Molding the Minds of Shepherds:
Intellectual Formation of Diocesan Priests in the United States

Michael G. Coughlin, S.T.L.
Dissertation
Doctorate of Sacred Theology
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

Director:

Mark Massa, S.J., Th.D.
Boston College

Readers:

Franklin Harkins, Ph.D.
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

Katarina Schuth, O.S.F., Ph.D.
The Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity

Abstract

Priestly formation is a daunting task in the contemporary American landscape. Short of increasing the time of seminary studies, it is important that the available time is maximized and focused to the intended goal: to form faithful shepherds adequately prepared to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century church. While the human, pastoral, and spiritual dimensions of priestly formation are obviously critical, this dissertation focuses on the state of intellectual formation in American diocesan seminaries, specifically theological formation.

A number of questions arise with respect to this topic of intellectual formation in seminaries. What is the point and purpose of theological education for diocesan priests in the United States? How has this purpose been understood and pursued in the past? What are the norms of the universal church with respect to theological education of priestly candidates? How are these norms understood and applied in the context of present day American diocesan seminaries? What is the current state of theological formation in diocesan seminaries and what adjustments might be made to best meet contemporary challenges? These are the questions this dissertation aims to respond to regarding the intellectual formation of diocesan priests in the United States.

The first four chapters of this dissertation is a survey of the history of diocesan seminaries in the United States, with particular attention on the purpose and understanding of theological education in the formation of diocesan priests. Special focus is given to the key ecclesial documents governing priestly formation and their application in the concrete circumstances and historical context of American seminaries. Chapter 5 is concerned with current theological programs at six American seminaries during the 2019-2020 academic year.

Table of Contents

Preface

This dissertation was made possible through the generous support of many individuals, to whom I am most grateful. I am truly humbled to think of the number of people who welcomed me with open arms and encouraged me in my work. To say "thank you" falls far short of the gratitude I hold in my heart, but I will try.

Though I owe thanks to far more people than I can mention here, I would like to single out a few individuals. Mark Massa, S.J. provided the first spark to my interest in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States through his courses at the Boston College School of Theology and Ministry. His continued support over my years of study and in directing this dissertation merit special recognition and appreciation. Sister Katarina Schuth, O.S.F. and Dr. Franklin Harkins offered generous suggestions and recommendations to improve my text over months of correspondence, many of which fell during the adverse circumstances of a global pandemic. The personal warmth, generous support, and serious scholarship of these three individuals are an example I will strive to imitate in my life, both professional and personal. I would also like to thank Andrea Vicini, S.J. and Sr. Meg Guider, O.S.F., the directors of the S.T.D. program during my years of doctoral study, for their support in helping me through each stage of the program.

I am grateful to the faith communities that have sustained me during this project, especially the parishes of St. John Neumann and Our Lady of Mercy, both in Merrimack, N.H., where I had the privilege of ministering over these past several years. The day-to-day experience of a parish community helped ground me during my doctoral studies, and always kept before my mind the ultimate purpose for studying theology.

Most of all, I am thankful for the constant love and support of my family and friends. In a special way, I am eternally grateful to God for the gifts of my parents, who lovingly provided me every opportunity and encouragement along the way; for my two older brothers, my sisters-in-law, and my nieces and nephews; and especially, for my wife, Cindy, who continuously and selflessly supported me in this pursuit during the first years of our marriage. *Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam*.

Michael Coughlin
Nashua, N.H.

Introduction: An Historical Background to Seminary Intellectual Formation in the U.S.

Priestly formation is a daunting task in the contemporary American landscape. With ever increasing demands and decreasing numbers, capable and well-rounded Catholic priests are needed more than ever. Formal seminary training, usually spanning from five to eight years for most candidates for diocesan priesthood, seems of long duration at first glance but, given the range of skills and knowledge priestly ministry calls for, is in reality quite brief. Short of increasing the time of seminary studies, it is important that the available time is maximized and focused to the intended goal: to form faithful shepherds adequately prepared to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century church. While the human, pastoral, and spiritual dimensions of priestly formation are obviously critical, this dissertation focuses on the state of intellectual formation in American diocesan seminaries, specifically theological formation.

A number of questions arise with respect to this topic of intellectual formation in seminaries. What is the point and purpose of theological education for diocesan priests in the United States? How has this purpose been understood and pursued in the past? What are the norms of the universal church with respect to theological education of priestly candidates? How are these norms understood and applied in the context of present day American diocesan seminaries? What is the current state of theological formation in diocesan seminaries and what adjustments might be made to best meet contemporary challenges? These are the questions this dissertation aims to respond to regarding the intellectual formation of diocesan priests in the United States.

The first four chapters of this dissertation is a survey of the history of diocesan seminaries in the United States, with particular attention on the purpose and understanding of theological education in the formation of diocesan priests. Special focus is given to the key ecclesial

documents governing priestly formation and their application in the concrete circumstances and historical context of American seminaries. Chapter 5 is concerned with current theological programs at six American seminaries.

Chapter 1 covers the period between the establishment of the first American diocese in Baltimore in 1789 through the end of the papacy of Pius X in 1914. Chapter 2 treats the time period between the papacy of Benedict XV and the implementation of the 1917 *Code of Canon Law* through the mid-1960s. Chapter 3 considers the reforms of the Second Vatican Council, their impact on priestly intellectual formation and their implementation in American seminaries over the following decades, through the 1980s. Chapter 4 spans the period between John Paul II's *Pastores Dabo Vobis* in 1992 and the issuing of the new *Ratio Fundamentalis* in 2016 for Catholic seminaries throughout the world, *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation*. Building on this historical and theological understanding of intellectual formation in American seminaries, Chapter 5 analyzes the current theological formation programs at six contemporary American seminaries during the 2019-2020 academic year.

Recruitment and formation of clerical candidates was a priority of the American Catholic Church since its founding. Catholic seminaries in the United States developed out of earlier traditions of various shapes throughout church history. A watershed moment in the formation of diocesan priests came with the Council of Trent; however the Council was preceded by various models of formation in the early church and the Middle Ages, and succeeded by models implemented throughout Europe, especially France.

The first known efforts to intentionally form clergy in the early church stem from the fourth century, when several bishops organized the life of their local clergy around a quasi-monastic life

in common, centered around their initiative and direction.[1] In the Middle Ages, most priests received little to no formal education, being ordained after only a brief period of apprenticeship with an experienced priest who handed on the minimal necessary practical knowledge. The education of clergy took place in three main settings, each distinct yet intimately related: the monastic school, the cathedral school, and the university.[2]

One of the contributing factors or causes to the Protestant Reformations of the sixteenth century was the moral laxity and generally low state of Catholic clergy.[3] The challenge of clerical reform was at the heart of the Catholic Church's response to the period and, therefore, was an issue taken up ultimately by the Council of Trent to be applied in the universal church.

In restoring Catholicism in England during the reign of Queen Mary Tudor, Cardinal Reginald Pole instituted a reform program which formed a foundation for the Council of Trent's 1563 decree on clerical formation. The decree sketched out broad outlines for seminaries to provide more effective instruction for candidates for the priesthood. Building on the existing model of the cathedral school, Trent called for each diocese, whenever possible, to provide religious education and church discipline for boys who were at least twelve years of age and had acquired basic reading abilities, with preference for those from impoverished backgrounds. If this educational institution was not possible for a particular diocese, the decree allowed for groups of

[1] The most famous instance of this model was the community built by St. Augustine in Hippo. Although those gathered into his household were already priests, their ongoing education and formation while engaged in practical ministry impacted the church in North Africa in subsequent generations, as many members of the community went on to influential roles as diocesan bishops and abbots. See John Tracy Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: I – The Apostolic Age to Trent," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 4.
[2] See Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, Vol. I*, ed. F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), 29; Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: I – The Apostolic Age to Trent," 8-12. See also "Appendix A."
[3] Pope Paul III's 1537 commission charged with studying reform in the face of the reformations determined a foundational problem to be the admission of candidates to holy orders and recommended protocols to help regularize the relationship and accountability of ordinands with their bishop. See text of report in Joannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio, Vol. I* (Paris and Leipzig: Welter, 1902), 347-355.

dioceses to cooperate together in the establishment and operation of a seminary.[4] The conciliar text on seminary formation provided a skeleton outline of what the seminary was to do in forming candidates for the priesthood. Diocesan bishops were the single most important leaders in its application.

The Trent decree did not provide for an explicit spirituality for the diocesan priest which would help inform the seminary program. This priestly spirituality, of critical importance and influence on the early period of seminary formation in the United States, took shape in 17th century France through the influence of the Society of St. Sulpice and the Congregation of the Mission.[5] The focus of this "French Tradition" of spirituality was prayerful identification with the mysteries of Jesus's life as infinite sources of contemplation and reflection, rooted in the priesthood and victimhood of Christ. This focus led to an emphasis on self-denial as a means for identification with Christ to supplant identity with self.[6] The corresponding view of priesthood highlighted its supernatural character, set apart from the world.

With anti-clericalism gaining momentum in the French revolutionary movement of the late eighteenth century, Sulpician superior general Jacques-André Emery saw dark skies ahead and sought options for the survival of his community abroad in the summer of 1790. After consulting with the papal nuncio, Archbishop Dugnani, Emery was encouraged to reach out to the recently

---

[4] See Henry J. Schroeder, ed., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books, 1978), 177-178; James A. O'Donohoe, *Tridentine Seminary Legislation: Its Sources and Its Formation*, Bibliotheca Ephermeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, Vol. 9 (Louvain, 1957), 89-162. See also "Appendix A."

[5] See John Tracy Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," in *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Historical Investigations*, ed. John Tracy Ellis (Collegeville, MN: Saint John's University Press, 1971), 12. See also "Appendix A."

[6] See Joseph M. White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," in *Reason for the Hope: The Futures of Roman Catholic Theologates*, by Katarina Schuth (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989), 12-13; Joseph M. White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to the Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 18-20; Walter J. Burghardt, "Towards an American Theology," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CLIX (September 1968), 184; and Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 13-14. See also "Appendix A."

elected Bishop of Baltimore, John Carroll, who was in England for his episcopal consecration, to offer his community's services in operating a potential seminary in Baltimore. Emery took the initiative and reached out to Carroll who, at first, was hesitant to accept the offer of Sulpician assistance because of realistically low expectations for providing enough students to enroll in such a seminary. Carroll, however, was in need of priests to minister to the American Catholic population, having only about one priest for every nine hundred Catholics. After further meetings and a Sulpician agreement to help with general pastoral needs, Carroll accepted the Sulpicians' generous offer to provide priests and a few seminarians for the new seminary, to pay for their own passage to Maryland, and to independently maintain and support the seminary institution.[7]

In the spring of 1791, four Sulpician priests, led by the appointed superior, François Charles Nagot, and five seminarians departed for Baltimore, arriving in July. Their new Seminary of St. Sulpice, renamed St. Mary's Seminary, officially opened in October 1791, making it not only the first American Catholic institution of higher education, but also the first fully developed independent institution dedicated to theological education in the United States, regardless of denomination.[8]

The timing of the French Revolution and the end of the *ancien régime* coincided with the beginning of both the United States of America and the American Catholic Church, organized around the Diocese of Baltimore. This coincidence in timing provided an opportunity for the French Sulpicians to escape revolutionary France and to establish themselves in America, while at the same time benefiting the American church by bringing their clerical formation expertise in staffing St. Mary's, the first seminary in the United States.[9]

---

[7] See Christopher J. Kauffman, *Tradition and Transformation in Catholic Culture: The Priests of Saint Sulpice in the United States from 1791 to the Present* (New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1988), 38-44.
[8] See ibid.
[9] See ibid.

The seminary became an influential institution not only in the Catholic community but also within the broader culture of the city of Baltimore, especially through their schooling of both Catholic and Protestant students. Emery insisted that the nascent Sulpician community and seminary, however, maintain their identity rooted in the "French Tradition" of spirituality, adjusting their rule of life only in the nonessentials. Carroll's original fears about enrollment, however, were not unfounded. Financial difficulties and the lack of students led the Sulpicians to seriously consider withdrawing from the project in 1803. However, at the urging of Pope Pius VII, the Sulpicians remained at Baltimore and, slowly, the enrollment grew in the first decade of the nineteenth century.[10]

[10] See ibid., 43-54.

Chapter 1: American Catholic Seminary Intellectual Formation, 1789-1914

A. Models of Seminary Formation in the U.S.: 1789-1914

From its founding, St. Mary's Seminary became an influential institution for the formation of diocesan clergy and, with its influence, the popularity of the French spirituality imbued by the Sulpicians. It was not long in existence, however, before other American seminaries came into being. The expansion of the American church, marked by the growing number of dioceses throughout the nineteenth century, was matched by an increase in the number of seminaries. Of the forty-three dioceses erected between 1789, the date of the founding of the Diocese of Baltimore, and 1866, the date of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, more than fifty percent attempted to start and run some form of seminary for its local church.[11] Of these many educational startups, there were naturally varying degrees of success, though a variety of organizational models emerged. The six models considered here are the mixed model (with a college), the domestic/diocesan model, the national ethnic model, the religious community model, the freestanding provincial model, and the model of the American seminary abroad.[12]

St. Mary's Seminary was an example of a mixed model, combining a seminary providing philosophical and theological education for clerical candidates and a college providing instruction

[11] One of the first priorities of a new diocesan bishop was to provide for the building of a local clergy, which helps explain the interest in forming seminaries. Often this meant recruiting qualified priests from Europe with the ability to staff the seminary and seminarians to attend. Unsurprisingly, this priority resulted in a proliferation of numerous, small institutions, with an average of about thirteen students in 1843, and many did not last. See John Tracy Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: II – Trent to Today," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 48. See also Joseph M. White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to the Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 48.

[12] Some elements of these models overlap so they are not meant as absolute distinctions but, instead, as helpful tools to approach the variety and creativity of seminary organization in the American context.

in the liberal arts to students, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, who did not necessarily intend to pursue future ordination. Sometimes the college was considered a minor seminary, providing the preparatory education to seminarians necessary for continuing on to the study of philosophy and theology; however this was not always the case.[13] Often this mixed model was developed as a means of survival. The fees paid by the college students helped offset the costs of educating seminarians and operating the institution. However, the teaching duties of the seminarians in the college were the major time commitment, leaving little time or energy for rigorous theological study. This time commitment was not widely seen as a problem, but rather as an important part of priestly formation, in line with the French spiritual tradition infused in even non-Sulpician American seminaries. It was a formation in the *esprit ecclésiastique* and was designed to overcome the temptation toward intellectual vanity.

A second organizational model, popular in the pre-Civil War period and fitting the proliferation of dioceses, was that of the domestic seminary in the household of the diocesan bishop and created at his initiative. Following the seminary ideal espoused by the decrees of Trent, and founded on the earlier tradition of Augustine's community and the medieval episcopal school, this model provided an intimate community and connection of the seminarians and priest instructors within the bishop's household.[14] Some of these domestic seminaries, once again as a matter of

[13] St. Mary's, for example, opened a lay college in 1799 and later a minor seminary, St. Charles College, in 1848. Another example of this sort was Mount St. Mary's Seminary in Emmitsburg, Maryland, which began in 1808 as a Sulpician minor seminary and eventually blossomed into a college institution run by diocesan priests, where priestly candidates taught classes at the college and received theological instruction. See Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: II – Trent to Today," 48-49.

[14] An early example of this sort was the exigent inauguration of seminary life in Boston, when Bishop Jean Cheverus began a domestic school for his seminarians who were unable to return to Baltimore due to the War of 1812. Other examples include St. Thomas Seminary, founded in 1811 in the Diocese of Bardstown, Kentucky, at the initiative of Bishop Benedict Flaget, and the "Philosophical and Classical Seminary" of Bishop John England's Diocese of Charleston in 1822. See "Bishop Benedict J. Fenwick's Letter to Francis Dzierozinski, April 11, 1826," in *History of Saint John's Seminary, Brighton*. ed. John E. Sexton and Arthur J. Riley (Boston: Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston, 1945), 25; "John B. David's Letter to Antoine Duclaux, September 14, 1814," in Lloyd P. McDonald, *The Seminary Movement in the United States: Projects, Foundations and Early Development, 1784-1833* (Washington: Catholic

survival, included a mixed model where the seminarians instructed younger students; however, this teaching arrangement was not always the case. Following most closely the Tridentine model emphasizing the direction of the bishop over the seminary, the practical realities of the American circumstances differed greatly from sixteenth century Europe. These differences, namely the small pool of American clerical candidates and limited financial resources of the American church, led many of these domestic seminaries to adapt and adopt a quality of the first seminaries in France, emphasizing them as places for the formation of candidates immediately prior to ordination who had already completed their studies elsewhere, rather than as a thoroughly comprehensive theological program.[15]

A third organization model was that of the national ethnic seminary, meeting the pastoral needs of a demographically shifting Catholic population through immigration. Between 1820 and 1870, the Catholic population grew to approximately 1.2 million, about two-thirds being Irish Catholic and one-third German Catholic. Linguistically, the Irish immigrants experienced a smoother cultural transition to the American environment. For German Catholics, who settled mostly in the area between Milwaukee, Cincinnati, and St. Louis, however, their German language was central to their identity and they therefore required ministers equipped to meet their pastoral needs. Similar pastoral needs arising in other immigrant communities were addressed in a like manner.[16]

University of America Press, 1927), 39-40; Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: II – Trent to Today," 49; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 48-50.

[15] Oftentimes, in the American context, these candidates were from Europe and used this time to adapt to American life, language, and culture. See "Michael O'Connor to the Council of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, Pittsburgh, February 24, 1845," quoted in White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 63-64.

[16] Toward satisfying this need, Bishop Martin Henni of Milwaukee founded St. Francis Seminary in 1845, which became effectively a national seminary for German language seminarians, intellectually influenced by the Austrian Jesuits at the University of Innsbruck, while at the same time a provincial seminary for the surrounding dioceses. Another German seminary was the Pontifical College of Josephinum, founded in 1875 and eventually put directly under the auspices of the Holy See. Later on in 1886, Sts. Cyril and

A fourth model for seminary organization during the period was operation by various religious communities, bringing their particular charisms to bear on priestly formation in the American context. Beyond the Sulpicians, whom we have encountered already in the American setting, other religious communities significantly contributed to the formation of diocesan priests in the period.[17] These religious communities provided diocesan seminaries in a mixed model with a lay college, as a means to help support both the seminary and broader community, as seen in other models. This model is a further example of necessary adaptation of the Tridentine ideal in the American context, because Trent did not envision religious priests being in charge of formation for diocesan seminarians.[18]

A fifth model, which became more popular from the mid-nineteenth century and the expansion of American archdioceses, was the freestanding provincial seminary. Calls for designating a central or national seminary (rather than strictly diocesan) to train candidates from throughout the United States were made as early as the 1820s, but both the First and Second Provincial Councils of Baltimore in 1829 and 1833, respectively, did not take action for a variety of reasons, including financial concerns about such a project's feasibility and the preference of

---

Methodius Seminary was established in Michigan as a national seminary for the Polish community. See "Bishop Henni's Letter to the Monks of Einsiedln, May 22, 1844," in Peter Leo Johnson, *Halcyon Days: Story of St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, 1856-1956* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1956), 22; Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: II – Trent to Today," 52, 54.

[17] Although the Society of St. Sulpice is technically a community of diocesan priests committed to priestly formation and, therefore, not a religious order, Sulpician involvement in seminaries is more similar to that of a religious community than that of other diocesan priests, so they are considered in this category.

[18] Members of St. Vincent de Paul's Congregation of the Mission arrived in Missouri in 1818 and, over the course of the century, operated both seminaries and colleges, such as Niagara College and Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels in New York. Benedictines from both Germany and Switzerland contributed to the needs of German Catholic immigrants by establishing monasteries, schools, and seminaries, such as St. Vincent Archabbey and Seminary in Pennsylvania, St. Meinrad Abbey and Seminary in Indiana, and St. John's Abbey and Seminary in Minnesota. Italian Franciscans established St. Bonaventure College in 1859, and provided seminary formation for candidates from the Diocese of Buffalo along with their own community candidates. See Joseph M. White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," in *Reason for the Hope: The Futures of Roman Catholic Theologates*, by Katarina Schuth (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989), 17-18; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 121.

many bishops for more local seminary control. In 1851, the idea of a Catholic University for the United States was first put forward by Archbishop John Purcell of Cincinnati, though it would take nearly fifty years for this idea to take shape and become a reality. By 1853, new ecclesiastical provinces were established, bringing the total number of American archdioceses to seven, and there began a pattern of establishing larger, freestanding seminaries in the archdiocese, which served the dioceses of the entire province. At the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866, the bishops promoted the founding of provincial seminaries when it was not possible to sustain more local diocesan institutions.[19]

These freestanding provincial seminaries, by pooling the resources of finances, personnel, and students of a larger territory, provided a more sustainable model than the smaller diocesan seminaries of the previous decades. They were freestanding in that they did not depend on the operation of a college for non-clerical students in order to survive and were all-encompassing, effectively separate from the surrounding world both in their rural location and practical day-to-day life. The seminarians' responsibility for teaching was eliminated, allowing more time to focus on personal formation. The provincial seminary moved away from a literal following of the Tridentine ideal focused on the diocesan bishop, and, with increased complexity and size, required more detailed organization in terms of faculty, curricula, and way of life to successfully launch the larger institution.[20]

---

[19] Examples included Purcell's own Mt. St. Mary's Seminary of the West for the province surrounding Cincinnati, and St. Joseph's Seminary at Troy, New York for the province surrounding the Archdiocese of New York. See "Bishop Fenwick's Letter to Bishop James Whitfield, September 10, 1828," in *History of Saint John's Seminary, Brighton*, ed. Sexton and Riley, 28; Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore* (New York: Macmillan, 1932), 180; Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: II – Trent to Today," 55-56; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 67-69.

[20] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 84-85; White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," 17.

