farley argues that the "study of theology" has been replaced by training in a series of particular skills needed for the tasks to be performed by the leaders in Christian communities, and that consequently there has been

<sup>36</sup> Cf. the Special Forum in the *National Catholic Reporter*, Feb. 25, 1983, 7-24. Most of the concerns expressed in these articles are about the quantity and the quality of the seminarians rather than about the theological programs as such.

<sup>37</sup> For an attempt to clarify some of these confused expectations, see Evelyn E. and James D. Whitehead, *Method in Ministry* (New York: Seabury, 1980).

a multiplication of disciplines (mostly nontheological) in which students are trained but that there is nothing that unifies them.<sup>38</sup> Although Farley's critique is based primarily on the experience of Protestant theological education in the United States, it applies to a lesser extent to current Roman Catholic theological education, since in this post-Vatican II period Roman Catholic seminaries have tended to model themselves on their Protestant counterparts and adopted ATS standards, as I mentioned above.<sup>39</sup> In the post-Tridentine Roman Catholic seminary, however, systematic theology and, to some extent, moral theology dominated the curriculum and gave at least the appearance of an integrating factor. With much greater emphasis today being placed on biblical and historical studies as well as pastoral skills, there is a vast amount of information as well as widely diverse methodologies which the student is expected to integrate or synthesize. The recognition and acceptance of pluralism and diversity even within theology itself has only compounded the problem of integration in theological education. Although Farley's critique must be taken seriously, I wonder if theological education was ever as unified in the past as he seems to think. Some balance between unity and diversity in theological education must always be sought.

Although unity is a problem and we recognize that we are in a pluralistic situation both culturally and religiously, theological education still takes place in relative isolation from the great religious traditions of the East (Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam) and from the cultural traditions of Asia and Africa. We are just beginning to pay attention to the voices from Latin America in the liberation theologies from that continent. Recognition of these diversities and their possible contribution to the fullness of the Christian experience has yet to take place. As Rahner has pointed out, the "global Church" really only began with Vatican II, and its full impact on theological education has yet to be felt.

Finally, although I think that the increased emphasis on pastoral skills is necessary, the model of ministry motivating it has become too narrowly therapeutic—geared primarily to a "one-to-one" form of ministry in parishes or chaplaincies. Despite a growing concern for issues of justice and peace, little or no attention is being paid to the background and skills necessary for longer-range and less personally oriented forms of ministry demanded by these issues. Research and study, political and organizational activity are not included in the model of ministry operative in most theological education today.

<sup>38</sup> Edward Farley, *Theologia: The Fragmentation and Unity of Theological Education* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

<sup>39</sup> On this and some other points of similarity and difference, see Robert J. Schreiter, "A Roman Catholic Response to Edward Farley's *Theologia*," forthcoming.

Although much remains to be done, the changes in theological education for ministry since Vatican II provide a much better preparation for leadership in the Christian community than that offered 20 years ago. In comparison with some other institutional situations within the Church, the seminaries and theological centers have been extraordinarily faithful in following out the spirit and emphases of Vatican II. The full impact of this form of education has yet to be felt in the life of the Church but, despite the decline in numbers, we have every reason to be hopeful.

**ORIGEN: SPIRIT & FIRE**  
**A Thematic Anthology of His Writings**  
*by Hans Urs von Balthasar*  
*Translated by Robert J. Daly, S.J.*

Called the "man of steel" by scholars who came after him, Origen ranks in importance for the history of Christian thought beside St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas. Von Balthasar compares his philosophy with that of Heraclitus and Nietzsche: "For their work too is, externally, ashes and contradiction, and makes sense only because of the fire of their souls which forces their unmanageable material into a unity and, with a massive consumption of fuel, leaves behind it a fiery track across the earth."

Order code VOSF

*cloth* \$34.95

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY  
**OF AMERICA**

**PRESS**

P.O. Box 4852, Hampden Station, Baltimore, Md. 21211/Telephone: 301-338-7817