The sixth and final model of seminary organization during this period was the formation of American seminaries in Europe, to make use of established Catholic faculties and universities for intellectual formation. While some American seminarians studied at the Urban College in Rome since the 1780s, the movement for specifically American seminaries in Europe took shape in the mid-nineteenth century.[21] Despite the initial opposition of some American bishops, the American College in Rome was opened in 1859 with twelve students from eight sending dioceses. The candidates at the American College in Rome were American citizens from American dioceses destined for future ministry in the United States. At roughly the same time, parallel efforts were made by some American bishops to establish an American College in Belgium at the University of Louvain, which opened in 1857. At first, the purpose of this college was to prepare European clerical candidates for future ministry in the United States, although American students were also assigned there, including John Lancaster Spalding, future bishop of Peoria, and Patrick Riordan, future archbishop of San Francisco.[22]

[21] A major impetus for this movement was the broad 1853 visitation of the American church by Archbishop Gaetano Bedini, nuncio to Brazil, on behalf of the Holy See. Bedini commented, among other things, on the large number of seminaries in the United States of unimpressive quality and stature. The solution, he proposed, would be the founding of an American residential college at Rome which would infuse American priestly candidates with a taste of *Romanitas*, inspire more vocations, provide a superior education, and become a training ground for future episcopal candidates. Pope Pius IX shared Bedini's enthusiasm and desire for the establishment of an American college. See James Connelly, *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America, June, 1853-February, 1854* (Rome: Universita Gregoriana, 1954), 5-15, 244-247. See also White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 86-87, 91-93.

[22] See Robert F. McNamara, *The American College in Rome, 1855-1955* (Rochester: Christopher Press, 1956), 28-36, 57-61, 63-71; John D. Sauter, *The American College of Louvain, 1857-1898* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1959); Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: II – Trent to Today," 57-58; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 95-96.

B. Intellectual Life in American Seminaries from Carroll to the Baltimore Plenary Councils

Pastoral necessities of the nineteenth century American Catholic community, both in ministering to the Catholic population and in staffing diocesan seminaries, required reliance on European priests willing to come as missionaries to the American church. The three main countries providing missionary priests to America were France, Ireland, and Germany. The characteristics of the spirituality and training of these European priests in their own national context understandably impacted their approach to priestly formation in the United States, so a few general remarks will be made on their differences of emphasis.

With the French Sulpician influence present in the American church from its beginning, quite naturally many early bishops in the United States were French-born and relied on French clergy to fill priestly vacancies in their dioceses. The post-Napoleonic renewal of French Catholicism in the early nineteenth century was marked by an emergent ultramontanism and an increase in newly formed religious communities and vocations generally. Priestly formation of the period focused on fostering sincere devotion in the seminarian, rather than overt intellectual curiosity or academic pursuits. Personal and liturgical devotions took up many hours of the day in most French seminaries, and the main focus of theological study was practically oriented and not generally interested in engaging broader intellectual currents.[23] Rigorist moral positions as were traditionally held in 17th and 18th century French spirituality accompanied a spirit of self-denial.

[23] See Paul A. Gagnon, *France Since 1789* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 109; Adrien Dansette, *Religious History of Modern France* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961), II, 6; John Tracy Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," in *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Historical Investigations*, ed. John Tracy Ellis (Collegeville, MN: Saint John's University Press, 1971), 16, 18.

Irish clergy were the most numerous group of European priests to minister in the United States. While their own seminary training varied, with some formed in continental seminaries throughout Europe, most received their clerical formation in Ireland after the British government permitted the founding of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, in 1795 as the national seminary, and other local seminaries soon after. Since many faculty formators of these Irish seminaries were trained in France, the "French Tradition" of priestly spirituality and formation also impacted future Irish clergy who went on to staff American seminaries throughout the period.[24]

The intellectual environment of Germany provided a different atmosphere for German priests who came as missionaries to the United States. Catholic intellectuals maintained active presences at German universities so that, broadly speaking, seminary education and university education were not completely separated. While not all German priests studied at the university, and not all German missionaries who served in the United States were trained in the university setting, serious intellectual engagement was part of the overall culture shared by German Catholic clergy.[25]

Building on these foundations of the broad tradition of clerical formation, we are now in a better position to explore the intellectual life in American seminaries during this period. The two greatest influences on how intellectual formation was pursued were, first, the Tridentine emphasis on the supernatural character of the priesthood and the celebration of the sacraments and, second, the "French Tradition" of priestly spirituality focused on identification with Christ, moral rigor and self-denial, and the "otherness" of the priest, set apart from both the world and the laity. With these influences in mind, several characteristics of seminary intellectual life can be seen.

[24] See Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 20-21.
[25] Ibid., 20.

First, the overall purpose or end-goal of intellectual life at American seminaries was directed toward its pastoral application in ministry and the celebration of the sacraments, especially confession. The early American priest was inherently missionary, either travelling to reach remote Catholics or engaging in basic instruction and carrying on liturgical life in parishes, adjusting to pastoral need. To meet these needs, American bishops required priests to be trained as quickly as possible and, with the final say about the time necessary for adequate formation, they prioritized expediency.[26] Capable and competent priests were needed, and not necessarily sophisticated theologians.

Second, the overall seminary program was geared toward fostering and promoting good behavior, responding to a broader problem of clerical misbehavior during the period. Intellectual training and study took place within this context and was often subordinated to external observance of the daily schedule of the seminary. Clerical conduct was especially important because of the leadership role and personal example the priest provided in immigrant communities.[27] Coupled with the emphasis of the dominant French spirituality, seminaries enforced a highly organized daily schedule and seminary rule or way of life to try to form habitual discipline and *esprit ecclésiastique* in the priestly candidates.[28]

---

[26] This pastoral need took on a new importance with the radical increase in the Catholic population through immigration to cities, and the practical ministry of priests involved devotions centered around the parish, the heart of the immigrant community. See John Grassi, "The Catholic Religion in the United States in 1818," in *Documentary Reports on Early American Catholicism*, ed. Philip Gleason (New York: Arno Press, 1978), 238-239; "John Carroll to John Grassi, November 30, 1813," in *John Carroll Papers*, ed. Thomas O'Brien Hanley (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), 3:243-244.

[27] Some European priests who came to minister in the United States did so because their situation was not working out at home for a variety of disciplinary reasons, raising the issue as a priority in American seminaries. See Michael V. Gannon, "Before and After Modernism: The Intellectual Isolation of the American Priest," in *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Historical Investigations*, ed. John Tracy Ellis (Collegeville, MN: Saint John's University Press, 1971), 304; Connelly, *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America*, 240.

[28] Despite the emphasis on a specifically priestly spirituality, there was a limited body of theological writing and spiritual reading on the priesthood in the English language, so a reading knowledge of French was a useful skill to access this material. See Arthur J. Scanlan, *St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York, 1896-1921, with an Account of the Other Seminaries of New York* (New York: United States

The daily *horarium* directed the seminarian's day from the moment of waking until sleep, and was filled largely with blocks of time for communal and personal prayer and meditation. The seminarian developed a regular relationship with a priest as confessor and spiritual director, and other priest faculty members voted each year on the seminarian's fitness to continue in formation, based on the perceived adaptation to, and internalization of, the way of life.[29]

Third, within this context prioritizing good behavior, formal intellectual learning was often of secondary importance. Without external norms, seminary programs, especially in the first half of the nineteenth century, were of flexible lengths of time for both the study of philosophy and theology.[30] Only with the rise of the larger, provincial seminaries in the second half of the century did a standard time frame crystallize at about two years of philosophy and three years of theology. In theological studies, the two main subjects were dogmatic and moral theology. Whatever the content of intellectual studies, however, the goal of the seminarian was ordination, not the earning of an academic degree.[31]

Fourth, faculty members at American seminaries during the period received varied academic training and were often preoccupied with other formation responsibilities. In the earlier period of smaller, more numerous local seminaries, it was common to have only one or two priest faculty members to teach the entire scope of theology. With the growth of larger provincial

---

Catholic Historical Society, 1922), 27. See also White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 126, 130.

[29] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 128-29.

[30] More advanced students often took on a tutoring role for the junior students, and there was some degree of latitude in working at a personal pace. See John O'Hanlon, *Life and Scenery in Missouri; Reminiscences of a Missionary Priest* (Dublin, 1890), 13.

[31] Some seminaries were authorized to grant pontifical degrees, including the doctorate, such as St. Mary's in Baltimore and St. John's Abbey and Seminary in Minnesota, but this was usually only done in an honorary way for faculty and outsiders rather than for the academic achievement of students. Some seminaries were authorized by the state to grant bachelor's degrees to both lay students and seminarians who completed their college program, but not all exercised this right in the nineteenth century. See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 132-33.

freestanding seminaries from the mid-nineteenth century, the faculty size grew to allow for specialization.[32] The pedagogical method in the classroom depended on the use of textbooks, so faculty were required to do minimal preparation prior to class, nor did they engage in many independent scholarly pursuits or research.

Some faculty members from religious communities, such as the Sulpicians and the Vincentians, were not sent for further theological studies after their own seminary program on the principle of the vanity of learning. Even those educated in Rome were limited in their intellectual exposure, since a doctorate in theology at the Roman universities at the time lasted three years, the same as the ordinary theology curriculum in most American seminaries. Moreover, those educated in Europe and then serving in American seminaries did not bring much innovation and depth to their classrooms in terms of approach or content.[33]

Fifth, American seminaries utilized standard theological textbooks or manuals as the chief teaching tool for the key subjects of dogmatic and moral theology. These manuals presented their topics in clear, organized sections, helping to facilitate rote learning and examination, but little in scholarship and depth of learning. Popular texts used in France and French-influenced American seminaries during the early nineteenth century included Louis Bailly's *Theologiae Dogmatica et Moralis* and Abbé Regnier's *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi*. In non-Sulpician American seminaries, the dominant manual for dogmatic theology from the mid-nineteenth century was Jesuit Giovanni Perrone's *Praelectiones Theologicae* and *Compendium*.[34] In moral theology, the key emphasis in

[32] See Henry Szarnicki, "The Episcopate of Michael O'Connor First Bishop of Pittsburgh, 1843-1860," (Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1971), 143-145; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 132.
[33] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 132; Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 30.
[34] Ecclesiological preferences often determined which manual author was chosen for class instruction. Since most American bishops were directly or indirectly influenced by French Sulpicians, they often inherited a moderate Gallican ecclesiology emphasizing collegiality among bishops. By mid-century, Rome began to exert tighter control over theological questions in the face of modern challenges and to

the classroom and manuals was on hearing confessions. French manuals tended to hold a rigorist approach to moral theology, but the less rigid Liguorian approach became more popular in the American context[35] through the textbook of Jesuit Jean Pierre Gury, *Compendium Theologiae Moralis*. Despite the wide popularity of Perrone in dogmatics and Gury in moral theology, mention should be made of the textbooks in both areas by American Francis Patrick Kenrick. While they were not overly influential in American seminary life, they do provide an example of an American theologian attempting to create texts for use in the American context.[36]

Sixth, outside of dogmatic and moral theology, few other topics received focused intention in the intellectual program. Scripture studies received regular treatment, but not to the same extent as dogmatics and morals. Seminary programs paid little attention to church history, though faculty members used an English translation of Johann Herzog's comprehensive work at Mount St. Mary's Seminary of the West, Cincinnati's provincial seminary. Instruction in preaching and liturgy gave a practical focus as to how to celebrate the sacraments and to provide useful homiletic structures. Canon law, as a whole, was not valued as a worthwhile subject in the context of American seminaries.[37]

---

favor ultramontane views, a chief expression being Pope Pius IX's *Syllabus of Errors* of 1864. The Bailly text was condemned and fell out of favor, being replaced in Sulpician seminaries by Jean-Baptiste Bouvier's *Institutiones theologicae*. See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 134-138; M. Edmund Hussey, *A History of the Seminaries of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, 1829-1979* (Norwood, OH, 1979), 21.

[35] Broadly speaking, moral rigorism held that the most meritorious moral act was that closest to the law allowing the fewest exceptions, in keeping with the austere spirit of self-denial so prevalent in the "French Tradition." Liguori's approach struck a middle way between excessive rigor on the one hand and moral moderation on the other.

[36] See Hussey, *A History of the Seminaries of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati*, 21; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 138, 140.

[37] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 141; Johannes Baptist Alzog, *Manual of Universal Church History, 3 Volumes* (Cincinnati, 1874-78); Joseph Michael Connors, "Catholic Homiletic Theory in Historical Perspective" (Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1962), 242-288; Henry J. Browne, ed., "The Archdiocese of New York a Century Ago: A Memoir of Archbishop Hughes, 1838-1858," in *Historical Records and Studies 49-50* (1950), 163.

The purpose of intellectual formation in American seminaries during this period was principally focused on forming knowledgeable priests able to celebrate the sacraments and minister to the basic spiritual needs of the American Catholic community. The priest as sacred minister was to represent the fruits of ideal formation during the period. All elements of the seminary program, including academic pursuits, were directed toward this end. Outside of the United States, most of the nineteenth century was a time when papal efforts were responding to the new intellectual currents of modernity. The *Syllabus of Errors* of Pius IX and the 1879 encyclical of Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris*, which stressed the importance of the scholasticism of St. Thomas Aquinas and called for its renewal, were examples of past efforts to defend the Catholic faith from the perceived errors of the time. This position resulted in a defensive, "siege" mentality that saw the modern world as hostile. Quite naturally, intellectual engagement in Catholic seminaries in the United States followed this approach and focused on the apologetic, practically useful preparation of ministers who would be working in the midst of diverse, largely immigrant communities, facing the daily struggles and challenges of living within a non-Catholic American majority.[38]

C. American Seminary Education From the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore to 1914

The period from the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884 to the death of Pope St. Pius X in 1914 was marked by both a surge of optimism and openness to intellectual vigor in

[38] Moreover, many of the intellectual shortcomings of Catholic institutions of higher learning in the United States during the nineteenth century, including seminaries, were also shared by non-Catholic institutions. What we commonly think of as a modern research university only took shape in the United States in the 1870s when American universities, such as the University of Michigan and Johns Hopkins University, adopted some of the critical methods, faculties, and programs as those found in the leading German universities of the nineteenth century. See Gannon, "Before and After Modernism," 318.

American seminary life and a doubling down of Roman influence on American seminaries in the face of Modernism and its apparent threats. This timeframe is sometimes called the "Americanist Period," when unique aspects of the American experience were brought to bear on Catholic life in the United States.

In the wake of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore and its decrees for seminary formation, several new seminaries embraced engagement with current intellectual movements and scholarship. Influential seminary leaders of the era took seriously their responsibility to provide meaningful theological training for their students. The Catholic University of America, founded in 1887, exemplified this as a priority.

During this period, the ideal model of the American diocesan priest was a community leader with professional expertise. Building on the earlier model of priest as sacred minister, this period model responded to the pastoral needs of the day. With a growing Catholic community, the skills of American priests were more and more called upon beyond the sacred-sacramental dimension. As a leader of the local community, the priest was often an administrator, builder, educator, and much more. These diverse roles called for a professionalization of formation to help provide the training necessary to carry out these duties.

American bishops who gathered at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884 took up the issue of seminary formation. A standard time frame and curriculum were recommended to help improve and unify the formation of clerical candidates throughout the United States. The teaching of the Council came out of earlier discussions touching on intellectual formation of priests at the two prior plenary councils.

The First Plenary Council of Baltimore, meeting in 1852, was the initial episcopal gathering that included an increased number of archdioceses formed in mid-century. Following

the pattern of the proliferation of numerous, small diocesan seminaries with limited resources, the First Plenary Council encouraged the founding of provincial seminaries when individual bishops were unable to provide a suitable seminary in their own diocese.[39] This encouragement launched the movement of forming larger, regional seminaries that continued for the rest of the century.

When the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore met in 1866, more substantial decrees concerning seminaries were issued. The Council attempted to provide directives on the content of studies within both minor and major seminaries.[40] The Council tried to address the pastoral concern of priestly candidates moving from seminary to seminary by requiring letters of suitability from both the sending bishops and prior seminary leaders to attest to a seminarian's character and fitness for continued study. Finally, for the first time in a national meeting of American bishops, the hope of forming a Catholic university was raised by Archbishop Martin J. Spalding of Baltimore, a hope which would later be taken up by his nephew, John Lancaster Spalding.[41] However, due to concerns for the nascent American College in Rome and the overall lack of episcopal interest in a university at that time, the idea was not acted upon at the Second Plenary Council.

Unlike the earlier American councils, the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore was ordered by Rome to address issues in the American church, especially those dealing with relations between

---

[39] Earlier gatherings of provincial councils joined the suffragan bishops within the one American province of Baltimore with its singular American archbishop. After some unsuccessful efforts to establish a national seminary at the first two provincial councils in 1829 and 1833, the five following provincial councils between 1837 and 1849 did not issue any decrees on seminary structure or life. See *Concilium Plenarium Totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, Baltimori Habitum Anno 1852* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1853), 47. See also Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 34.

[40] Minor seminaries, which were affirmed following the tradition of Trent, were to focus on classical and modern languages, history, and the liturgy. Philosophy offerings were to consider the history of philosophical movements, largely with an apologetic aim to refute the perceived errors of modern thinkers. Studies in major seminaries were to include moral and dogmatic theology, Scripture, canon law, and preaching. Larger, provincial seminaries could include more expansive offerings, including Hebrew. See *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II. . . . Acta et Decreta* (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1868), 108.

[41] See Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 35; "Spalding to Timon, Baltimore, August 23, 1865," in John Tracy Ellis, *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America* (Washington: American Catholic Historical Association, 1946), 45-46.

priests and bishops. Due to the institutional structure of the church in America as a missionary territory throughout the nineteenth century, bishops wielded tremendous authority, priests possessed few rights, and canon law was not fully in effect. Since only one canonical parish existed in the United States, in New Orleans (dating from its French period), priests were frequently moved on short notice and at the discretion of the diocesan bishop without the established rights of a pastor. Upon receiving numerous appeals from priests suspended by their bishops, Roman authorities ordered American archbishops to call a plenary council and invited them to Rome for a preliminary meeting to outline an agenda.[42]

Prior to the planning meeting in Rome, officials from the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda drew from a report compiled by Jesuit Giovanni Franzelin on the state of the American church. In Franzelin's estimation, two major problems faced the church in the United States: first, the behavior and discipline of priests, and, second, financial issues, especially fundraising methods.[43]

With respect to American seminaries, Franzelin identified two principal concerns, one intellectual and one disciplinary. The first concern was about the short duration of the seminary curriculum, often three to four years for both philosophical and theological study. This curricular timeframe was considered, from the Roman perspective, inadequate. This problem concerned a perceived anti-intellectual attitude in the American church, which existed in part because the practical life of missionary priests did not require extensive higher studies. The second seminary

[42] As a mission country, there were no canonical parishes or pastors in the United States under church law. See Gerald P. Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy from 1870 to 1965* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1985), 27-28; Nelson J. Callahan, *A Case for Due Process in the Church: Father Eugene O'Callaghan, American Pioneer of Dissent* (Staten Island, NY: Society of St. Paul, 1971). See also White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 146, 150.

[43] See Franzelin Ponenza, 252 (October 1883), 252:1083-1084, 1087-1089, 1091-1092, 1237-1238, 1408-1409, Propaganda Fide Archives, referenced in White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 150-153.

concern, of a disciplinary nature, was with the practice of American seminarians returning home to their families during summer vacations. A more desirable alternative, in Franzelin's eyes, would be the practice of requiring seminarians to reside in summer villas common in Europe. The Franzelin report concluded with a few questions relating to American seminary life; first, whether to force bishops to follow the call of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in establishing regional or provincial seminaries; and, second, whether to encourage the founding of a Catholic university in the United States, an issue that had been recently promoted by John Lancaster Spalding of Peoria, Illinois.[44]

With the Franzelin report in mind, officials from the Roman Propaganda met with representatives from the American archdioceses in November 1883 to discuss the upcoming council. The agenda prepared in Rome included the question of seminaries as a top priority, but the American representatives took issue with the insistence of requiring summer villas for seminarians, a custom foreign to the culture and financial abilities of the American church. The American contingent did agree, however, with other elements of the Roman agenda for American seminaries. These recommendations included a six-year curriculum for major seminaries, with two years of philosophy and four years of theology, the use of textbooks covering the entire course of studies, and an emphasis on forming well-organized and qualified faculties. The Americans also agreed to recommend the provincial seminary model, with suffragan dioceses sending students to a seminary under the control of the local archdiocese. The American representatives returned home and began composing draft schema in advance of the Council to be held a year later, in November 1884.[45]

---

[44] White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 152-153.

[45] See Francis P. Cassidy, "Catholic Education in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore I," *Catholic Historical Review* 35 (October 1948), 266-272; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 154.

The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore itself addressed minor seminaries, major seminaries, and a Catholic university. With respect to minor seminaries, the bishops encouraged their founding in each diocese whenever possible. The minor seminary was to be freestanding and to serve those preparing for clerical ministry, though the possibility of a mixed structure with non-priestly candidates was permitted if necessary. There was to be a six-year curriculum, focusing on the basics of the Catholic faith, proficiency in English, Latin, Greek, and other pastorally useful modern languages, and other general subjects such as history, mathematics, and the sciences.[46]

Major seminaries were to be opened in each ecclesiastical province, echoing the call of the earlier plenary council. The major seminary curriculum was to span six years, two for philosophy and four for theology, making the overall program of study twelve years from minor through major seminary. Some bishops, including Archbishop Joseph Alemany of San Francisco, objected to the long length of study on account of the pastoral need for expediently trained priests, and some flexibility was agreed upon. Philosophy courses were to include metaphysics, logic, and ethics, with a special adherence to the scholasticism of St. Thomas Aquinas as called for by Pope Leo XIII in *Aeterni Patris*. Theology courses included the traditional priorities of dogmatic and moral theology, as well as scriptural exegesis, church history, canon law, and liturgy. The bishops did not endorse the Roman call for summer villas, emphasizing the necessary freedom for discernment experienced during that time which was seen as critically important in testing a priestly vocation.[47]

On the question of a Catholic university, John Lancaster Spalding was the most articulate spokesperson for its establishment at the Council. His argument was that the purpose of a seminary was to prepare candidates for priestly life and ministry; but that:

---

[46] White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 155-156.
[47] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 156-157; *Concilii plenarii Baltimorensis III acta et decreta* (Baltimore, 1886) in Cassidy, "Catholic Education in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore I," 275-288.

> the ecclesiastical seminary is not a school of intellectual culture, either here in America or elsewhere. . . . It must impart a certain amount of professional knowledge, fit its students to become more or less expert catechists, rubricists, and casuists, and its aim is to do this. . . . Hence its methods are not such as one would choose who desires to open the mind, to give it breadth, flexibility, strength, refinement and grace.[48]

The purpose of such an institution proposed by Spalding, one of higher studies for priests, was not to reform the seminary, but rather to build upon it by developing a habit of learning beyond the foundational work of the seminary curriculum. In Spalding's vision, this heightened level of theological pursuit would, in turn, inaugurate a new era of American Catholic intellectual life, similar to the impetus given to theological renewal in the thirteenth century upon the founding of the University of Paris.[49]

Several days later, the question of founding such an institution came up for discussion at the Council. Despite some opposition, the matter was referred to a committee which recommended to first found a seminary for higher theological studies near an important city, out of which a university could grow. When Spalding received a financial gift from a lay person to go toward its founding, the groundwork was laid for the opening of the Catholic University of America in Washington D.C. in 1889.[50]

Beyond discussion of the foregoing concerns, the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore provided concrete directives for seminary life in the United States, though the original initiative for many of the Council's directives came from Rome, a foreshadowing of a subsequent period of Roman intervention in American seminary life. It took a long time for its norms to be implemented,

---

[48] John Lancaster Spalding, "University Education Considered in its Bearings on the Higher Education of Priests (November 16, 1884)" quoted in White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 159.
[49] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 158-159; Spalding, "University Education," 16, 20, 23, 25.
[50] See "Appendix B" on the founding of the Catholic University American and priestly formation. See also White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 160, 189-208.

but the course charted out by the Council provided a vision for the future of seminary intellectual formation to respond to the needs of the American church community.

In the wake of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, several new, freestanding seminaries were established to apply some of the enthusiasm for seminary reform developing in the period. The new seminaries of the 1880s and 1890s included St. John's Seminary in Boston, St. Bernard's Seminary in Rochester, New York, St. Paul's Seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota, St. Patrick's Seminary outside of San Francisco, and St. Joseph's Seminary in the Archdiocese of New York.[51]

Many of these seminaries were housed in modern, up-to-date buildings that were the pride of the local church and sought to enshrine the best of the traditions of the past while opening to the possibilities of the future. The American church was finally able to produce a critical mass of American-born priestly candidates drawn from its historic immigrant communities to provide leadership in all aspects of the growing Catholic subculture. Most of the freestanding seminaries of the period were able to support between one and two hundred seminarians.[52]

At the end of the nineteenth century, more was being asked of the American diocesan priest in terms of his ministry than ever before. Beyond the sacred role of celebrating the sacraments, the American priest was called on to preach with eloquence, to teach the catechism, and to administer parochial institutions such as schools. The variety of professional skills needed to adequately carry on these tasks called for new approaches in the seminary curriculum. Many positive qualities, including courtesy, honesty, and compassion were to be enhanced in the course of a broad, liberal education. At the same time, the supernatural character of the priesthood was still emphasized through a rigorous daily *horarium* rooted in discipline, self-denial, and fraternal correction. In

[51] White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," 21-22.
[52] Ibid., 22.

addition to being committed to an efficacious sacramental life, seminarians participated in devotions of piety that spread throughout the Catholic world in the nineteenth century, such as the rosary, Eucharistic Adoration, and devotions to St. Joseph and to the Sacred Heart of Jesus.[53]

At first glance, the daily life of many seminaries appeared to carry on the traditions of the past. However, subtle but significant adaptations were made in many seminaries that brought opportunities for continued personal and intellectual growth.[54]

Many seminaries replaced devotional reading at meals with intellectually stimulating works. Some seminaries permitted opportunities for pastoral ministry, such as visiting hospitals and teaching children. Also, many new publications and journals, such as the *American Ecclesiastical Review* and the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, sought to provide intellectual formation to both seminarians and priests by presenting current topics and conversations of pastoral importance.[55] As in the nineteenth century, the goal of the seminary program was ordination and not the awarding of an academic degree. Students exhibited a variety of intellectual abilities, but many lacked serious scholarly interests.[56]

---

[53] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 209-210, 211, 219-221, 224-226.

[54] For example, the modern buildings of many new seminaries provided basic comforts and healthy environments not available in older structures. Concern for regular physical exercises prompted some seminaries to move beyond the customary weekly chaperoned walk and to try novel forms of exercise, some of which were compulsory. Awareness of current events was another area of openness to the outside world. Since a modern priest needed to be aware of what was happening in the world, politically, socially, and intellectually, reading rooms were supplied that offered general reading literature, with both a Catholic and secular focus. Ibid., 230-231.

[55] Ibid., 232; Anthony Vieban, "Charitable Work of Seminarians as a Preparation for the Work of Ministry," in Catholic Educational Association, *Report of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Second Annual Meeting* (1905), 249-263; Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 52.

[56] A few seminaries sought the ability to grant degrees from both the state and the Holy See, and others, such as St. John's Seminary, Boston, and St. Paul Seminary, Minnesota, sought affiliation with the newly formed Catholic University of America. Even when degrees were earned, however, they were of limited importance because they were not required for any type of pastoral role in the church, including seminary instructor. This trend toward granting degrees, in turn, led to consideration of the proper training for seminary faculty and helped to establish the norms for further study and academic degrees after ordination to more adequately prepare for teaching roles. See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 254-257; St. Mary's Minutes Book, Visitation, 1904, Sulpician Archives Baltimore, in White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 254.

In terms of formal intellectual curriculum, dogmatic and moral theology broadly maintained priority in the curriculum and continued the manualist tradition. Following the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, a committee was charged with producing a "Program of Studies" that would help implement the conciliar goals. Though not binding, the document sketched out both the six-year minor and six-year major seminary curricula in greater detail than the Council documents. For theology courses in major seminaries, textbooks were recommended for dogmatics (Hurter, replacing Perrone), moral theology (Konings or Lemkuhl, replacing Gury), and church history (Brück or Birkhaüser). New emphasis was placed on canon law, church history, and especially Scripture that was not present in the earlier period. By the turn of the twentieth century, Hurter's dogmatic theology textbook was replaced by that of Adolphe Alfred Tanquerey.[57]

D. Newer Programs of Study for Catholic Seminaries in the Late 19th Century: 1884-1911

The "Program of Studies" recommended by the bishops' committee was not binding and left room for other creative approaches to forming a meaningful seminary curriculum. We will now consider some of the ideas first, of John Hogan, and, second, of John Talbot Smith. Hogan, as rector of St. John's Seminary, Boston, and president of the Divinity College at Catholic University, was intimately engaged in seminary life, whereas Smith offered the perspective of a diocesan priest engaged in parish ministry and not directly involved in priestly formation. Consideration of their views lend an appreciation for creative efforts to bring clerical studies up to date with the concerns and needs of contemporary circumstances. Central to both of their

[57] See *Catholic Mirror* (Baltimore), July 18, 1885; *A plan of studies for the direction of those Institutions which educate youth for the Priesthood* (Baltimore, 1886), 13; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 238, 248-249; Anthony Vieban, "Father Tanquerey," *Voice* (1928).

approaches was the critical importance of history in providing proper context for theological studies.

John Hogan was an Irish Sulpician, open to the intellectual currents of nineteenth century Catholic liberalism. Teaching dogmatic and moral theology for several decades at Saint-Sulpice in Paris, Hogan was appointed first superior of St. John's Seminary in Boston upon its establishment in 1884. He was known more as a teacher than a scholar and employed a Socratic approach in the classroom that challenged his students to think critically in their studies rather than to passively absorb the material. Hogan published a number of articles in the *American Ecclesiastical Review* during the 1890s on different aspects of the intellectual formation of priests, later published in a single volume called *Clerical Studies*.[58]

His reflections stand as a testament of an engaged theological mind involved in seminary formation on the meaning and purpose of intellectual formation of diocesan priests. He commented on all aspects of intellectual life in the seminary, but especially important were the intended audience for the work and also his emphasis on Scripture and history. Hogan did not advocate for a radical reorganization of the seminary curriculum but rather its infusion with historical consciousness and the positive benefits of contemporary scholarship.

Hogan addressed his work to both seminarians and recently ordained priests engaged in pastoral work who might be open to supplementing their seminary studies with self-directed intellectual formation. He did not accept pastoral busyness as a valid reason to forgo continued intellectual growth. Instead, he saw the flexibility of parochial life as full of opportunity for study, if it was made a priority and pursued with commitment:

---

[58] See Christopher J. Kauffman, *Tradition and Transformation in Catholic Culture: The Priests of Saint Sulpice in the United States from 1791 to the Present* (New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1988), 65; Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 53.

> Many things in his daily life need take less time than is given them ; while others which, at first sight, seem beyond reach, by steady effort may be brought nearer and nearer, and finally become a part of his ordinary mental occupations. Let our young priests only try, and many will soon find how much more they can do than they have been doing.[59]

Hogan understood theology not as a subject to study once, but rather as a continual source of contemplation and reflection that should lead forward into further research and new lines of inquiry.[60] In his view, the individual was the prime agent in the intellectual life and through disciplined and regular commitment, the intellectual habit could be nurtured and grow throughout the priest's life. This attitude toward lifelong study was a quality of the type of intellectual culture, on the personal level, envisioned by the founders of the Catholic University of America.

Two critical and related issues for Hogan's approach to the study of theology were the place of Scripture and history. Scripture was to be the ultimate grounding of dogmatic theology, for example, because *a priori* deductions so fundamental to the scholastic approach, in his mind, did not appeal to the modern mind. Scripture, however, was to be understood in its historical and literary contexts, as were the writings of the Fathers of the Church. "History it is that more than aught else makes theology into a thing of life. In fact, it is doubtful whether without it there can be such a thing as a full intelligence of any theological question."[61] For Hogan, history was a sort of integrating principle for all areas of theological study.

John Talbot Smith, a priest of the Archdiocese of New York who was not directly engaged in seminary formation, wrote extensively on the topic of the intellectual life of priests. Smith's work, *Our Seminaries: An Essay on Clerical Training* of 1896, was later updated and republished as *The Training of a Priest: An Essay on Clerical Education* in 1908. He considered not only the academic dimension of seminary life, but the entire seminary structure as a whole, from the health

[59] J.B. Hogan, *Clerical Studies* (Boston: Merlier & Company, 1898), iii-v.
[60] Ibid., 179.
[61] Ibid., 175-178, 191.

and manners of seminarians to their spiritual life, with a particular focus on the American, not European, context. Unlike Hogan, who envisioned a tinkering of the existing curriculum, Smith called for a complete reorganization of the plan of studies in accord with the needs of the time, in a word deemphasizing moral theology in order to reemphasize Scripture. "It is admitted on all sides that the clerical training of fifty years ago is not the thing for these times as far as methods and external features are concerned. What changes are to be made?"[62]

Smith's organizing principle for his aspirational curriculum, the main object of all theological disciplines, was Jesus Christ. Contrary to the dominant tradition emphasizing moral and dogmatic theology, Smith emphasized Scripture as the top priority in his theology curriculum. His rationale was both simple and compelling: "The first priests had Jesus Christ for teacher and text-book. He was their only study. The second generation of priests had the Apostles and disciples for teachers, and the life of Christ was *their* only study. The third generation studied Him in the four gospels . . . . Why have we fallen away from the first and best method of training the priest to faithful service?"[63]

Following Scripture, in Smith's curricular order of importance, were philosophy, dogmatic theology, general literature, moral theology (which he refers to as a "usurper"), moral philosophy, science, and canon law. No specific place was allotted for history, not because Smith did not value it, but, rather, because it was to be the very environment and "atmosphere" of the entire curriculum.

> It should precede, accompany, follow each individual branch of learning like the astrologers of ancient days accompanied their kinds; ready and able, as princes believed, to describe the past, to keep in memory the present, and to read the future. This is the office of history; this is the measure of its capacity.[64]

---

[62] John Talbot Smith, *The Training of a Priest: An Essay on Clerical Education* (New York: Longman's Green and Co., 1908), 4.
[63] Ibid., 267-268.
[64] Ibid., 266-274.

Smith, like Hogan, valued the role of history in advancing theological understanding. For both thinkers, one of the chief roles of the priest in the modern world was to bring the Catholic theological tradition to bear on the issues of the time, and a key tool for doing so was appropriate historical consciousness brought about by an opening to modern scholarship and intellectual advances.

The beginning openness to modern intellectual trends, such as historical awareness and advanced research, advocated by thinkers like Hogan and Smith and pursued in several seminaries in the decades after the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, were reined in by Roman authorities in response to the perceived dangers of Modernism in the early twentieth century. A period of greater intervention by Rome in the intellectual life of American seminaries began a pattern of centralization and standardization that would largely continue until the Second Vatican Council.

Direct Roman intervention on matters concerning seminary intellectual formation was, of course, not entirely new. For example, Pope Leo XIII's 1879 encyclical, *Aeterni Patris*, encouraged scholastic approaches to philosophy and theology, especially that of St. Thomas Aquinas, as especially proper Catholic responses to the modern world. This papal position naturally reinforced the traditional approach to these subjects in the seminary curriculum and, correspondingly, discouraged novel or different approaches. Modern scholarly methods in history opened new vistas in biblical studies, but Leo XIII restricted their application by Catholic scholars in matters of inerrancy and inspiration in his 1893 encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*. In 1903, he established the Pontifical Biblical Commission to direct Catholic scholarship in accord with these limitations. Moreover, Pope Leo XIII's 1899 encyclical, *Testem Benevolentiae*, condemned the so-called Americanist movement and chilled scholarly innovation in the United States.[65] While

[65] See Pope Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus* (November 18, 1893), http://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_18111893_providentissimus-deus.html; Pope Leo XIII, *Testem*

not directly addressed to the seminary context, this encyclical contributed toward a climate of intellectual caution and hesitation to set out on unexplored theological terrain in the American environment.

With the turn of the twentieth century and the election of Pope St. Pius X in 1903, these trends of Roman intervention developed a new urgency addressing the perceived threats of Modernism to the Catholic faith. Two 1907 documents, the Holy Office's *Lamentabili* and Pius X's *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, officially condemned numerous positions held by scholars such as George Tyrrell and Alfred Loisy, grouped together under the title of "Modernism." Pius X extended the condemnation of Modernism to the seminaries, warning bishops not to ordain seminarians suspected of sympathy with these ways of thinking, instituting an oath against Modernism to be taken by seminary faculty, and forbidding seminarians from reading contemporary journals and periodicals. Awareness of recent developments in scholarship was now discouraged, if not prohibited, for both seminarians and faculty, and intellectual life was limited to the apologetic defense of the faith under a siege mentality so common in the earlier period. Whereas the Council of Trent envisioned the local bishop as responsible for seminary life in his diocese, by the beginning of the 1900s Rome asserted more and more direct control over all aspects of clerical formation.[66]

Many of these documents and actions by the Holy See were directed at the universal church, though they of course had concrete effects in local settings. Two events from this period

---

Benevolentiae (January 22, 1899), https://www.papalencyclicals.net/leo13/l13teste.htm; White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," 22; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 257-258.

[66] See Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition, *Lamentabili Sane Exitu* (July 1907), https://www.papalencyclicals.net/pius10/p10lamen.htm; Pope St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (September 8, 1907), http://www.vatican.va/content/pius-x/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-x_enc_19070908_pascendi-dominici-gregis.html; Pierre Veuillot, ed., *The Catholic Priesthood According to the Teaching of the Church: Papal Documents from Pius X to Pius XII* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1958), 81-82.

that demonstrated the effects of Roman intervention on American seminary life took place at New York's St. Joseph's Seminary and at Boston's St. John's Seminary. Both seminaries were formed after the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore as new, modern seminary institutions entrusted to the priests of the Society of St. Sulpice. Many of their faculty were open to bringing the useful aspects of modern critical scholarship to engage with Catholic theology and created vibrant intellectual environments within their seminaries.

Priest faculty members of St. Joseph's Seminary published a serious theological journal, the *New York Review*, from 1905-1908 under the approval and auspices of the Archdiocese of New York. The journal brought ideas and methods from modern critical scholarship to bear on Catholic theology and biblical studies, especially historical development and consciousness. These modern approaches, of course, were critical of traditional scholastic logical argument, separated as it often was from any historical context or understanding. Faculty from St. Joseph, such as Francis Gigot and Francis Duffy, contributed articles but outside authors, such as Alfred Loisy, George Tyrrell, and William Sullivan who were leading figures in the Modernist movement of scholars, also contributed. Due to perceived limits on academic freedom, four Sulpician faculty members of the seminary and contributors to the journal left the Sulpician community to become diocesan priests of New York. In the climate of suspected Modernism and Roman intervention to enforce orthodoxy, Archbishop Farley of New York ceased publication of the journal in 1908 so as to avoid future conflict. James Driscoll, the Sulpician rector of St. Joseph's, was replaced by John Chidwick, a New York pastor who had no academic qualifications.[67]

[67] See Kauffman, *Tradition and Transformation in Catholic Culture*, 212-214, 216, 222; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 259; Edward Dyer, *Dunwoodie* (1906), 53, Sulpician Archives of Baltimore, quoted in Kauffman, *Tradition and Transformation in Catholic Culture*, 217-218; Michael DeVito, *The New York Review (1905-1908)* (New York: United States Catholic Historical Society, 1977) 248-296, 299.

At St. John's Seminary in Boston, the Sulpician faculty members were long supported by Archbishop John Williams. John Hogan, whom we encountered already as one of the leading seminary reformers of the late nineteenth century, was founding rector of the seminary. The situation changed, however, when Bishop William O'Connell was named coadjutor and, then, Archbishop of Boston upon Archbishop Williams's death in 1907. O'Connell was a former rector of the American College in Rome, strong in his ultramontane loyalties, and personally close with Cardinal Merry del Val, Pius X's Secretary of State and leading figure in the crackdown against Modernism. Upon arrival in Boston, a particular focus of O'Connell's attention was the Sulpician faculty of St. John's, for both theological and personal reasons. The traditionally Gallican ecclesiology and views of seminary life of the Sulpicians were at odds with O'Connell's views of the papacy and strong Roman centralization, and he suffered negative experiences while a student at a Sulpician college. He gradually isolated Sulpician faculty and replaced them with diocesan priests, eventually removing the Sulpicians from the seminary entirely in 1911.[68]

In summary, the period 1884-1914 marked a new chapter in the intellectual life of American seminaries. The period began with focused episcopal attention to academic matters at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore and many new seminaries were founded as a breath of hope for intellectual engagement. The late nineteenth century was full of optimism for opening Catholic intellectual life with modern currents of thought, and creative thinkers on the seminary curriculum were active in circulating ideas.

The model priest called for by the pastoral needs of American Catholics during the period was one of increasing professionalization and pastoral skills that could be applied to the increasing

[68] See Fogarty, *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy*, 261-263; Kauffman, *Tradition and Transformation in Catholic Culture*, 230-231, 235-237; William Henry O'Connell, *Recollections of Seventy Years* (Boston, 1934), 55-64.

responsibilities of the parish priest. However, these qualities did not necessarily require advanced theological facility. There was a constant tension between the "natural" and "supernatural" characteristics of the priesthood.[69] Following the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, some seminary leaders experimented with ways of revitalizing the theological curriculum to meet the needs of the contemporary church and ministry. An attitude of openness to the broader world provided hope for greater depth in seminary intellectual life in the final decade of the nineteenth century. By the end of the period, and in response to broader contexts beyond the American environment, the Holy See exercised a more direct form of control and intervention in seminary life, including academic studies, which would have ongoing consequences well into the twentieth century.

[69] The "natural" characteristics of the priesthood correspond to the traditional cardinal virtues of prudence, temperance, justice, and fortitude common to all, both clergy and laity, Christian and non-Christian. In contemporary terminology, these refer to the human formation dimension of seminary life. The "supernatural" characteristics, on the other hand, focused on the "otherness" of the priesthood, distinct qualities and graces conferred at ordination and not shared with the laity.

Chapter 2: Intellectual Formation in American Seminaries, 1914-1965

A. 1917 *Code of Canon Law*

The 1917 Pio-Benedictine *Code of Canon Law* legislatively enshrined the trend toward centralization of church governance around the papacy and Rome. This trend was especially operative since Pius X in response to the Modernist controversy. With respect to intellectual formation in seminaries, the *Code* provided the legislative structure that would govern seminary life and theological formation for the next fifty years, until the reforms of the Second Vatican Council. It reflected the prior tradition of emphasizing discipline and proper behavior, fostered through regular spiritual observance, and an apologetic approach to intellectual formation in the main areas of dogmatic and moral theology.

The structure of legislative work in general reflects the mind of the legislator and the way in which a particular part fits within the context of the whole. Within the organizational structure of the 1917 *Code*, the topic of seminaries was placed in the Third Book, "On Things," and treated in its Fourth Part, "On Ecclesiastical Magisterium." In this section, the topic of seminaries was situated alongside other related issues such as preaching, schools, the censorship of books, and the profession of faith.[70] The grouping of these topics together suggests a pattern reflective of a legislative priority to ensure orthodox belief and teaching in these areas. This pattern provides the context necessary to properly understand these topics in the broader schema of the *Code*.

A brief overview of the content of the title on seminaries as a whole will benefit an understanding of the role of theological formation within its overall purpose as laid out in the 1917

[70] See *The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law in English Translation*, trans. Edward N. Peters (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001), III.IV.20-24.

Code. The *Code*'s treatment of seminaries is situated after a chapter "On Preaching the Divine Word" and before a chapter "On Schools." Title 21, "On Seminaries," was composed of twenty canons in total. Out of the twenty canons governing seminaries, two dealt with the content of intellectual formation to be pursued, and one addressed the role and office of teacher. In other words, fifteen percent of the canons treating seminaries were directly related to intellectual formation. The other canons touched on such details as the establishment of seminaries and the qualifications of candidates, the responsibility of the bishop in directing the life and mission of the seminary, and an enumeration of the necessary offices within the seminary administration.[71]

Following the Tridentine model, seminaries were to be established by the diocesan bishop within his diocese whenever possible, with provision for a minor seminary, focusing on the liberal arts, and a major seminary, for the study of the ecclesiastical subjects of philosophy and theology. If a bishop could not establish a seminary, he was allowed to send his seminarians to another seminary, with preference for a local interdiocesan or regional institution if one existed. The ideal candidates for seminary formation, again following the Tridentine tradition, were youth "who give signs of an ecclesiastical vocation" and could be "kept with special care from the contagion of the world." This view was consistent with the common "siege" mentality regarding the threats of the "outside" world common in the period. Priests and bishops bore the responsibility of encouraging applicants to pursue a vocation to the priesthood. Potential candidates were to provide documents showing their "legitimacy of birth." If a candidate was previously in priestly formation at a seminary or in a religious community, proper investigation into the circumstances of his departure were to be undertaken by the bishop to verify "that there is nothing in these inconsistent with priestly status."[72]

[71] See ibid., Canons 1352-1369.
[72] See ibid., Canons 1353-1354, 1363.

As prescribed in the 1917 *Code*, the founding of a seminary was ultimately the responsibility of the bishop. He was to provide for the necessary development of the institution, and to maintain a personal knowledge of its operation through personal visits so as to become familiar with the seminarians and be aware of the content of classroom instruction.[73]

To assist the bishop in carrying out this responsibility, the 1917 *Code* specified certain offices to be filled by individual seminary personnel: the rector, to serve as pastor of the seminary and whose stated task was primarily discipline; a business and operations director, to coordinate the overall needs of the seminary community; a spiritual director, to organize a regular spiritual regimen including two or more ordinary confessors for the seminarians; and teachers to impart instruction. Except for the business director, all other offices were to be filled by exemplary priests, "outstanding not only for doctrine but also for virtue and prudence." A succinct statement of the ultimate goal of the seminary was provided in Canon 1368: "The rector of the Seminary and all moderators under his authority shall take care that students observe most assiduously the statutes given by the Bishop and the course of studies and are imbued with a truly ecclesiastical spirit." Grounds for removal from the seminary included violation of the community rules, a patterned demonstration of "characteristics [that] seem unsuitable for the ecclesiastical state," and an inability to proceed successfully through the course of studies.[74]

The overall formation program of the seminary outlined in the 1917 *Code* reflected the Tridentine ideal of a diocesan seminary was to be directly overseen by the diocesan bishop. It was to emphasize good behavior and pious devotion, virtues that were to be pursued through a focus on discipline and the fostering of an ecclesiastical spirit. Intellectual formation was presented as important, insofar as failure to progress through the coursework was one of the stated grounds for

[73] See ibid., Canon 1357.
[74] See ibid., Canons 1358, 1360, 1367-1369, 1371.

dismissal, but perhaps of a secondary importance to other goals. Allowance was provided for adaptation to local circumstances, for example, in the use of regional or interdiocesan seminaries when appropriate, but generally a standard model was to be followed universally. As demonstrated in the 1917 *Code's* treatment of both the intellectual formation program and the role of teacher, it is evident that intellectual formation was understood as secondary within its wider vision of the seminary institution.

Nonetheless, the *Code* made general provision for both the minor and major seminary academic curricula. In the minor seminary, presumably made up of the six-year equivalent of four years of high school and the first two years of college, the first goal was the fostering of "religious discipline . . . pursued most diligently." A special focus was language acquisition, both in the modern language of the particular country and in Latin. Other areas of study establishing common educational foundations included the liberal arts, which were to be consonant with "the general culture and status of clerics in the region." In other words, the minor seminary curriculum was centered around religious discipline, language training (especially Latin), and the basic foundations of priestly culture and learning.[75]

Studies in the major seminary, building on the intellectual formation of the minor seminary, consisted of a two-year course in philosophy and a four-year course in theology. The philosophy course treated "rational philosophy and related disciplines" according to the approach of the "Angelic Doctor," St. Thomas Aquinas, but the *Code* was also referencing the entire neo-Thomistic manualist tradition emphasized especially since the nineteenth century. Beyond this terse statement, it did not elaborate on the content of the philosophy curriculum.[76]

[75] See ibid., Canon 1364.
[76] See ibid., Canons 1365 §1, 1366 §2.

More detail was offered on the content of the four-year theology course, at least by way of identifying several specific areas. Dogmatic and moral theology, consistent with their traditional place as the pinnacle of seminary studies, were proposed as the main theological subjects, and other important areas were also mentioned, namely Scripture, church history, canon law, liturgy, preaching, and chant. The desired amount of time spent on these areas was not made clear, but their articulation as key elements in priestly training indicated the requirement of a broad theological education. Finally, the 1917 *Code* identified the need for pastoral training and practical experience in areas such as hearing confessions, giving catechetical instruction to children, and ministering to the sick and dying. While a call for pastoral training was significant, it was not clear whether the 1917 *Code* intended this experience to be gained directly in the field or through simulation exercises.[77]

Candidates for the office of seminary teacher in the areas of philosophy, theology, and canon law were limited to qualified priests, with a preference for those with doctoral degrees from ecclesiastical universities or faculties recognized by the Holy See. Their methods of instruction were to be "according to the system, teaching, and principles" of St. Thomas Aquinas, to which the teachers must hold "religiously." Importantly, the 1917 *Code* called for teachers with specific preparation in the specialized areas of Scripture, dogmatics, moral theology, and church history, likely as an effort to move away from the common practice of a given teacher instructing in multiple areas outside of his expertise.[78]

Once again, deep commitment to the philosophy and theology of Aquinas and the neo-Thomist tradition as a defense against heterodoxy was a characteristic trait of the post-Modernist church of the period, supporting the important apologetic purpose of theological study for clerical

[77] See ibid., Canon 1365, §§2-3.
[78] See ibid., Canon 1366.

candidates. Training in a properly recognized educational institution was a way of certifying preparation for the neo-Thomistic approach, perhaps at the expense of other proven approaches within the Catholic theological tradition. The stated preference for those with doctoral degrees showed an appreciation for academic qualification as did the provision for teachers with specialized training in discrete fields, such as church history, biblical studies, and dogmatic and moral theology.

In furthering the goals of the 1917 *Code of Canon Law*, the purpose of the seminary and the role of intellectual formation reflected central aspects of the Tridentine view of the seminary coupled with concerns of the post-Modernist church. Personal and spiritual discipline were the overall goals for forming an ecclesiastical spirit in the candidate for priesthood. While reflecting much of the tradition and preserving it for the next several decades until Vatican II, the 1917 *Code* also made efforts to elevate the level of theological formation in seminaries, identifying a broad array of important areas in the study of theology, and providing teachers professionally trained to offer meaningful instruction in these areas.

B. Neo-Scholastic Thomism and the Catholic Worldview

The dominant intellectual approach to Catholic theology in seminaries during the early twentieth century was the scholasticism of St. Thomas Aquinas, especially promoted as a fortification against the perceived threats of modern challenges to the Catholic faith from the nineteenth century and beyond. Held out as normative for the Catholic approach to theology by the 1879 encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris*, and the 1917 *Code of Canon Law*, the use of St. Thomas's name was a catch-all for the long tradition of Catholic thought building on the work

of the 13th century Dominican through the neo-Thomist manualists still in use in the twentieth century American seminary some seven centuries later. Little time, if any, was spent in American seminaries reading St. Thomas's own writings and studying the method he used in approaching the theological questions of his day, but rather the manual textbook tradition used in the classroom handed on a more static version of Catholic theology different from the dynamism of St. Thomas.[79]

The scholasticism of the manualist tradition tended to present Catholic theology as unchanging and fixed, without acknowledging the historical context of the thirteenth century in which Aquinas lived and worked out his synthesis. St. Thomas used the then-cutting edge scholarly framework of his time and place, namely the "rediscovery" of the philosophical texts of Aristotle and its tradition of non-Catholic commentators, in order to present Catholic theology using the best intellectual tools available. In contrast, the subsequent tradition of scholasticism often presumed the conclusions of St. Thomas to be timeless and perfect truths, rather than looking to the entirety of the process in which he theologized as a method to be incarnated anew in the intellectual landscape of each generation. Moreover, the period of subsequent scholastic theology tended to limit itself to St. Thomas as the figurehead of that tradition, rather than as one important figure in the thirteenth-century and other Thomistic scholars in later centuries.

A further important distinction between St. Thomas and the scholastic manualist tradition was over their respective understandings of the natural law and its relationship to the moral life. Aquinas understood the natural law as an internal aspect of human nature participating in God's wisdom and aimed at human flourishing, thus calling forth the development of virtues directed toward the ultimate end of the human person, union with God in heaven. These virtues were

[79] For an excellent overview on neo-Thomism in the nineteenth century and beyond, see Gerald A. McCool, *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century: The Quest for a Unitary Method* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1977).

discerned and practiced throughout the dynamic contexts of life, both individual and social, and were always a work in progress during life on earth.[80]

In contrast to this more internal understanding of the natural law and the human person's growth in virtue, the scholastic manualist tradition tended to understand the natural law as external to human nature, as something received from God from the outside. This view of the external dimension of the natural law led to an emphasis on its objectivity and its logical impositions on the moral life, what could and could not be done morally. The "givens" of the natural law became principles upon which universal conclusions could be based that were morally and universally binding. If a particular conclusion was logically sound, it was proven in the sense of arriving at universal certainty. It is unsurprising that the manualist tradition developed a close connection between this form of legalistic moral reasoning and the practical sacramental ministry of hearing of confessions by priests, which was one of the main concerns of moral theology during the period. The scholastic manualist tradition also applied this type of syllogistic reasoning to dogmatic theology, in addition to moral theology.[81]

The Catholic worldview of the scholastic manualist tradition was systematic and comprehensive. Its approach emphasized logical deductions and dialectic reasoning. Since it was grounded in this foundation of logical analysis, its conclusions claimed a high degree of certainty. This method touched not only elements of dogmatic and moral theology, but even the understanding of the church vis-à-vis the world, often emphasizing the institutional dimensions of the church as a "perfect society" in which each member had his or her own clearly defined place

[80] See Mark S. Massa, *The Structure of Theological Revolutions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), 15-16.
[81] See ibid., 15-17.

and role.[82] Within the context of the siege mentality embraced in the face of Modernism, this brand of scholasticism contributed to the continued isolation of Catholic life in the United States during the early twentieth century, including the intellectual formation of priestly candidates. Further, the manuals in use in American seminaries were published in Latin, removing them from the broader intellectual context of the United States.

For example, the approved textbooks for dogmatic and moral theology at St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, in the 1940s were those of Adolphe Tanquerey, the French Sulpician who had taught at St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore. Composed in Latin according to the scholastic manualist tradition, these textbooks were the basis, in effect, of the entire theological curriculum. Professors of the core disciplines in the theological curriculum were expected to keep to the textbook during classroom instruction. One philosophy professor at St. Patrick's Seminary was reprimanded for using a book by Fulton Sheen in a course on natural theology rather than the Latin manual approved as normative for the course. Strict adherence to the approved text led to a tendency toward rote memorization rather than active engagement with the material. Peter Guilday, the influential church historian, described his academic experience in a similar climate at St. Charles Seminary in Philadelphia as "an intellectual coma."[83] These situations were common in American seminaries in the pre-conciliar twentieth century.

---

[82] See Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei* (November 1, 1885), http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_01111885_immortale-dei.html.

[83] See James P. Gaffey, *Men of Menlo: Transformation of an American Seminary* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1992), 42-43; see also Thomas J. Shelley, *Dunwoodie: The History of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, New York* (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, Inc., 1993), 174.

C. Intellectual Life of American Seminaries, 1914-1965

The period beginning with the papacy of Pope Benedict XV and extending to the immediate years around Vatican II largely continued the precedent of increasing Roman control and standardization among seminaries, as expressed primarily in the 1917 *Code of Canon Law*. The "supernatural" character of the priesthood was emphasized with its corresponding concern for spiritual discipline and proper external behavior. Following the response to Modernism, Catholic intellectual life in seminaries largely continued patterns set in previous generations, namely approaching philosophy and theology through the scholastic method of neo-Thomism with an apologetic focus and relying on the textbook for course instruction. This approach meant a general intellectual isolation from the broader academic world.

Despite these limitations, several movements provided opportunities for a heightened intellectual life in seminaries, such as increased interest in faculty credentials, the formation of learned societies, and openness to explore academic accreditation. The experience of Catholics serving in two world wars helped bring Catholics out of their isolated cultural enclave and into the mainstream of American life. By the 1960s, calls for seminary reform coincided with the general reforms of the Second Vatican Council.

In 1929, the Holy See named St. John Vianney as the patron saint of priests and model for priestly life.[84] Vianney's life and example were full of pastoral zeal, emphasizing personal devotion and holiness, centered around the celebration of the sacraments, especially hearing confession. His academic struggles were well known, and his elevation made a clear statement of the Roman view of the proper priestly model that was to be followed in seminary formation. As

[84] See Pierre Veuillot, ed., *The Catholic Priesthood According to the Teaching of the Church: Papal Documents from Pius X to Pius XII* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1958), 1:167-168.

such, the spiritual life was the priority in most American seminaries. Spiritual discipline was built into a highly regulated *horarium* and continued the tradition of previous periods.

The overall thrust of academics in the seminary during the pre-conciliar twentieth century was to present official church teaching in a way that could be absorbed and put to use for apologetic purposes. The prime student virtue was listening and the ability to articulate what was learned through hearing. Dogmatic and moral theology remained the most important subjects, and they were often offered in cycles each year, for example, with the entire seminary body taking a single course in dogma. Consonant with the institution's educational tradition, the manual textbook remained a staple of course instruction. The majority of study was carried out during class, and outside reading or research was generally not assigned. Latin was stressed as the language of instruction, but the degree to which it was put into practice varied widely throughout the period from seminary to seminary.[85]

A 1935 study by Theodore Heck offered insight into course texts for seminaries. For dogmatic theology, most of the textbooks used in the 1930s dated to the pre-Modernist period, suggesting that new dogmatic texts were not being composed for fear of Roman reprisal. The most popular text for dogmatics remained Adolphe Tanquerey's *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae*, published in 1894, which was composed in a clear and easily understood Latin style suitable for American students. There was more variety in moral theology textbooks, though the most commonly used were those of Jerome Noldin, Luigi Sabetti, and Tanquerey.[86]

---

[85] See Theodore Heck, *The Curriculum of the Major Seminary in Relation to Contemporary Conditions* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America, 1935), 44-46; Joseph M. White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," in *Reason for the Hope: The Futures of Roman Catholic Theologates*, by Katarina Schuth (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989), 25.
[86] See Heck, *The Curriculum of the Major Seminary*, 45, 47.

Other courses in the seminary curriculum did not receive as much attention as dogmatic and moral theology. Scripture studies improved, but there was no commonly used manual outside of the Bible itself. The amount of time committed to the study of church history varied, but the main focus was usually institutional history rather than the process of historical development. Other courses included canon law, homiletics, ascetical theology, and pastoral theology. Notably, seminarians were expected to take all of the courses the seminary offered, meaning no elective course options were available as means to pursue particular interests.[87]

Many seminary faculty members offered critiques of the seminary curriculum, such as the amount of time spent in the classroom, the exhaustive use of the manual for instruction, and the inability to provide enough time to students for independent and outside study; however, these criticisms did not yet carry enough momentum to bring about large-scale reform. Also, seminarian graduates acknowledged the lack of correspondence between what they studied in the seminary and what their pastoral life as ordained priests called for. Through the 1960s the overall approach to seminary studies was largely the same as at the start of the period, based on the manual textbook in the neo-Thomist tradition, although the manual came to be emphasized in different ways according to the preference of the instructor.[88]

One final aspect to mention regarding seminary intellectual life during the period was the pattern of expansion of seminaries throughout the twentieth century, mirroring the growth of the Catholic population. Many of these institutions were minor seminaries, built either in conjunction with a major seminary or in dioceses without the means to support a major seminary. The

[87] See ibid., 40, 43, 48-50, 52-54, 56, 67; Joseph M. White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to the Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 369.
[88] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 269-270; Philip J. Murnion, *The Catholic Priest and the Changing Structure of Pastoral Ministry, New York, 1920-1970* (New York: Arno Press, 1978), 127; John C. Boere, "A Survey of the Content and Organization of the Curriculum of the Theological Departments of Major Seminaries in the United States of America," (M.A. thesis, Catholic University of America, 1963), 66.

geographic location of these seminaries tended to be in more rural, physically isolated areas. Even when close to a population center, the self-sufficient nature of their total institutional way of life resulted in limited engagement with the outside world. This isolation contrasted with a movement of religious order theologates beginning in the 1960s, when they began to decrease in number and reorganize with others, along with non-Catholic schools of divinity, into mutual associations in urban areas gathered around a university. Leading examples included the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago, the Washington Theological Union in Washington, D.C., the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, California and the Boston Theological Institute.[89] This consolidation provided opportunities for greater intellectual engagement and raised academic life in religious seminaries that corresponded with Vatican II's call to engage the modern world.

Despite overall continuity in academic life throughout the period, several key movements occurred that elevated theological engagement at the seminary level. Taken as a whole, these movements slowly and incrementally brought American Catholic seminaries and intellectual life out of isolation and into greater engagement with the broader world.

The first movement addressed the professional formation of seminary instructors. In accord with the new 1917 *Code of Canon Law*, seminary faculty were urged to receive degrees from ecclesiastical institutes of study. Pope Pius XI's 1931 apostolic constitution *Deus Scientiarum*

[89] Naturally, an increase in the number of seminaries resulted in unequal quality, as was experienced in the early nineteenth century before the growing popularity of the provincial seminary. In 1910, out of an American Catholic population of 14.6 million, there were almost seven thousand seminarians studying at 82 diocesan and religious seminaries. By 1962, the Catholic population had grown to 43.9 million and the total number of all seminarians studying in the United States reached over 45,616 at 409 institutions. See Walter D. Wagoner, "Seminary Clustering: The Way the Wind Blows," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CLIX (December, 1968), 378-390; *The Official Catholic Directory and Clergy List for the Year of Our Lord 1911* (Milwaukee: Wiltzius, 1911), 1077; National Catholic Welfare Conference, Department of Education, *Summary of Catholic Education 1962 and 1963* (Washington, 1963), 8.

Dominus established more rigorous academic standards and programs of study for graduate work at pontifical institutions in the ecclesiastical disciplines of theology, philosophy, and canon law.[90]

The increased program requirements for ecclesiastical degrees brought them more in line with degrees in modern universities and, in turn, provided at least some exposure to modern currents of scholarship. No longer would it be possible to receive the pontifical doctorate in theology, for example, after the ordinary seminary course and comprehensive examinations; instead, additional coursework and a dissertation would be required. The licentiate of theology would now be earned with at least four additional years of study, and the doctorate with five.[91] The enhanced level of professional development brought about by *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* not only increased the quality of preparation for seminary instructors in terms of credentials, but also in opening them to the idea of continued development and research. Over time, this intellectual openness expanded their understanding of theology from apologetics to scholarship.

Beginning in the late 1930s, a second faculty-related movement contributed to a higher degree of intellectual life in seminaries through the gradual formation of professional societies and associations of Catholic scholars mirroring those existing for non-Catholics, beginning in the late 1930s. Groups formed according to respective scholarly fields, such as the Catholic Historical Association, the Catholic Biblical Association, the Canon Law Society of America, and the Catholic Theological Society of America. These associations met in annual conventions to discuss scholarly research and issues, publishing proceedings from their meetings for distribution. Their gatherings brought together many committed thinkers, including priests engaged in seminary education, and served as a melting pot and catalyst for intellectual creativity. The National Catholic

[90] See White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," 25-26.
[91] Ibid., 26. See also James J. Markham, *The Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities of Studies* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1957), 47-101.

Educational Association became a venue for those interested and involved in seminary topics to circulate ideas related to reform of future seminary formation.[92]

A third movement, flowing from the scholarly associations, was the publication of numerous scholarly journals contributing to Catholic intellectual life. Many of the Catholic learned societies published their own journals, such as the Catholic Biblical Association's *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* and the Canon Law Society's the *Jurist*. Also, religious communities began to publish their own theological journals, such as the Dominicans' *The Thomist* and the Jesuits' *Theological Studies*, which provided invaluable substance for Catholic theological discussion.[93] The period witnessed a growing body of substantive literature on theological topics pertinent to the American scene.

A fourth movement that improved standards in seminaries was the drive to grant academic degrees, especially for the minor seminaries at the bachelor's level. This desire led to accrediting the seminary academic programs. Former seminarians who spent years in study but discerned a calling other than the priesthood had often been left with no educational credentials to show for their time and effort. Moreover, priests frequently served as teachers in Catholic schools and sought licensing from their respective state department of education, which did not recognize coursework from a non-accredited institution.[94] However, applying for accreditation brought in external evaluators to judge seminary academics, which brought about the implementation of baseline educational standards. Some aspects of the seminary structure did not fit secular educational norms in the United States, such as the six-year minor seminary course, which

[92] White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 371-74. See also White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," 27.
[93] See "The Canon Law Society of America," *Jurist* 1 (January 1941), 92-93; White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 373.
[94] See White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," 26; Edward A. Cone, "The Diocesan Clergy in Secondary Education," (M.A thesis, Catholic University of America, 1935), 22-23.

overlapped with both the American high school and the first two years of college, and so had to be adjusted. Though slow to be adopted across the American Catholic landscape, accreditation brought seminary academics into engagement with the broader educational scene.

Finally, openness to theological trends was present in papal teaching that would later be more fully developed and applied at the Second Vatican Council. This openness marked a meaningful step toward renewal of theological activity and had implications for seminary training. Most significant were two 1943 encyclicals of Pope Pius XII on ecclesiology and biblical studies, respectively. The document *Mystici Corporis* stressed the reality of the church as the Body of Christ, with each member part of a living, organic union. Though not devaluing the unique character of the ordained priesthood, this ecclesiological view showed the priest's connection to the whole of the church, including the laity, rather than specifically being set apart and above. This mystical understanding of the church also stood in contrast with the institutional presentation common at the time. In terms of Scripture, Pius XII began opening Catholic biblical studies to modern critical methods with *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. While acknowledging the extreme positions of some critical methods, Pius XII framed modern methods in a more positive light and put them at the use of Catholic Scripture scholars.[95] These movements were only beginning to unfold in the life and thought of the church during the 1940s, but they found their full expression at Vatican II.

[95] See Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi* (June 29, 1943), http://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi.html; Pope Pius XII, *Divino Afflante Spiritu* (September 30, 1943), 33, http://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_30091943_divino-afflante-spiritu.html.

D. Calls for Seminary Academic Reform

The shortcomings of the American seminary of the twentieth century continued to be raised up to the threshold of the Second Vatican Council. During the conciliar era of the 1960s, calls for seminary reform in the United States reached a crescendo at an opportune movement. During this time period American Catholic seminary numbers were at a height due to the trend of proliferation over the preceding several decades; yet the quality of academic instruction in the traditional mode did not seem optimally suited to the pastoral circumstances and needs of the church in the modern world.

In terms of organizational structure, the isolation of the American seminary seemed an obstacle to personal growth, development, and future ministry for the priest in training. Since the term "seminary" covered many different institutions during the period, namely high school, college, and graduate schools, some thinkers argued that the ultimate purpose of the seminary had to be clarified in order to determine whether the existing organizational structures were best suited toward that purpose. While purposes such as a general education or professional preparation for high school teaching might be related to the work of a future priest, ultimately the primary purpose of the seminary institution was to be the preparation of priests for pastoral ministry. All other purposes or goals were to be subordinated and directed toward the pastoral ministry. Since other institutions existed to pursue different goals, such as the university for pure academics, reformers proposed that to justify its continued existence the seminary's unique focus must be on forming priests for pastoral ministry. "The theologate is not a school preparing students for a research or

an academic career in theology. Rather it is a professional school whose purpose is to prepare men for the pastoral ministry."[96]

With the end goal of pastoral ministry in mind and pursuing an Ockham's razor approach to minimize institutional duplication, some reformers advocated for radical seminary reorganization and consolidation. To reach the critical mass of students necessary for successful educational engagement, James Michael Lee, for example, proposed abolishing small seminaries and reorganizing them nationally into five or six regionally dispersed seminaries, each centered around a significant Catholic university. Seminarians would live in an interdiocesan community and attend most classes at the university with non-seminarian students, taking a minimum of courses exclusively for seminarians on specific topics related to priestly formation. This consolidation would benefit the seminarians intellectually, Lee argued, because it would enliven theological study and discussion and bring seminary theology out of isolation and into contact with the broader church and culture. Such an arrangement would also benefit sending dioceses by distributively sharing costs and removing many of the obstacles that flowed from small, insufficient seminary resources. Finally, Lee proposed that this model would benefit the American church by engaging the seminary in the life of the university and have a positive impact on the entire student body and local church.[97]

In terms of educational reform of American seminaries, many thinkers focused on both classroom methods and curricular reframing. The most common seminary method of instruction, as mentioned, was the lecture in conjunction with the manual textbook. Several commentators

[96] See James Michael Lee, "Overview of Educational Problems in Seminaries: I -- Objectives and Administration," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 84-85, 91.
[97] James Michael Lee, "Overview of Educational Problems in Seminaries: II -- Administration," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 158-160.

argued that over-reliance on the lecture method was a relic of the past. Rooted in the university of the Middle Ages, the lecture was the most educationally effective method for instruction before the advent of the printing press and wide access to books. It presupposed that the student was not reading on his own, a presumption no longer appropriate in the contemporary age of modern libraries and resources potentially available to the twentieth century seminarian. Exclusive reliance on a textbook instilled passivity in seminarians, valuing accumulation of knowledge provided to them and their ability to repeat it, while failing to prioritize the development of critical thinking that would help them to apply learning in priestly life. Moreover, most theological literature from the tradition was written in Latin with limited English translations, leaving seminarians with a theological vocabulary not readily useful for the pastoral ministry of a parish priest in the United States.[98]

Understanding and learning ought to be the goal of seminary methods of instruction rather than pure knowledge, according to several critics of the 1960s. They believed that learning and understanding came about through a personal, direct encounter with the material being studied, whereas knowledge could be obtained more impersonally and at a distance. A shift in focus was called for, from emphasizing what the teacher imparted in the classroom, to what the student learned. One thinker distinguished between the "funnel" model of teaching in which the instructor "pours out" what is to be received by the student, and the "pump" model in which the instructor assists the student in developing the ability to actively engage the materials himself. The individual student's responsibility for his own education was beginning to be stressed, which was contrary to the prior method of passive learning so dominant in the earlier tradition. This active learning could

[98] See John L. McKenzie, "Theology in the Seminary Curriculum," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 409-410; Sergius Wroblewski, "The Intellectual Climate in Seminary Life," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 239.

be achieved through increasing class discussions to supplement the lecture, decreasing time spent in the classroom, and providing opportunities for independent study and elective courses.[99]

Building on calls for a more student-centered approach to seminary academics, reformers proposed curricular adjustments aligned with modern theological developments and approaches. If true and authentic learning was to be promoted rather than the fragmentary accumulation of knowledge, the search for an integrative principle uniting all aspects of the theological curriculum was proposed as essential. In the past, the main integrating theme uniting elements of theological study in the seminary was scholastic dialectic, with emphases on the apologetic dimensions of dogmatic theology on the one hand, and the practical aspects of hearing confessions for moral theology on the other. Proposed alternative integrative principles that might better unite a modern theological curriculum included courses in Scripture, liturgy, and history.[100]

John McKenzie, an American Jesuit and leading biblical scholar, proposed organizing a reformed curriculum according to the eight key areas included under the 1917 *Code of Canon Law*: dogmatic theology, moral theology, Scripture, church history, canon law, liturgy, homiletics, and sacred music. He suggested concentrating the core courses in these areas during the first two years of the four-year theologate or, alternatively, for half the course load each semester for the full four years. The remaining courses would be electives chosen from the main areas by the student with faculty guidance. These electives would rely mostly on student discussion and meaningful research

[99] See Lee, "Overview of Educational Problems in Seminaries: I -- Objectives and Administration," 94 and Wroblewski, "The Intellectual Climate in Seminary Life," 244; James Michael Lee, "Curriculum and Teaching in Seminary Education," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 375; McKenzie, "Theology in the Seminary Curriculum," 416.

[100] See Wroblewski, "The Intellectual Climate in Seminary Life," 235; McKenzie, "Theology in the Seminary Curriculum," 418.

papers and assignments, as an opportunity to further develop the "habit of theology" which should be the desired outcome of the seminary curriculum.[101]

Finally, reform of seminary faculty preparation was also an object of discussion during the 1960s. Not uncommonly, priests were assigned to a seminary because of their own personal and spiritual development, rather than from their interest in teaching and seminary formation. Also, a seminary position was sometimes sought by a priest as a career stepping stone to a higher office in the church.[102] Mixed motivations, obviously, impacted the quality of service faculty were able to offer.

To address this issue, James Michael Lee, for example, proposed careful scrutiny in the hiring process for seminary teaching positions. A seminary professorship, he argued, should be viewed as a career goal rather than a temporary assignment, and the proper investment in terms of professional development and quality of life of such a position should make it an attractive and desirable aspiration. Moreover, once adequately trained in the academic and professional skills necessary for effective teaching, seminary faculty ought to take seriously their duty to engage in research and scholarship, to participate in professional associations in their field, and to maintain connection to the broader academic community. To recruit the best faculty possible, Lee and others advocated that seminaries should consider hiring lay persons with the requisite qualifications and abilities, not only in theologically-ancillary areas but also in the core subjects.[103]

In summary, the period 1914-1965 maintained a high degree of continuity with earlier periods in terms of academic seminary formation in the United States. The model of priesthood in

[101] See McKenzie, "Theology in the Seminary Curriculum," 419-420, 424.
[102] See Lee, "Overview of Educational Problems in Seminaries: I -- Objectives and Administration," 106-107. See also Lee, "Curriculum and Teaching in Seminary Education," 379.
[103] See Lee, "Overview of Educational Problems in Seminaries: I -- Objectives and Administration," 106; Lee, "Curriculum and Teaching in Seminary Education," 379-385.

this era might be understood as the priest as a public figure, an ideal which included both the sacred role of the priest as administer of the sacraments within the parish community, but also the professional skills utilized in his capacity as a community leader, school principal, and chaplain to various groups. The priest in this period was often seen as a spokesperson for the church and its official teachings. This role corresponded largely with the intellectual approach taken in theological studies in the seminary, which prioritized learning official church teaching, especially in the areas of dogmatic and moral theology, and an ability to articulate it accurately. This type of learning was largely passive and emphasized the accumulation of a certain set of knowledge and the ability to recall the information as needed. It did not prioritize critical thinking and academic curiosity outside of the prescribed courses, nor did it take into account pastoral application of the priest's knowledge.

However, during this period the need for a reform of seminary intellectual life was both felt and worked toward in a variety of ways. The increased professional training of seminary professors, the founding of Catholic scholarly associations and journals, and the openness to pursue academic accreditation in the granting of degrees by outside, non-Catholic organizations, all worked toward ending the intellectual and social isolation of the American seminary. Moreover, the calls for reform from thinkers concerned about the pastoral effectiveness of intellectual formation in seminaries set the stage for the reception and implementation of the Second Vatican Council.

Chapter 3: Vatican II and Beyond, Intellectual Formation through the 1980s

A. The Second Vatican Council and the Reshaping of Seminary Intellectual Formation

The Second Vatican Council directly addressed seminary formation in its Decree on Priestly Training, *Optatam Totius*. Before treating this text in detail, this chapter considers other aspects of the Council that impacted the understanding of the priesthood and how that understanding should impact seminary formation. It takes up the Council's understanding of the church and its view of relationship to the world, its renewed vision of aspects of the seminary curriculum, namely Scripture and the liturgy, and its shift to a more historically conscious theological method.

Vatican II marked a significant shift in approach of the church's relationship to the outside world, one that would have a tremendous impact on subsequent seminary methods. Since the sixteenth century Reformations, the church commonly adopted a siege mentality against the errors of modern thought, viewed largely as an enemy to be defeated. Theological inquiry became a battleground between orthodoxy and heterodoxy. The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries affirmed this defensive approach in combating the trends of modern critical scholarship and efforts to accommodate the Catholic faith to the world. Theologians hesitated to respond creatively to the challenges of modern life for fear of saying anything perceived as contrary to the faith.

The theological response to this approach, as reflected in seminary academics, was apologetic defensiveness in explaining the Catholic faith in response to Protestantism or secular world views. As mentioned earlier, the intellectual state of seminaries in the pre-conciliar twentieth century continued the earlier tradition of reinforcing this position. Priority was given to learning

the church's official teaching and how to present it to those on the "outside," emphasizing logical argument following the scholastic tradition. The prime educational skills for seminarians in this context were listening and having a good memory.

The Council, however, called for engagement with the world rather than combating it. The Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World, *Gaudium et Spes*, identified the church's mission and its corresponding relationship to the world as singular: "to carry forward the work of Christ under the lead of the befriending Spirit. And Christ entered this world to give witness to the truth, to rescue and not to sit in judgment, to serve and not to be served."[104] The language of friendship indicated conversation and dialogue, rather than vanquishing an enemy through overwhelming force of logical argument. The church's mission was articulated by the Council as one of service to the world. New pedagogical and theological methods were required of seminary faculty to teach seminarians how to actively engage with the modern world in all of its aspects, social, political, and intellectual.

In terms of ecclesiology, Vatican II presented a new understanding of the church's corporate reality as the Body of Christ and the People of God who were to respond in a spirit of collaboration and harmony. The earlier tradition emphasized the hierarchical and institutional aspects of the church, focusing on what sets certain members apart from others, such as ordination, religious vows, and ecclesial rank. In contrast, the Council's Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, *Lumen Gentium*, presented baptism as the central point of unity for all Christians and, through baptism, a sharing in the mission of Christ's priestly, prophetic, and shepherding roles. Though

[104] Vatican II, *Gaudium et Spes* (December 7, 1965), 3, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html.

not minimizing the effects of ordination, *Lumen Gentium* showed its interrelationship with the entire life of the church, rooted in the foundational unity of baptism of all of the faithful.[105]

Moreover, the emphasis on baptism pointed to the relationship of Catholics to other Christians and, through the common bonds of the entire human family, to non-Christians.[106] This perspective opened avenues for genuine ecumenism and inter-religious dialogue and further demonstrated the depths of engagement called for by the Council. Rather than a surface knowledge of Protestant beliefs and those of other religions with a goal of refutation, seminary academic programs would have to seriously consider this critical aspect of engagement in terms of dialogue with the world in the post-conciliar era.

Further ecclesiological shifts touched on both the ministry of priests and episcopal collegiality. The Decree on the Ministry and Life of Priests, *Presbyterorum Ordinis*, framed the entirety of priestly ministry in terms of service to others, calling for priests to better understand the conditions of those they serve rather than being separated and set apart from them. Priests were to collaborate with the laity in ministry and mission by calling on their many gifts for service to the church. Whereas the earlier period emphasized the individual and personal ministry of the priest, the Council drew attention to the corporate reality of the priesthood, especially within the diocese, and the relationship between all priests together and with their bishop in a familial bond.[107]

Within the episcopacy itself, its corporate nature was shown through an emphasis on collegiality and encouragement of bishops to form national conferences in order to more

---

[105] See Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium* (November 21, 1964), 10, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html.
[106] Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, 14-16.
[107] See Vatican II, *Presbyterorum Ordinis* (December 7, 1965), 3, 7-8, 9, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_en.html.

adequately address the pastoral needs of their respective countries.[108] Collegiality was a vital aspect of the American church in the nineteenth century as shown in the three Plenary Councils of Baltimore. These aspects of collegiality and cooperation brought out by the Second Vatican Council called for new adaptations and considerations in seminary intellectual life that would have to be addressed.

The Council's treatment of Scripture and liturgy elevated study of these subjects within the seminary curriculum. As noted, in the past tradition of curriculum content in the seminary, dogmatic and moral theology were viewed as critically important areas. While more attention was being paid to other subjects in light of scholarly advances in Catholic circles by the mid-twentieth century, there was no uniformity in seeing these subjects as worthwhile in their own right. For example, Scripture in the scholastic tradition was often used to bolster dogmatic or moral positions rather than studied in its own right and for its own value. Liturgy in the seminary was sometimes limited to the practical aspects of how to follow rubrics in celebrating the sacraments rather than a theology of worship.

Reclaiming the fundamental role of Scripture studies, the Council's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation, *Dei Verbum*, affirmed that "the study of the sacred page is, as it were, the soul of sacred theology," rather than a useful subordinate discipline, and that modern historical and literary criticisms should be appropriately used in its study. With respect to liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, called for liturgical studies to be "ranked among the compulsory and major courses in seminaries" and to be treated in

[108] See Vatican II, *Christus Dominus* (October 28, 1965), 37, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_christus-dominus_en.html.

comprehensive depth and wide-ranging content. Other seminary courses were to show their connection with the liturgy, so as to demonstrate the unity of the seminary academic curriculum.[109]

One of the main shifts in theology promoted by the Second Vatican Council was a shift in method. The *ressourcement* movement, which championed a return to the writings and theological approaches of pre-medieval theologians such as the Fathers of the Church and other theologians of the Middle Ages besides Aquinas, offered a new method for "doing" theology different from that of scholastic neo-Thomism. Whereas the latter promoted a unified and coherent theological system based on logical deductions and dialectical reasoning and, therefore, was oftentimes presented as timeless and unchanging, the *ressourcement* movement pointed to a diversity of approaches, all faithfully Catholic, that were rooted in Scripture and mindful of the living tradition within particular historical contexts. It was, in the terminology of Bernard Lonergan, a shift to an "historically minded" worldview from the "classicist" model.[110]

Such a shift in method recognized the theological project as reasoned reflection on divine revelation, inherently incarnational, unfolding within concrete historical contexts, and therefore aware of the critical importance of an historical and developmental perspective. The study of theology was to be more of a personal relationship and encounter with God than the accumulation of information. This new method and attention to the historical context in which theology was pursued drew attention to this understanding. Even the work of St. Thomas Aquinas, from this perspective, did not arise in an historical vacuum but, rather, took place within the broader context of the thirteenth century and developed within his own lifetime and career. Within this

[109] See Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* (November 18, 1965), 12, 24, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html; Vatican II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (December 4, 1963), 16, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html.

[110] See Bernard Lonergan, "The Transition from a Classicist World-View to Historical Mindedness," in *A Second Collection*, ed. W.F.J. Ryan and B.J. Tyrell (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974), 1-9.

ressourcement approach, a plurality of diverse theologies was to be expected, similar to the plurality of spiritualities recognized within the Catholic tradition, such as Franciscan, Dominican, or Ignatian, and the diversity of liturgical rites within the Catholic Church. The theological monopoly of neo-Thomism was no longer a given.[111]

The Second Vatican Council's understanding of the relationship of the church to the world, its internal ecclesiological relationships, the fundamental importance of the study of Scripture and liturgy, and its shift to an historically conscious theological methodology are but representative examples of the new approaches that seminary life was called to incarnate in the post-conciliar period. The implementation of the Council directives inaugurated a period of change and experimentation in seminary life, as in the broader church. It is clear that movements for reform of the seminary academic program in American seminaries were beginning to form during the pre-conciliar period. A number of thoughtful ideas on how the academic programs in American seminaries might meaningfully reflect the conciliar calling and the pastoral needs of the faithful were circulating in the 1960s. The next period in the history of intellectual formation in American seminaries was one of experimentation and creativity in carrying these reforms out in reality. These reforms were most intimately related to the Council's specific text on priestly formation, to which we now turn.

[111] See Grant Kaplan, "The Renewal of Ecclesiastical Studies: Chenu, Tübingen, and Theological Method in *Optatam Totius*," *Theological Studies* 77, no. 3 (2016): 567-592; T. Howland Sanks, "Education for Ministry Since Vatican II, *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 483; Vatican II, *Dei Verbum*.

B. *Optatam Totius*

The Second Vatican Council touched on all aspects of the church in the modern world, including the seminary. Its Decree on Priestly Formation, *Optatam Totius*, sought to bring a renewal to seminary life which, in the Council's understanding, was at the heart of the renewal of the entire church: "the desired renewal of the whole Church depends to a great extent on the ministry of its priests." The document sought to maintain those elements of the seminary tradition that continued to show their enduring value, while calling for the adoption of new approaches that might better meet the ministerial needs of the church in the contemporary world.[112]

The text of the Decree was brief, at only twenty-one numbered paragraphs, but six of these paragraphs were committed to "The Revision of Ecclesiastical Studies," suggesting both the weight of this topic's importance in the minds of the conciliar bishops and the degree to which the past practice had to be updated and adjusted. Before exploring the specific revisions of intellectual formation outlined by *Optatam Totius*, three novel elements of its overall framing of seminary formation bear mention: first, its allowance for a more decentralized and localized approach to seminary formation; second, its offering of a clearly articulated statement of primary purpose for seminaries; and, third, its concerted effort to contextualize all efforts of the seminary formation program within a more holistic approach to human development.

First, *Optatam Totius* promoted a more decentralized and localized approach to seminary formation than was reflected earlier in the twentieth century. Whereas the 1917 *Code* presented a standard model for seminaries throughout the universal church, *Optatam Totius*, from its very

[112] See Vatican II, *Optatam Totius* (October 28, 1965), http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_optatam-totius_en.html.

beginning, called for application of universal norms within the context of particular countries through their respective "programs of priestly training." This approach struck a balance between common elements of priestly formation present in all seminaries throughout the world, while allowing for flexibility to meet the needs of the local church. These national programs were to be revised as necessary, providing a further vehicle for more rapid adaptation to changing pastoral circumstances. This decentralization maintained a proper balance between Roman directives and the prudent judgment of national episcopal conferences on the topic of priestly formation.[113]

Moreover, reflecting the Council's ecclesiology of the church as the People of God, *Optatam Totius* situated the responsibility of fostering vocations within the entire faith community, beginning with the family and the parish, whereas the earlier tradition, reflected in the 1917 *Code*, saw this task as largely belonging to priests and bishops. This decentralized promotion of vocations moved from a largely clerical task to include all members of the church community. While the bishop was still to play a unique role in priestly vocations and seminary life, the conciliar text presented him more as a loving father of a household rather than chief executive of an institution.[114]

A second novel element to the overall approach of the conciliar Decree was that it provided a clear articulation of the primary purpose for the major seminary: "the formation of true shepherds of souls after the model of our Lord Jesus Christ, teacher, priest and shepherd." Therefore, everything done within the seminary was to work toward the pastoral purpose of ministerial service. Given this primary purpose, all seminary endeavors could be assessed in light of this ultimate mission. In pursuing this purpose of forming shepherds, priestly candidates were to be prepared for the corresponding ministries of the word, of worship, and of the parish. A concrete example of applying this pastoral purpose to seminary formation was the adoption of pastoral

[113] See ibid., 1.
[114] See ibid., 2, 5.

apprenticeship programs, such as at St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, in which, beginning in 1968, deacons resided full-time in parishes during at least part of the fourth year of theology as a way to enter into sustained parish ministry prior to priestly ordination.[115]

Pastoral ministry was the ordering principle of all aspects of seminary formation and, insofar as some aspects did not correspond to this pastoral end, they would need to be adjusted accordingly. This statement was an important development in understanding the many different dimensions of seminary life and formation and directing them toward a unified model. For example, spiritual devotion and coursework were not pursued independently and in isolation from each other, but rather both were seen as part of the broader fabric of preparing for pastoral ministry. This pastoral priority could then serve as a corrective for some aspects of the past seminary tradition that seemed to be prioritized as ends in themselves, such as the minutiae of a discipline without a proper understanding of its proper context.

A third new aspect to the conciliar approach to seminary formation was to situate all of its dimensions within the context of a more holistic approach, sensitive to the stages of human development and growth. For example, since youth were still considered the most likely pool of potential candidates for seminaries, minor seminary programs were to be pursued in accord with sound developmental psychology, including encouragement for social contact with both family and friends as elements of a balanced life. The academic dimension was to be organized so that a candidate who discerned a different vocation might easily transition into another setting. Further, the document recognized differing needs that might arise in older seminary students, and provision

[115] See ibid., 4; see also James P. Gaffey, *Meno of Menlo: Transformation of an American Seminary* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1992), 103-104.

to found institutions to best meet those needs was provided. The goal of human maturity, appropriate to age and time spent in formation, was the purpose of human formation.[116]

This holistic approach offered an opportunity to correct some aspects of the prior tradition that perhaps were pursued in isolation from the larger picture. For example, in terms of spiritual training, *Optatam Totius* encouraged traditional practices of piety and devotion, but cautioned "lest the spiritual formation consist in them alone or lest it develop only a religious affectation." In another area, the Decree presented discipline as important not only within community life when it is understood as adherence to external rules, but also within the context of a truly formative experience of self-mastery, maturity, and responsibility to self and others.[117]

The holistic approach of *Optatam Totius* also found expression in its understanding of the need for more time for formation to take place in order to authentically take root. It envisioned a transition period, something akin to a novitiate experience, for inauguration into the spiritual life before beginning other aspects of the formation program. Moreover, the text encouraged more focused times for pastoral formation, even possibly interrupting studies for a more extended experience, while retaining adequate time for theoretical and practical learning. *Optatam Totius* also raised the possibility of a given nation raising the minimum age for ordination, possibly by having graduates of the theology program spend a period of time in diaconal ministry before ordination to the priesthood. All of these suggestions illustrated the Council's intention to require the time necessary for adequate formation, and a willingness to provide more time for the seeds of formation to take root rather than to rigidly follow a pre-set schedule.[118]

[116] See Vatican II, *Optatam Totius*, 3, 11.
[117] See ibid., 8, 11.
[118] See ibid., 8, 12, 20.

With an understanding of some of these new approaches to broader seminary formation presented in *Optatam Totius*, the document's treatment of the seminary curriculum can be seen in its proper context. A major difference with the earlier tradition expressed in the 1917 *Code* was emphasis placed on minor seminaries. While *Optatam Totius* acknowledged their existence and their role in the formation of younger candidates, the educational goals typically met in the minor seminary described by the 1917 *Code*, namely a balanced foundation in the liberal arts and language acquisition, were stated with an implied understanding that they might be achieved in other educational settings. In the section of the Decree specifically covering "The Revision of Ecclesiastical Studies," the prerequisite intellectual training was described as being necessary "[b]efore beginning [the] specifically ecclesiastical subjects" of philosophy and theology covered in the major seminary, but did not say where those prerequisite studies should take place. This language indicated that perhaps candidates for the major seminary might arrive there without prior formal seminary formation, which was certainly a change from the typical process in the past. A special focus of these prerequisite studies was a basic knowledge of classical and biblical languages, namely Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and a general introduction to Catholic theology.[119]

Turning to the major seminary curriculum of philosophy and theology, *Optatam Totius* identified the key principle that would order the renewal of intellectual formation: a coherent unity to the program of studies that showed its relationship to living the faith, rather than as abstract, unrelated subjects studied in isolation. An important vehicle for achieving this coherence from the start was to be an introductory course sketching a roadmap for the entire course of philosophy and theology, showing "the mystery of salvation" in such a way that students "perceive the meaning, order, and pastoral end of their studies." This introductory course, which was to last "an

[119] See ibid., 13.

appropriate length of time," was envisioned to serve a transitional role from prerequisite studies and the subjects proper to the major seminary. In this way, it was an academic analogue to the type of introductory transition to the spiritual life recommended by the Decree before commencing seminary formation.[120]

The Decree's treatment of philosophical studies in the major seminary was much more detailed than that found in the 1917 *Code*. While preserving the priority of "a philosophical patrimony which is perennially valid," meaning the approach of Aquinas and his neo-Thomist heirs, the text allowed for other approaches to exploring the study of the world, the human person, and God. The use of the phrase "philosophical patrimony" rather than a singular "perennially valid" system suggested an openness to a plurality of traditions. The historical development of the philosophical tradition was seen as an important element not only in understanding the approaches of the various leading schools of philosophy, but also for discerning the strengths and weaknesses of each, with a view to engaging the contemporary mind and culture. The pastoral aim of philosophy was to connect its rational pursuit of truth with the human experience lived each day.[121]

Similar to its more detailed description of the philosophy curriculum in the 1917 *Code*, the Decree provided more robust outlines for the approach to and content of the theological disciplines. *Optatam Totius*, in concurrence with the teaching of other conciliar documents, recognized the central role of Scripture as the "soul of all theology." Seminarians were first to be introduced to the content of Scripture and the major themes of divine revelation as a continuous source for spiritual nourishment. Once a certain familiarity was reached, students were to be gradually instructed in the methods of exegesis, making use of appropriate tools of sound scholarship. The Council's clear emphasis on the priority of Scripture as a unifying principle for the theology

[120] See ibid., 14, 12.
[121] See ibid., 15.

program and on its openness to exegetical methods were a clear sign of departure from the dialectic scholastic approach more commonly utilized in the past.[122]

Dogmatic theology, long seen as the dominant subject in the seminary curriculum, was to be permeated by both Scripture and awareness of historical development. A clear methodological approach was outlined for covering dogmatic theology, beginning with scriptural sources, followed by the Fathers of the Church and later development in the tradition, and finally rational-speculative reflection, following the example of Aquinas. Dogmatic theology was no longer to be presented in isolation, but rather through the process of historical reflection, with special care to show its connection with the mysteries of the faith as celebrated in the liturgy.[123]

After treating Scripture and dogmatic theology, *Optatam Totius* discussed as a group "other theological disciplines," including moral theology, canon law, church history, and liturgy. This organization was a significant change from the past, when dogmatic and moral theology effectively made up much of theological formation. Although positioning moral theology with other areas that were once considered secondary, this action did not suggest that it was no longer relevant or important; however, it did indicate a new and necessary approach by drawing from biblical foundations and focusing on living the Christian vocation in the world. This renewal of moral theology likely stemmed from a movement away from the legalism common in the prior tradition, which would also explain the renewal of canon law in light of the Council's teaching about the church as the People of God. Areas of pastoral theology, such as catechetics, preaching, and the art of spiritual direction, were to be taught in the classroom and put into practice in various pastoral field assignments. The Decree also prescribed the inclusion of both ecumenical and interreligious matters during the course of studies. Finally, with respect to the renewal of seminary intellectual

[122] See ibid., 16.
[123] See ibid.

formation, *Optatam Totius* called for teachers to offer a variety of styles of classroom instruction, while utilizing the traditional lecture format and supplementing it with discussion and seminars, to allow opportunities for more active engagement with the material and personal appropriation by the student.[124]

Vatican II's *Optatam Totius* sought to renew seminary formation, including the intellectual programs of philosophy and theology, by retaining those aspects from the tradition that assisted the purpose of forming shepherds destined for the pastoral ministry while also adding new developments from the contemporary understanding of theology. The central role of Scripture in the life of the church and the project of theology called for reworking theological subjects, with greater attention given to historical consciousness. While the philosophical and theological tradition of Thomism still held a privileged place, other approaches, flowing from biblical foundations, were encouraged as a way of demonstrating the unity not only of the academic curriculum, but also of intellectual formation with all other aspects of priestly formation. *Optatam Totius* included more detail regarding seminary intellectual formation than the 1917 *Code*, but still allowed room for more local adaptations to be worked out in the respective national programs of priestly formation. It created a map of the terrain of the modern world and key landmarks along the journey of priestly formation in light of its pastoral purpose in the contemporary context. Later church documents helped fill in more of the details, including those from the local national bishops' conferences and the Roman Congregation for Catholic Education.

[124] See ibid., 16-17, 19.

C. Vatican II and the Program of Priestly Formation

The post-conciliar period of implementing the reforms of the Second Vatican Council in American seminary life began with the ratification of the U.S. Bishop's inaugural *Program of Priestly Formation* by the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education in April 1970 and its final approval in January 1971. In the wake of the renewal brought by the Council, especially those related to changes in seminary life, this period was a time of experimentation and discernment about how best to respond to the calls of the Council to form priests for pastoral ministry in the modern world. Directives were issued throughout the following decades by ecclesiastical leaders in the universal and American church to help provide guidance in this transition.

This transition period posed a significant challenge, namely shifting from traditional practice in seminary formation on a large scale without a clear and tested alternative. Despite this challenge, the transition period also provided exciting opportunities to apply a more contemporary understanding of priestly ministry to the pastoral mission of the church in the modern world. However, with a sudden change in theological approaches that coincided with changes in the Catholic faith that came in the post-conciliar period, many priests and seminarians faced something of an identity crisis that may have led to a significant decrease in numbers. Moreover, new questions and issues, such as whether or not lay students should attend Catholic seminaries and how to come to terms with a growing split between theology in American Catholic universities and seminaries, were raised and considered with the goal of forming the most appropriate environment and academic programs for seminary candidates.[125]

[125] See "The 'Land O' Lakes' Statement on American Catholic Universities (1967)," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader, Second Edition*, ed. Mark Massa and Catherine Osborne (New York: New York University Press, 2017), 38-44; see also "'Statement by Catholic Theologians' on *Humanae*

The model priest during this period of conciliar implementation was one who served with a missionary attitude. Like the traditional understanding of a missionary bringing the faith to an unknown land, the priest during this transition period was charged by the Council to bring the church to the modern world through a pastoral ministry of service. Prime virtues of a missionary are adaptability and creativity in the circumstances of ministry, qualities of critical importance for the priest in this period. Also, a missionary is called to listen to the people receiving ministry, and to engage in dialogue with them and find successful means of presenting the Gospel in modern culture. As mentioned previously, this calling was exactly the mission of the church as espoused in *Gaudium et Spes*, to be carried out by all of the faithful and, in a special way, by priests.

In the wake of the renewal, *Optatam Totius* called for national episcopal conferences to draw up their own "program of priestly training" to embody the Council's vision for the universal church within the particular conditions of the local church in order to meet its unique pastoral needs. To assist in this effort, the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, at the request of the first international synod of bishops, drew up a Basic Plan for Priestly Formation, or the *Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis*, upon which the respective national plans would be based.[126]

The *Ratio* affirmed that the seminary's ultimate purpose was to prepare candidates for the priesthood and outlined the essential elements of the seminary that the local bishops' conferences were to incorporate into their national programs. While mentioning the minor seminary, the main focus of the *Ratio* was on the major seminary. Priests were preferred to be the professor, with

Vitae (1968)," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader, Second Edition*, ed. Mark Massa and Catherine Osborne (New York: New York University Press, 2017), 197-199.

[126] See ibid., 1; Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, "Basic Plan for Priestly Formation," in *Norms for Priestly Formation: A Compendium of Official Documents on Training Candidates for the Priesthood* (Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1982).

academic preparation of at least the ecclesiastical licentiate and professional training in teaching methods. For seminarians, theological formation was to last four years, and be complemented by spiritual formation centered on the liturgy and pastoral formation helping the seminarians develop skills for genuine pastoral care of the faithful.[127]

The American National Conference of Catholic Bishops' *Program of Priestly Formation (PPF)*, first adopted in January 1971, concretized the principles of the *Ratio* for American seminaries. The bishops presented the seminary as a community that provided the environment for priestly formation, rather than as a setting for individual pursuit of holiness in frequent isolation. Within the seminary community, freedom and responsibility, rather than rigid discipline and regulation, were to inform relationships among seminarians, faculty, and formators.[128]

With respect to the academic curriculum, the *PPF* recommended some of the reforms called for in the preceding decades, such as an increased awareness of historical consciousness in all aspects of theological study and the central importance of Scripture. "Stress is now put on the need to involve the student in a dynamic process of reflection on the problems of life, and to instill in him a sense of the historical development of the Christian faith in the life of the individual and the Christian community."[129] The emphasis on the historical dimension was certainly a profound shift from the repeated insistence on the priority of scholastic approaches in the earlier tradition. The *PPF*, however, cautioned against the extremes of "static immutability" on the one hand, and "excessive relativism" in the employment of an historical approach, on the other.[130]

---

[127] See Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, "Basic Plan for Priestly Formation," 19, 30-31, 42, 48.
[128] See National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation* (Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1971), 171.
[129] Ibid., *Program of Priestly Formation*, 27.
[130] See Joseph M. White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to the Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 417-18; National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation*, 27, 30.

Theological formation in the seminary, according to the *PPF*, was to be "deeply engaged with the concerns and problems" of the modern world, and therefore pastorally oriented. This emphasis did not mean a purely practical or applied method of theological instruction, but rather that all seminary studies were to be considered in relation to the pastoral ministry, not in isolation from it. The document organized the content of theological study in major seminaries into five main categories: Sacred Scripture, historical studies, systematic theology, Sacred Liturgy, and pastoral studies. The priority given to Scriptural studies was notable in that it reflected the conciliar concern to reclaim the place of biblical formation as the center of theology. Most interestingly, the two dominant areas from the broad tradition of seminary intellectual formation, dogmatic and moral theology, were considered together under the title "systematic theology" (with moral theology including ascetical theology) and placed third in order of theological areas after Scripture and history, sending a significant message as to the scope of academic renewal and reorganization under way.[131]

The Bishops' first *PPF* provided concrete direction for the renewal of seminary life in the United States, especially as it pertained to intellectual formation. Subsequent versions of the *Program of Priestly Formation* were updated in 1976, 1982, 1993, 2005, and 2019. The sixth edition is completed and awaiting final Roman approval. The 2005 *PPF: Fifth Edition* will be treated in greater depth in Chapter 4 of this dissertation since it is the guiding document of seminaries at this time.

The experience of academic transition in light of the conciliar vision for priestly formation at St. Patrick's Seminary in Menlo Park, California, offered insight into both the creativity and challenges of such a project. Many administrators and faculty members at St. Patrick's Seminary

[131] See National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation*, 31-32, 48-76.

were priests of the Society of St. Sulpice. Tension often resulted between seminary formators trying to apply the reforms in pastorally effective ways and the local bishop concerned with the radical departure from traditional approaches.

Immediately following the Council, the theology faculty at St. Patrick's Seminary replaced the neo-Thomist Latin manuals with more recent texts as a way to engage seminarians with contemporarily relevant approaches. After some initial openness to these changes, however, in 1966 Archbishop Joseph McGucken criticized what he found to be general confusion as to the basic foundations of Catholicism on the part of newly ordained priests and called for a return to a more traditional style of teaching and textbook. The new inductive teaching methods utilized in the classroom alongside the new texts led to, in Archbishop McGucken's view, more questions than answers and an attitude of selectively accepting or rejecting church teaching on the part of seminarians. Clearly of the classicist mindset, McGucken's critiques were seen by the seminary faculty as contrary to the calls of the Council to reorganize seminary studies along biblical foundations with attention to historical consciousness.[132]

With the appointment of Patrick McCormick as the dean of studies in 1968, a further reform of the theology curriculum was proposed for St. Patrick's, dividing the four years of the program into three distinct levels. The first level consisted of introductory courses in the major theological disciplines for first-year students. The second level occurred over the second and third years, and was composed of a mix of core courses and electives in areas of interest. The third level of the proposed revision was a year-long pastoral experience as a deacon in a parish setting. A student advanced to the next stage of the theology program through passing an examination on competencies for the given level. Not surprisingly, Archbishop McGucken objected to these

[132] See Gaffey, *Meno of Menlo: Transformation of an American Seminary*, 86, 92-93.

reforms as too undefined, especially the residential pastoral assignment for deacons, and providing an undue allowance of freedom.[133]

A similar tension between the seminary faculty and the church hierarchy over the immediate post-conciliar reforms was also evident at Immaculate Conception Seminary in New Jersey. The seminary relaxed many aspects of its way of life to try to better situate the formation program to respond to the modern world. With respect to academic formation, these adaptations included moving away from the use of standard manuals in the classroom in the latter half of the 1960s. For the 1967-1968 academic year, the number of class hours was decreased to allow more time for individual study. Classroom instruction moved from purely lecture methods to include openness to seminars, writing assignments, and outside reading. Faculty urged the discontinuation of organizing core courses into "cycles," a popular approach up to the the time of the Council where, for example, a single dogmatic theology course would be offered in a given semester and all seminarians would take that course together, and then the next course in the cycle would be offered the following semester for the entire body of seminarians in the theologate. In a spirit of reform, some courses were reorganized at Immaculate Conception Seminary to avoid unnecessary duplication and to enhance pastoral effectiveness, for example consolidating the theological, canonical, and liturgical dimensions of sacramental theology, previously treated in separate courses, into a singular multidisciplinary offering.[134]

Those representing the local hierarchical church authority objected to many of these changes. In 1972, the seminary board and consultors from the Archdiocese of Newark criticized these moves as engendering doctrinal confusion in seminarians between what was official church

[133] See ibid., 99-105.
[134] See Robert J. Wister, *Stewards of the Mysteries of God: Immaculate Conception Seminary, 1860-2010* (South Orange, NJ: Immaculate Conception Seminary, 2010), 286.

teaching and what was the personal opinion of particular professors. They requested that seminarians no longer be allowed to take notes during class, for the seminary to designate official textbooks to be used by professors, and for professors not to assign additional reading lists to supplement the manual. The seminary faculty rejected these critiques by the hierarchical representatives as uninformed and contrary to the directives of both the universal church and the American bishops for updating the seminary academic program.[135]

Beyond the above examples of conflict between seminary formators and church authority, a major challenge for seminaries in implementing the reforms for priestly formation envisioned by the Second Vatican Council and the U.S. *PPF* was the overall institutionalization of the program. Since the Council of Trent, the seminary was identified as the standard location for diocesan priestly formation, a process taking place over a period of time in a setting separate from the place of future pastoral ministry. Within this context, the seminary was often seen as the institution that qualified seminarians for ordained priestly ministry, the single institution imparting the necessary skills and proficiency that would be called for in parochial life, much like law school for lawyers or military boot camp for soldiers. The required pastoral proficiency expected in future ministry naturally was to take place in the context of the contemporary world, which was one of the great efforts of Vatican II to renew the church's mission in the twentieth century environment. However, the challenges of the modern world were so rapidly changing that the expectation that seminarians could possibly be prepared for his entire priestly life in the seminary was readily seen as impossible. For example, if it was thought that skills in counseling might be helpful for future priestly ministry, a course in counseling might be added to the existing curriculum, without reimagining the curriculum's entirety for the contemporary context. The resulting multiplication

[135] See ibid., 283-284.

of courses in the ever-increasing areas in which the future priest was expected to be proficient continues to be a significant challenge for seminary personnel.[136]

The theology curriculum was in a stage of transition, trying to respond to the directives of reform while still holding on to vestiges of the past. Although the content and method of the core courses incorporated more variety, the overall structure of the theological program tended to remain relatively the same as the pre-conciliar period, with the explicit addition of pastoral training. Rather than using a standard manual textbook in Latin for dogmatic and moral theology, more openness to a variety of readings reflected a diversity of viewpoints. Since more seminary professors had received their own academic formation in non-Catholic settings, their viewpoints increased the number with ecumenical perspectives. However, the tension between faculty who held classicist and historically minded viewpoints continued to exist in U.S. seminaries well into the present time. A continuing challenge was identifying the unifying factor to the seminary curriculum, whether it would be Scripture, history, liturgy, or some other disciplines that would bring all of the elements of the program into a comprehensive unity amidst the multiplication of courses. The neo-Thomistic tradition of dogmatic and moral theology served as a standard unifying principle in the pre-Vatican II seminary and, in the wake of the conciliar reforms, no single alternative was universally accepted to replace it.[137]

In terms of the seminary's engagement with the broader U.S. academic world, we saw previously that by the mid-twentieth century some seminary educators and thinkers were exploring the possibility of accreditation for seminary programs. At first, this interest in accreditation focused on the high school and college levels to ensure education at least equal to the non-seminary

[136] See James Downey, "The Creeping Curriculum," *African Ecclesial Review* 24, no. 6 (Dec 1982): 324-336; see also James Downey, "The Seminary Curriculum and the Ministry," *African Ecclesial Review* 19, no. 1 (Feb 1977): 23-31.
[137] See Sanks, "Education for Ministry Since Vatican II," 494-495, 498-499.

programs in the area, but eventually the question of accrediting theology programs in the major seminaries was also raised. Various ideas were circulated as to how to bring this about, including the possibility of forming a Catholic accrediting agency that would be able to investigate and approve seminary programs.

By the late 1960s, however, an alternative means for accreditation appeared more viable than forming a new independent agency for Roman Catholics, that is, affiliation with the existing American Association of Theological Schools, or AATS (and later the Association of Theological Schools, or ATS), originally formed by Protestant seminaries but not inherently opposed to Catholic membership. After a period of self-study by the interested seminaries and review of their academic criteria, the AATS conducted in-person evaluations and, upon successful findings, offered qualified seminaries to apply for membership. In 1968, fifteen Catholic seminaries joined the AATS as associate members, and by 1984 almost fifty were in various stages of the membership process.[138]

The accreditation application process and its requirement of self-reflection led many seminaries to honestly assess the strengths and weaknesses of their programs, especially relative to faculty credentials and curriculum. As a result of accreditation and the professional standardization it provided, seminaries were able to grant academic degrees on par with their Protestant divinity school counterparts. The Master of Divinity degree became the standard degree for ordained ministry in the United States. As more lay students began to enroll in seminary programs, other degrees were offered, such as Master of Arts in Theology or Pastoral Studies.[139]

---

[138] See *Directory of Theological Schools (ATS), 1968 Edition*, cited in Sanks, "Education for Ministry Since Vatican II," 487. See also Sanks, "Education for Ministry Since Vatican II," 487.
[139] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 422; Katarina Schuth, "Theological Faculty and Programs in Seminaries," in *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, ed. Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Miller (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997), 171.

The new opportunities for priestly life and ministry during the period were accompanied by new challenges. For example, the number of Catholic priests and the number of seminarians decreased rapidly in the post-conciliar period. The total number of U.S. major seminarians, both diocesan and religious, fell from its highest number of 8,916 in 1966, to 4,244 in 1984, a 52.4 percent drop. Correspondingly, the number of seminaries in the United States decreased as well, from 134 seminaries in 1961-1962 to fifty-three in 1981-1982.[140] This result was not overly surprising if one remembers the proliferation of small secondary seminaries throughout the mid-twentieth century. Since minor seminaries largely disappeared after the Council, their numeric loss in terms of both seminarians and seminaries likely impacted the overall numbers. In addition, a large number of religious institutions consolidated and formed collaborative unions, such as the Catholic Theological Union in Chicago and the Washington Theological Union in Washington, D.C.

With the decline of clerical candidates entering seminaries, the period was marked by opening studies to a new segment of students, namely aspiring lay ministers and members of religious communities not preparing for ordination. For the first time, seminaries whose central focus had been forming priestly candidates for pastoral ministry found themselves educating students outside of that traditional mission and scope. The Catholic seminaries accredited by ATS in 1984 had almost three thousand such lay students enrolled in their programs, including over twenty percent women.[141]

---

[140] See Adrian Fuerst, ed., *CARA Seminary Directory* (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, 1984), vi; see also CARA data cited in "Appendix 1-A: Theological Schools: Enrollment of Seminarians, 1961-62 to 2014-15" in Katarina Schuth, *Seminary Formation: Recent History -- Current Circumstances -- New Directions* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2016), 175.
[141] See Sanks, "Education for Ministry Since Vatican II," 486.

The presence of lay students and faculty was a point of contention during the Holy See's visitation of U.S. seminaries in the 1980s. Concern was raised about developing and communicating a clear understanding of the ordained priesthood when lay ministers were studying alongside priestly candidates. The *PPF: Third Edition*, addressed a related concern about the impact of lay programs in seminaries:

> [The primary purpose of a seminary, formation of priests] should not be weakened by the addition of programs that would jeopardize the centrality of the program of priestly formation, create confusion concerning the specific nature of the ministerial priesthood, or obstruct the formation and community life of students preparing for the priesthood.[142]

Moreover, despite a lack of qualified priest faculty at some seminaries, the Congregation for Catholic Education's report cautioned against hiring too many non-ordained faculty members, lest the mission and character of the seminary be affected.[143]

A further challenge impacting intellectual formation in the U.S. context following the Second Vatican Council was the split between theology in the seminary and university settings. Prior to the Council, Catholic theology was largely the domain of priests teaching in seminaries. Inspired by the pastoral and theological renewal of the period, Catholic higher education and university theologians made serious efforts to engage in the broader life of the Church in the modern world following the Council. The new efforts of engagement by university theologians in the U.S. sometimes led to serious tensions between the Catholic academy and the church hierarchy.

Charter documents such as the "Land O' Lakes" statement sought to carve out autonomy for academic inquiry by Catholic theologians without external influence or fear of reprisal. This autonomy meant a separate and unique role of theologians vis-à-vis the formal teaching authority

---

[142] National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation, Third Edition* (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1982), 545.
[143] See White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States*, 426-427; National Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation, Third Edition*, 543-550.

of the church, an autonomy not possible for the seminary. For example, substantial critique and rejection of the theological and ecclesiological methods used in Paul VI's 1968 encyclical on artificial contraception, *Humanae Vitae*, by a group of American theologians was one major and lasting expression of this tension. Whereas pre-conciliar theology in Catholic colleges and in seminaries in the U.S. was largely insular and isolated from the broader intellectual world, Vatican II's call for both to engage the modern world resulted in a general division between university and seminary theology in the United States.[144]

D. Relevant Documents from the Congregation for Catholic Education

After the Second Vatican Council, the issuing of the *Ratio Fundamentalis* and the corresponding plans of priestly formation in each local church, the Roman Congregation for Catholic Education issued a number of documents on specific aspects of seminary formation to provide more clarity and depth in the 1970s and 1980s. Four such documents treating themes directly impacting theological formation in major seminaries were *The Theological Formation of Future Priests* (1976); *Instruction on Liturgical Formation in Seminaries* (1979); *Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests* (1988); and *Instruction on the Study of the Fathers of the Church in the Formation of Priests* (1989). We will consider the key imports of these texts, further elaborating the spirit of *Optatam Totius*, on the study of theology in major seminaries.

[144] See "The 'Land O' Lakes' Statement on American Catholic Universities (1967)," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader, Second Edition*, 38-44; see also "'Statement by Catholic Theologians' on *Humanae Vitae* (1968)," in *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader, Second Edition*, 197-199.

The first document, *The Theological Formation of Future Priests*, was an existential assessment of the challenges for priests and the church in the modern world, and the need for theological study to adequately respond to those challenges. In the face of "[d]eep cultural and theological changes," the Congregation's central concern was the proper balance between a healthy theological pluralism on the one hand, and a sufficient understanding of the unity of theology without a total fragmentation on the other. The text was organized into three main parts: modern challenges facing the priest and the church, the demands of theological teaching in the midst of those challenges, and the provision of guidelines for teaching theology.[145]

The challenges of the modern world identified by the document for the priest and the broader church are still relevant today. For the priest, the increased demands and responsibilities of pastoral ministry brought on by the decreased number of clergy called for a heightened theological training with an ability to apply theological thinking to changing situations and circumstances. Priests in the contemporary context ministered to a more theologically informed laity and their differing perspectives on reconciling Catholic theology with modern life, calling for a more honest and well-rounded approach from priests who, in times past, were likely the most

[145] Emphasis on the "unity of theology" by the Vatican and American bishops flows from a concern to highlight Catholic theology's relational dimension, which is one reason the "Christological" and "ecclesiological" roots of theology are often pointed out in these documents. In other words, this phrase emphasizes that theology is not a composite of several isolated and unrelated disciplines, such as history, philology, etc., pursued by isolated individuals, but rather that it is "held together" by the reasoned reflection on the data of revelation lived out within the community of the church. This emphasis is made in the face of a concern with the fragmentation of theology into unrelated areas, outside of the context of the faith community. This appeal to the "unity" of theology is not to be understood as a form of fundamentalism, because there is a rich diversity and variety within the tradition to draw from rather than a "one size fits all" standard. The term "unity" in this sense should not be read as meaning "uniformity," and so there is room for different theological approaches (what is meant by "theological pluralism"). Theological "unity" and "plurality" fit together in an analogous way as the interplay between the universal and particular church, i.e. the universal church is present in the particular church and vice versa. Reference to the "unity of theology" should not be seen as a remnant of integralism which relates mostly to church-state relations and a "turning back the clock" to a political ideal of medieval Christendom. See Congregation for Catholic Education, *The Theological Formation of Future Priests* (February 22, 1976), http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/theological.pdf.

theologically educated persons in their parish. Finally, the cultural and social environment of skepticism threatened the priest's own faith and identity.[146]

For the church, challenges included an increasingly secular world, elevation of the sciences as the most recognized source for truth, and new pastoral issues posed by sociology, political theory, and economics. Appropriate theological language able to speak to these modern circumstances was recognized as a critical need. Understanding the unity of theology and the interconnections of all its parts were at risk through fragmentation into separate and unrelated disciplines such as history, linguistics, and sociology. New approaches to theology in recent decades, such as liberation theology, raised a question of theological pluralism and its relationship to the unity of theology that appeared to be so central to the earlier tradition. All of these problems facing the priest and the church demanded more from seminary theological formation than training that was "predominantly practical and culturally mediocre."[147]

One all-encompassing problem in teaching theology recognized by the Congregation was the extensive material to be covered to provide an adequate theological foundation in the limited amount of time available to do so within the seminary. The temporal limits of formal seminary formation required a realignment of curricular content in order to efficiently and comprehensively achieve this task. To reasonably order this realignment, the Congregation articulated essential elements of theology that, once identified, could be better renewed in theological inquiry in priestly formation. First, theology was to be understood principally within the context of faith, a process of reasoned reflection on revelation, both historical and systematic within the community of faith. It was not to be reduced to fundamentally different approaches such as those found in the history of religion or religious studies, which do not necessarily require faith. Second, *The Theological*

[146] See ibid., I.I.1, 3-4.
[147] See ibid., I.I.5, I.II.1, 4-6.

Formation of Future Priests highlighted the essential connection between Catholic theology and the life of the church, its philosophical and theological tradition, and its teaching authority. Third, the spiritual dimension of "doing" theology was to be renewed, so that the theologian did not fall into a habit of abstract intellectualism in teaching and research. Finally, the ultimate role of theology was seen as one of service to the church, both to aid in ecclesial self-understanding and to serve the church's mission in the world.[148]

Theological pluralism was recognized as part of the tradition of the church, though the Congregation distinguished between the pluralistic schools of the past, which shared a common attempt to interpret the data of revelation, with the pluralistic approaches of contemporary times, which quantitatively and qualitatively differed among each other in numerous ways. The text made clear that the church welcomed all the approaches that contributed to a further reasoned reflection on revelation in faith, but cautioned against approaches based on tenets contrary to faith, such as relativism. Since the time spent in seminary formation was necessarily limited, the Congregation urged that seminarians first must be instructed by using the "great masters of the church," presented with an understanding of the unity of the Catholic faith, and given clarity in showing the difference between matters of faith and matters open to differing opinions. This instruction on theological pluralism was offered in the time of post-conciliar seminary experimentation when new patterns and approaches were being attempted to bring priestly formation into dialogue with the modern world. The strong argument of the need for seminarians, beginners in theology, to start from this understanding of theology as articulated in the text was made in response to these experiments as an intended corrective.[149]

[148] See ibid., II.I.1, 3-4, II.I.2.1, 4, II.II, II.II.2.5.
[149] See ibid., III.I.1.1-5.

The "prefect of studies" or academic dean, with the cooperation of the faculty, played a critical role in organizing a coherent and comprehensive program of studies and in promoting the unity of the entire curriculum over the isolation of individual classes. The essential core subjects within the theology curriculum were to be required, as distinct from optional electives offered as opportunities for further study. *The Theological Formation of Future Priests* appeared to identify nine core areas of the theology curriculum for major seminaries: Scripture, patristics, dogmatic theology, moral theology, pastoral theology, fundamental theology, liturgy, canon law, and church history. Lectures by teachers based on their professional expertise could be supplemented by more interactive class methods such as seminars and discussions, but these alternate formats were not to replace the lecture method which was seen as necessary for a systematic presentation of the discipline in question. Moreover, an important priority for instructors was to make scriptural, patristic, liturgical, and pastoral connections in the presentation of course material as appropriate.[150]

The Congregation for Catholic Education also explored the more specific topics of the liturgy, the church's social teaching, and patristics and their relationship to overall seminary theological formation in a series of documents issued in the decade between 1979 and 1989. Since one of the main themes of *The Theological Formation of Future Priests* was the unity of the seminary curriculum, it was not surprising for the Congregation to take up specific aspects of the formation program and, while treating each in its own right, also show its place and connection with the other elements of formation and study. The Congregation manifested the goal of the integrated and comprehensive whole of theological formation in seminaries through these documents.

[150] See ibid., III.I.2.2, III.I.3.3-4, III.II.1-7.

The *Instruction on Liturgical Formation in Seminaries* insisted on both direct practice and classroom teaching as critical components of sound liturgical formation as a means to nourish and promote fruitful pastoral ministry. Faced with an increasingly secular worldview, the future priest needed to appropriate for himself, and for those to whom he would minister, a proper understanding of the nature of the liturgy and its relationship to the paschal mystery and the life and prayer of both the church and its members. Building on the communal celebration of the liturgy, including the Mass, the Liturgy of the Hours, and other regular devotions, formal classroom instruction was to include both an overall introduction upon entering the seminary and specific focus in the major courses of the theological curriculum. Throughout liturgical studies, connections were to be made to the theological, pastoral, and ecumenical needs of the modern world.[151]

In addition to its treatment of the liturgy, the Congregation issued *Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests* as a way to ensure future clergy were adequately informed about the social tradition and able to apply it in pastoral ministry, in the parish and civic community. The text was organized into six chapters, the first five including a comprehensive overview of the historical, theoretical, and practical aspects of the church's social teaching. The final chapter addressed the role of Catholic social teaching specifically in the context of seminary formation, especially focusing on the formation of professors and, through them in their courses.[152]

---

[151] See Congregation for Catholic Education, *Instruction on Liturgical Formation in Seminaries* (1979), in *Liturgical Formation in Seminaries: A Commentary* (Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1984), 2, 4, 9, 43, 44.

[152] See Congregation for Catholic Education, *Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests* (Washington, DC: Office for Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1989).

The Congregation called for bishops to send capable candidates for further studies in the social doctrine of the church at ecclesiastically recognized programs. Knowledge of the relevant social encyclicals was necessary but not sufficient formation for professors. In addition to this foundation, they must develop an extensive knowledge of theology and the social sciences, with a proper understanding of the relationship of the church's social teaching to the areas of dogmatic, moral, and pastoral theology. Specific core and elective courses on Catholic social teaching were to be offered in the theology programs of major seminaries, rather than simply treating elements of social teaching as ancillary topics in other courses. The priest's role in forming the laity in Catholic social doctrine should also be stressed. Concrete application of the social teaching learned in the classroom was to be provided through pastoral experiences within the context of the social issues studied.[153]

Finally, in furthering the vision of the seminary curriculum, the Congregation for Catholic Education treated the study of the Fathers of the Church as especially appropriate for modern ministry. Responding to the trend of theologians drawing from Scripture and applying the exegetical process to modern circumstances without any recourse to subsequent historical development, the Congregation offered the example of patristic authors as mediators between the Bible and the living theological tradition through the centuries. Although the Fathers were sometimes dismissed by contemporary scholars as valuable sources for critical exegesis of biblical texts from a modern perspective, the document argued for the creative and spiritual depth of scriptural analysis found in the writings of the Fathers. The social climate of late antiquity shared similarities with the twentieth century as periods of transition and discernment, so the writings of these early theologians provided resources for navigating times of change in light of the Gospel.

[153] See ibid., 1, 66-67, 73, 76-77.

Moreover, inspiration from the patristic writings were reflected in other aspects of renewal promoted by the Second Vatican Council, such as the liturgy. The theological methods of the patristic authors, interpreting and drawing from Scripture, tradition, and the non-Christian intellectual world, coupled with the pastoral aim and context of their writing, proved worthwhile examples to hold out for the seminarian in formation in the contemporary setting.[154]

These texts of the Congregation for Catholic Education helped seminary faculty emphasize in greater detail elements of theological formation as envisioned by *Optatam Totius*. The unity of a well ordered theology curriculum centered around the study of Scripture and sensitive to historical development served the pastoral aim of ministry in the midst of the unique challenges in the modern world. The connections between theory and practice, and between theology, the liturgy, and social action were made by drawing attention to these areas of ministry. The patristic writings were held out as a special example of integrating all of these aspects within a pastoral context. These connections nourished the spiritual development within the seminary, showing the comprehensive beauty of the faith, and laid a foundation for continued growth and renewal beyond ordination.

E. 1983 *Code of Canon Law*

The revised 1983 *Code of Canon Law*, sometimes informally considered one of the final acts of the Second Vatican Council, incorporated many of the advances in theological formation in seminaries presented in *Optatam Totius* and the clarifying documents of the Congregation for

[154] See Congregation for Catholic Education, *Instruction on the Study of the Fathers of the Church in the Formation of Priests* (November 10, 1989), http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/fathers.pdf.

Catholic Education. Although the revised *Code* was promulgated in 1983, it is fitting to address its role in seminaries to conclude this chapter, which began with a consideration of the reforms of the Second Vatican Council and its vision for seminary life and intellectual formation, with a view of the 1983 *Code* and its treatment of theological study in seminaries.

The placement of the revised *Code's* treatment of seminaries within the entire legislation reflected the theological renewal of the post-conciliar decades. The structural positioning of priestly formation within the 1983 *Code* was significantly different from that of its 1917 predecessor, reflecting the ecclesiology of the Second Vatican Council focusing on the church as the Mystical Body. Whereas the 1917 *Code* considered seminaries in its Third Book "On Things" in a section on the teaching function of the church, alongside other topics such as preaching, schools, and censorship, the revised 1983 *Code* positioned clerical formation in Book II, "On the People of God," within Part I on "The Christian Faithful." Rooted in the theological understanding of the common call of all of the baptized, Part I of the 1983 *Code* considered first the obligations and rights of all Christians, then that of the laity, before treating "Sacred Ministers or Clerics" in Title III. Within this title on the ordained, Chapter I governed "The Formation of Clerics" and other chapters dealt with enrollment and incardination, the rights and obligations of clerics, and the loss of the clerical state. This shift in structure reflected a renewed understanding of the relation of the priestly minister within the entire church, flowing from baptism and in collaboration with the laity. The other topics grouped with seminaries in the 1917 *Code* remained together in Book III on "The Teaching Function of the Church" in the revised 1983 *Code*.[155]

The chapter on "The Formation of Clerics" in the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* was composed of thirty-three canons in total, touching on all aspects of seminary-related issues. Out of this total,

[155] See *Code of Canon Law: Latin-English Edition, New English Translation* (Washington, DC: Canon Law Society of America, 1998), II.I, III; see also *The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code*, III.IV.20-24.

fifteen canons directly related to intellectual formation in seminaries, including four on teachers, about forty-five percent of the whole section on academic formation, a significant increase from the previous fifteen percent in the 1917 *Code*. The most significant modification overall was the incorporation of *Optatam Totius*'s call for national programs of priestly formation, adapting and applying universal principles to concrete circumstances in each country. Moreover, the revised *Code* called for further adaptation to the local church community even within a given nation, by requiring each seminary to have its own rule of life applying the principles of the national program to each unique seminary setting.[156]

Minor seminaries were still seen as important for "fostering vocations," but the academic instruction provided in them, focusing on the liberal arts, was to be the equivalent of other similar programs for non-clerical students. This reflected the trend away from minor seminaries as the ordinary immediate preparation for major seminary and the goal of providing flexible options for those who discerned a different vocation to transition out of the minor seminary. A major seminary, the ordinary locus for immediate formation for clerical candidates, was to be established in every diocese when feasible, a reference to the continuing tradition of Trent, but when this establishment was not possible other seminaries were to be utilized, including interdiocesan models. The 1983 *Code*'s allowance for the consolidation of resources into fewer, better equipped seminaries as the local conditions called for was the more viable and sustainable option compared with the Tridentine ideal of numerous, small diocesan seminaries.[157]

The overall academic program of the major seminary was to be harmoniously unified with the spiritual formation program, so that the student "acquires the spirit of the gospel and a close relationship with Christ," and within one coherent intellectual curriculum, integrating the study of

[156] See 1983 *Code of Canon Law*, II.I.III, Canons 242-243.
[157] See ibid., Canons 234, 237.

both philosophy and theology in a manner providing a comprehensive foundation in the ecclesiastical disciplines. This integrated program was to be organized toward the pastoral aim of ministry in the modern world and the contemporary context of the local culture and the particular nation. Students were to gain facility with relevant local languages that would be used in future ministry, and with Latin, though the degree to which the desired Latin training was pursued was never universal. Philosophical and theological studies were to last for at least six years in total, but the way in which these years were organized could be either conjointly or successively, with the time being the equivalent of two years of philosophy and four years of theology. In other words, although the required norm would be two years of philosophy followed by four years of theology, the 1983 *Code* envisioned the possibility of integrating these years in creative ways to achieve the desired overall coherence. A balance of clear directives in the total number of years of study with the flexibility to experiment with the organization of those studies was a positive feature of the 1983 *Code*.[158]

The 1983 *Code* made limited provision for the specific content of the philosophy curriculum, leaving sufficient room for the descriptive lacunae to be filled in by the different national programs of priestly formation, attentive to the needs of each country. The philosophy course of studies was to be historically comprehensive and rooted in the "perennially valid philosophical heritage" of St. Thomas Aquinas and his neo-scholastic followers. Teaching methods employed were to highlight the instrumental use of philosophy as enhancing the student's reasoning skills, promoting their overall human development, and preparing for the future study of theology.[159]

[158] See ibid., Canons 244, 248-250.
[159] See ibid., Canon 251.

Summarizing the renewed vision of theological formation in seminaries framed by *Optatam Totius* and the subsequent documents of the Congregation for Catholic Education, the revised 1983 *Code* emphasized five key characteristics of theological study proper to priestly formation: its pursuit within the context of faith and the faith community; its relationship to the teaching authority of the church; its unity and interrelationship internally, with respect to all of the diverse aspects of the theology curriculum, and externally, with the other dimensions of priestly formation; its role in developing and sustaining a deep spiritual life; and its fostering of the ability to faithfully present the fruits of theological formation in pastoral ministry. Thus the ecclesial, spiritual, and pastoral dimensions of theological formation were highlighted in the 1983 *Code*'s treatment of the content of the theology curriculum.[160]

Seven major courses in the theology curriculum were identified by the 1983 *Code*, namely Scripture, dogmatic (with special attention to Aquinas), moral, and pastoral theology, canon law, liturgy, and church history. Mention was made of "other auxiliary and special disciplines" without specifying them. In a later canon, other skills which "pertain to the sacred ministry" were treated as important for instruction, such as catechetics, homiletics, and parish administration, but it was not clear whether specific courses in these areas were to be offered, or if these topics should be infused within other areas of study when appropriate. Furthermore, elements of missiology, ecumenism, and Catholic social teaching were to be treated adequately for the seminarians to be informed about the needs of the local church, the universal church, and the broader world.[161]

[160] See ibid., Canon 252 §1.

[161] See ibid., Canons 252 §2-3, 256-257 §1. It is important to note that the Congregation for Catholic Education's Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests, considered above, was issued after the promulgation of the 1983 Code. It stands as an example of further elaboration and expansion of a topic relevant to the seminary's course of studies only mentioned in passing by the 1983 Code.

Finally, the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* adopted many of the requirements for the central role of teachers in the theology program articulated in the conciliar and post-conciliar texts issued by Rome. Instructors in philosophy, theology, and canon law were to be appointed by the bishop or bishops responsible for the seminary. They were to have personal and professional qualifications, being "outstanding in virtue" and holding a licentiate or doctorate from an ecclesiastically recognized program. These qualifications attempted to strike a balance between requiring academic credentials in a given field and a desire by the church to assess the quality of those credentials.[162]

Moreover, to promote a high academic standard in the classroom and to avoid a teacher instructing in an area beyond the scope of competence, the 1983 *Code* called for the appointment of teachers with specialized expertise, for example, in Scripture, dogmatic theology, or canon law, and for them to teach their courses from the respective approach and methodology of each. This approach was a significant departure from the common earlier mindset that a doctorate in dogmatic theology from a Roman university, for example, qualified a teacher to give instruction in any subject, even those, such as college-level physics, without any overt methodological connection to the field of expertise. Despite specialized training, teachers were still to approach their courses within the framework of the unity of the coherent theology curriculum, providing opportunities for students to pursue their own research and interests. The rector and prefect of studies were to work toward maintaining curricular unity and to ensure adequate implementation of teaching responsibilities in accord with the national program of priestly formation and local seminary rule.[163]

[162] See ibid., Canon 253.
[163] See ibid., Canons 253-254, 261 §2.

The treatment of intellectual formation in major seminaries offered in the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* served as a capstone of a period of significant theological renewal flowing from the Second Vatican Council. The earlier 1917 *Code* handed on much of the prior tradition of priestly formation, going back even to the Council of Trent, and transmitted characteristics of the post-Modern church with respect to intellectual formation of clergy for the next half century. Seminary formation in the period of the 1917 *Code* was primarily concerned with forming an ecclesiastical spirit in future priests, and emphasized spiritual discipline and the fostering of proper behavior. Theological study was focused on dogmatic and moral theology, approached in an apologetic and dialectic manner often separated from engagement with the broader world.

By the time of Vatican II with its renewed understanding of the church internally and its relationship to the world externally, the process of priestly formation likewise was due for renewal. *Optatam Totius* charted the course of this renewal, focusing on the pastoral purpose of priestly formation, centered around a spiritual encounter from faith in reasoned reflection on revelation and sensitive to the holistic needs of the person in formation. The Council also provided for adaptation to local circumstances in its call for national programs of priestly formation, which were to respond to the diverse needs of time and place. In the post-conciliar period, the Congregation for Catholic Education issued various documents clarifying and expanding elements of theological formation in the seminary, reappropriating the conciliar call for renewal in seminaries with the lessons learned through various experiences of experimentation in priestly formation implemented immediately following the Council. By the time of the promulgation of the revised *Code of Canon Law* in 1983, elements of the reform of priestly training had settled over the previous several decades; therefore, its promulgation also marked the transition to a new

stage in the understanding of intellectual formation in the seminary to meet the circumstances of the late twentieth-century and beyond.

F. Major Seminaries in the U.S. at the end of the 1980s

As in most instances of noteworthy reform, it can take significant time for implementation of change on a broad and effective scale. The reforms of seminary intellectual formation issued by the Second Vatican Council, and the subsequent U.S. *Programs for Priestly Formation*, truly revolutionized the organization and pursuit of theological studies in the seminary. It took time for them to be digested and prudently applied in the American context. As a way to consider the state of intellectual formation at the end of the 1980s, we will rely on the 1988-1989 academic year as a representative snapshot to assess the implementation of the reformed academic curriculum.[164] We will note both faculty and student profiles, as well as the theological programs pursued.

During the 1988-1989 academic year in the United States, fifty-two Catholic schools of graduate theology intellectually formed about 3,600 seminarians (both diocesan and religious) and roughly 3,500 non-ordination track lay and religious students. Attempting to respond to the pastoral need for lay ecclesial ministers in the post-conciliar church, since the mid-1970s about two-thirds of these institutions expanded their offerings to students not preparing for the priesthood. However, nearly 60 percent of diocesan seminarians were educated in institutions enrolling only clerical candidates, whereas 93 percent of religious seminarians studied in a mixed model seminary along with non-ordination colleagues.[165] This split reflected differing points of

[164] Selection of this year is made possible by the indispensable work of Sr. Katarina Schuth, upon which we will rely for the following data.
[165] See *CARA Seminary Directory 1987: US Catholic Institutions for the Training of Candidates for the Priesthood*, ed. Adrian Fuerst (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate); Katarina

view as to how to best form candidates for the diocesan priesthood, whether in collaboration with other future lay ministers or set apart to preserve a specifically priestly intellectual formation.

With respect to seminary faculty in 1989, roughly 75 percent were priests, with members of religious orders having a slight majority over diocesan priests. The high number of religious priest instructors was likely a circumstantial anomaly, resulting from the recent consolidation of religious seminaries and the surplus numbers of qualified teachers without positions. The remaining quarter of seminary faculty were non-ordained, split among women religious and lay men, and a smaller proportion of lay women. Almost two-thirds of faculty members held a doctoral degree, the most common being the Ph.D. (about 44 percent of doctorates) and the S.T.D. (35 percent of doctorates). Twenty-two percent of the seminaries had a faculty where more than 75 percent held a doctorate or equivalent terminal teaching degree, whereas 28 percent of seminary faculties had a 50 percent or lower rate. Faculty degrees were from a variety of institutions, namely from European universities (about 41 percent) and American Catholic (about 42 percent) and non-Catholic (18 percent) schools. Of those educated in Europe, almost two-thirds held ecclesiastical degrees from Roman universities.[166]

In seminary life, faculty were assuming more and more diverse roles beyond teaching, including administrative and formational dimensions. These additional duties resulted in many faculty members feeling burdened with too many responsibilities outside of the classroom, perhaps contributing to high turnover rates at some seminaries. Moreover, few seminaries prioritized faculty scholarly contributions through research and writing over teaching and other responsibilities. Less than 15 percent of seminaries actively promoted faculty scholarship by

---

Schuth, *Reason for the Hope: The Futures of Roman Catholic Theologates* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989), 47, 53.

[166] See Schuth, *Reason for the Hope*, 98-99, 101.

reducing teaching course loads and encouraging publication. At other seminaries, faculty often did not have the time nor energy to apply toward scholarship given other ministerial tasks both inside and outside the seminary, and limited financial commitment was made for sabbaticals and other opportunities for focused research.[167]

The profile of a seminary student in 1989 varied from that of earlier periods in age, personal experience, and familiarity with the basics of the Catholic faith. Students at U.S. Catholic seminaries in the mid-1980s were about five years older than their counterparts in the immediate post-conciliar period, averaging around thirty years old. Twenty-seven percent of diocesan seminarians during this period were thirty years of age or older. The different formational challenges experienced by older seminarians included longer adult professional experience and difficulties in adapting to a very different way of life in seminary.[168]

Generationally, most seminarians of the period grew up without any personal memory of church life before Vatican II, perceiving the Council as an historic event of the past. Some possessed a desire for nostalgic return to the pre-conciliar church they had not experienced. Seminarians, unsurprisingly, were deeply influenced by the broader cultural milieu of their formative years, and many lacked a strong foundation in the fundamentals of the Catholic faith. Many were perceived as being less committed to social justice than earlier groups of seminarians. About 44 percent received at least some of their college education in a non-Catholic setting, compared with only 5 percent in 1966. This shift in religious background called for more attention to basic catechetical needs in seminary programs, usually at the pre-theology level (relatively

[167] Ibid., 102-103, 106-08.
[168] See Ibid., 113, 116; Eugene F. Hemrick and Dean R. Hoge, *Seminarians in Theology: A National Profile* (Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1986), 30; Raymond H. Potvin, *Seminarians of the Eighties: A National Survey* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 1985), 5-17.

recent in adoption, offered by less than 25 percent of seminaries at the time), to supplement the lack of formal Catholic background presumed in prior generations.[169]

The standard academic degree for ordination candidates was the Master of Divinity. The theology curriculum of the period was largely influenced by ecclesiastical oversight, such as the *Program of Priestly Formation*, and accrediting agencies, usually the Association of Theological Schools. Except in the area of pastoral formation, the educational curriculum had not changed much from prior years, nor was there an expectation of change in the near future. Questions concerning the relationship between the seminary programs for priestly candidates and lay ministry programs were being worked out in practice. The exact mission and purpose of the seminary was in transition, whether to prepare only ordained ministers and/or other ecclesial ministers as well. Moreover, the future role and specific ministry of the priest in the life of the church was not clear in light of recent cultural circumstances that affected parishes and other places of ministry. Since the overall mission of the seminary would impact the curriculum, and since this mission was not uniformly expressed at this time, the curriculum was in a period of adaptation.[170]

With respect to curricular content, the core areas were relatively uniform, with the importance of each area measured by required credit hours. As reflected in the table below, the recommendations of *PPF III* for credit distribution were generally followed by seminaries, though some deviated from the model more than others. The course credits recommended by *PPF III* were divided into the following areas as follows (see the second row of the table): biblical studies (18 to 21 credit hours), historical studies (12 to 15 credit hours), systematic theology (21 to 27 credit hours), moral theology (6 to 9 credit hours), pastoral studies (21 credit hours), pastoral field

[169] See Schuth, *Reason for the Hope*, 113, 117-118, 121, 187-188; Potvin, *Seminarians of the Eighties*, 10.
[170] See Schuth, *Reason for the Hope*, 166-171.

education (7 credit hours), and elective courses (20 credit hours). In contrast to the *PPF III* recommendations (laid out in the third row of the table below), seminaries tended to require more credit hours in moral theology (average of 11.2 credit hours), pastoral studies (average of 23.9 credit hours), and pastoral field assignments (average of 11.8 credit hours), and less in history (average of 8.6 credit hours) and elective courses (average of 8 credit hours).[171]

Course Distribution by Area, 1987[172]

	Scripture	Dogmatic Theology	Moral Theology	Church History	Pastoral	Field Placement	Electives
Credit Hours Recommended in *PPF* III	18-21	21-27	6-9	12-15	21	7	20
Average Credit Hours Required in Seminaries, 1987	17.6	26.6	11.2	8.6	23.9	11.8	9

Although the standard length of an M.Div. program according to the ATS was three years, most programs in Catholic seminaries lasted four years, in accord with the church norm of four years of theology prior to ordination. Those Catholic seminary programs granting the M.Div. degree in three years offered several options for the fourth year of theological study, such as an additional Master of Arts degree. Two Catholic seminaries extended the program over five years by adding a year-long pastoral assignment. With respect to teaching approaches in the classroom, the most common method of instruction remained the lecture, though faculty noted an increasingly passive approach to learning on the part of seminarians and, as a result, some instructors adopted more active and engaging methods.[173]

[171] Ibid., 171, 173, 175-176, 186.
[172] See ibid., 175.
[173] Ibid., 173, 186-187.

In summary, the end of the 1980s marked a turning point in the history of seminary formation in the United States. The reforms of the Second Vatican Council had been implemented and relatively routinized over the decades since the 1960s. The various editions of the *Programs of Priestly Formation* provided specific guidance for the American context to help recalibrate priestly formation for more effective ministry in the modern world.

The model of priest as missionary can be used to describe the goals of seminary formation during this period. Vatican II's call to engage the culture meant developing the flexible and persistent approach of the missionary in presenting the Gospel through conversation and dialogue. A missionary cannot view the "outside" world as an enemy to be at war with, but rather must engage in true Christian charity to try to establish trust and points of contact. The increase in the average age of seminarians compared with previous eras meant they brought broader life experiences to seminary formation not shared by their predecessors. These skills had the potential to provide a richer environment that could be utilized later in the missionary life of a diocesan priest. However, some seminarians of this period themselves often lacked basic formation in the Catholic faith and extended exposure to Catholic life and culture. Besides that lacuna, their sometimes limited educational backgrounds created a challenge in engaging them in graduate level theological reflection. Sometimes, too, a seminarian's overly rigid understanding of the faith was a genuine obstacle for their theological growth and development, as well as in sharpening critical thinking skills that would be essential to future ministry.

Academic faculty in seminaries attempted to reform the program of studies to be more in accord with the priorities of a renewed focus on Scripture in the life of the theologian, and instilling a profound sense of historical consciousness throughout the elements of the seminary curriculum. Moreover, new forms of ministry took shape during this period, including roles for non-ordained

ecclesial ministers and seminary faculty members. The question as to how to provide formation for these candidates while maintaining the integrity of priestly formation within the seminary community was a constant theme throughout the period. The role of lay ministers became especially acute with the decreasing numbers of both priests and seminarians in the United States. Many questions still remained, such as the proper relationship between ordination and non-ordination track programs within seminaries. Nonetheless, a level of stability had settled in the decades of the post-conciliar period.

Chapter 4: Seminary Intellectual Formation, 1992-2016

A. *Pastores Dabo Vobis*

John Paul II issued *Pastores Dabo Vobis* after the 1990 Synod of Bishops on the overall topic of priestly formation at the end of the twentieth century. The Synod met to reassess the formation of clerical candidates in the context of concerns in the contemporary world, especially in light of the declining numbers of priests in many countries. While gatherings of bishops in the years following the Second Vatican Council focused on the identity of the priest, the 1990 Synod turned its attention to the formation of priests. The Synod considered especially the rate of growth in the number of priestly vocations and the quality of formation provided in seminaries to prepare future priests for pastoral ministry. Priestly formation, both within the seminary and in the ongoing life of the priest, was "considered by the Church one of the most demanding and important tasks for the future of the evangelization of humanity." John Paul II provided this text as a summary and personal commentary on the topic of priestly formation based on the Synod gathering. It provided substantial theological reflection on the meaning of seminary formation in the modern world at the end of the twentieth century, including the importance of intellectual formation.[174]

While the particular focus of this research is on the role of intellectual formation within the entire scope of priestly training envisioned in *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, it is necessary to understand the organizational structure of the text as a whole. In treating the formation of priests, the document was organized into six main chapters reflecting corresponding elements of the overall topic of priestly formation. After identifying social, cultural, and philosophical challenges present in the

[174] See John Paul II, *Pastores Dabo Vobis* (March 25, 1992), 2-3, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_25031992_pastores-dabo-vobis.html.

contemporary world that posed significant challenges to priestly formation (Chapter I) and the essential elements of the mission and nature of the ordained priesthood (Chapter II), John Paul II addressed the central topic of the spiritual life of the priest in Chapter III. That chapter was the second longest in terms of the number of paragraphs in the entire document, and was located at its heart, reflecting the critically important spiritual dimension of priestly formation. After reflecting on the role of the priestly vocation in the broader pastoral ministry of the church (Chapter IV), Chapter V treated the topic of "The Formation of Candidates to the Priesthood." The last chapter addressed the continuing formation of priests throughout their ministry, a topic that was treated with the third highest number of paragraphs, demonstrating the importance placed on the continuing intellectual formation of clergy.

With this broader context in mind and with an understanding of the schematics of the document, we are in a better position to consider John Paul II's understanding of priestly formation as expressed in Chapter V of *Pastores Dabo Vobis*. This chapter was the longest chapter in the document, with almost twice the number of paragraphs dedicated to it as the second longest chapter, on the spiritual life of the priest. The internal structure of the chapter on priestly formation included discussion of the role of intellectual formation in the wider project. The chapter was divided into three main sections: first, on the dimensions of priestly formation; second, on the context and setting of priestly formation; and, third, on the active participants involved in the process of priestly formation.

One of the most significant conceptual contributions of *Pastores Dabo Vobis* was its identification of four main dimensions to priestly formation, namely the human, spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral dimensions. These characteristics, unsurprisingly, were long considered critical aspects of formation for the ordained ministry, but this document was the first to clearly

distinguish each from the others, especially in setting apart the human dimension, which previously was typically treated as an aspect of spiritual formation. In identifying four "pillars" of priestly formation, however, the unity and interconnection of all of the dimensions was to be maintained.

In describing each dimension or area of priestly formation, *Pastores Dabo Vobis* used a short adjective or phrase that captured the intended essence of that dimension in itself and in relation to the whole of formation. Human formation was described as the "basis" or foundation upon which all further development was to be built, focusing on the growth of the natural virtues (such as respect, justice, and integrity), affective maturity, freedom, and moral conscience. Spiritual formation was presented as being "in communion" with God through dedicated prayer, reception of the sacraments (especially the Eucharist and Reconciliation), and learning to encounter Christ in others. Intellectual formation was portrayed as "understanding" the mysteries of faith, which should nourish both one's personal spiritual life and pastoral charity. Finally, pastoral formation was presented as "communion with" the entire church in a ministry of service. Spiritual formation and intellectual formation were given equal treatment in terms of the number of paragraphs, two and three times that of pastoral and human formation, respectively, suggesting an understanding of the special need for emphasis in these areas.[175]

John Paul II presented intellectual formation in relation to both the human and spiritual dimensions, as a quest for knowledge and union with God through rational reflection on the world, the human person, and revelation. Sound philosophical and theological formation was intended to prepare the future priest for his pastoral ministry in the context of the "new evangelization," facing directly the contemporary challenges of moral relativism, religious indifference, and the numerous

[175] See ibid., 43-59.

ethical questions raised by scientific and technological progress. The intent was to emphasize the connection between intellectual formation and its pastoral dimension.[176]

A proper understanding of the unity of the formative process was a priority for John Paul II in articulating the role of intellectual pursuit in seminaries. A commitment to theological study was not to be understood as a secondary element of priestly formation, nor as somehow less academically rigorous because connected with spiritual and pastoral growth. Rather, *Pastores Dabo Vobis* made clear that the interconnection with the other elements of priestly formation in no way diminished the serious nature of academic study within the seminary program, nor was the pastoral aim of intellectual formation in any way an implication of anti-intellectualism. "In fact the pastoral nature of theology does not mean that it should be less doctrinal or that it should be completely stripped of its scientific nature. It means, rather, that it enables future priests to proclaim the Gospel message through the cultural modes of their age and to direct pastoral action according to an authentic theological vision." Academic study was presented not so much as something a seminarian *did*, but rather as a way in which he was formed to *be* a certain type of person and future priest, a believer equipped for the demands of ministry in the modern context.[177]

The two key dimensions of intellectual formation presented in *Pastores Dabo Vobis* were philosophy and theology. John Paul II proposed reflections on the nature of these disciplines in the life of the priestly candidate during seminary formation, rather than detailed syllabi of what should be studied and when. These reflections served as important articulations to guide the concrete realization of philosophical and theological formation in given seminaries within particular countries and contexts.

[176] See ibid., 51.
[177] See ibid., 51, 55-56.

John Paul II considered the study of philosophy to be critically important, not only as preparation for the future study of theology, but also on its own because of its concern with the human person, the meaning of human freedom, and the pursuit of both relationship and truth. Within a broader context of cultural relativism, he argued that disciplined philosophical reflection on these themes would help the priestly candidate respond to the deep human questions asked about ultimate meaning, first in one's own mind and heart and then in others met in pastoral ministry. The study of philosophy would demonstrate the possibility of human reason arriving at some level of truth, a necessary remedy to the skepticism prevalent in the modern mindset. Philosophical formation would also show the rational basis for the assent of faith in believing the content of revelation, thus connecting philosophy with theology in a complementary fashion: "faith itself cannot do without reason and the effort of 'thinking through' its contents."[178]

Trained himself as a neo-Thomistic philosopher, this approach was a foundational priority for John Paul II's vision of philosophy in shaping the minds of future priests to meet the pastoral challenges of the modern world. The neo-Thomistic approach, however, did not have to be ahistorical and statically taken from the Middle Ages without giving attention to subsequent development, a major criticism of the scholastic manual tradition followed in seminaires prior to the Second Vatican Council. John Paul II's own engagement with the twentieth century movement of personalism showed the possibilities for a Thomistic philosophy vitally engaged with contemporary currents of thought.

After treating philosophy, *Pastores Dabo Vobis* acknowledged the important role of the social sciences, such as sociology, psychology, and education, in contributing toward "a pastoral ministry which is as 'incarnate' as possible," taking detailed account of the human condition in a

[178] See ibid., 52.

particular local context. This stance suggested at least an openness to their role in seminary intellectual formation, especially considering the pastoral context of the "new evangelization" held out by John Paul II throughout the document.[179]

In reflecting on the role of theology in the intellectual formation of priests, John Paul II considered a proper understanding of the true nature of theology as essential to the whole of formation. The student of theology, first and foremost, was to be a believer who raised questions about faith in order to lead to deeper understanding. The reciprocity between faith and reflection constituted the essence of true theology. Moreover, John Paul II highlighted the belief that the theologian-believer never exists in isolation, but rather stands in constant relationship with the church and Christ, bringing out the ecclesiological and Christological dimensions at the heart of theology. These relationships rooted in the theological process, in turn, should nourish the spiritual life of the theologian and future priest and lead to dedicated ministry, once again showing the reciprocal dimensions of clerical formation.[180]

The theological program within the seminary envisioned in *Pastores Dabo Vobis* was to be coherent and systematically organized so that each element of the curriculum could be clearly seen as part of a unified whole, as a mosaic in which each tile was properly placed to reveal an entire picture. The document categorized two basic methodological movements within the study of theology which helped to organize the various theological disciplines. The first movement was the deep study of the "word of God" revealed in Sacred Scripture and the life of the church. Within this first category were the areas of Scripture studies, patristics, liturgical studies, church history, and an examination of the teaching authority of the church. The second methodological movement

[179] See ibid.
[180] See ibid., 53.

was the consideration of the human person in relationship to God. Under this category fell the disciplines of dogmatic, moral, spiritual, and pastoral theology, and canon law.[181]

Since theological training in priestly formation was ultimately to be directed to the pastoral end of the "new evangelization," *Pastores Dabo Vobis* identified two important needs of the contemporary world that called for the resources of particular theological disciplines. The first need was to show the proper relationship between reason and faith, to which the study of fundamental theology was appropriately suited. The second area of concern was addressing the need for relationship and solidarity across lines of social, cultural, and religious diversity. Theological courses in areas such as Catholic social teaching, inculturation, ecumenism, and non-Christian religions would help the future priest address these needs both in the universal and local context.[182]

The traditional setting for priestly formation was the seminary, both minor and major. Since the Second Vatican Council, the minor seminary declined in popularity and largely left unresolved the question of how to provide an adequate substitute. Prior to entering the community of formation that was the major seminary, *Pastores Dabo Vobis* pointed to the need for sufficient preparational formation. In the past, this prior formation typically took place in the minor seminary, which the document still recognized as essential in certain parts of the world. Even where it was not practical for dioceses to operate a minor seminary, John Paul II urged other support structures to be established to accompany the discernment and formation of those considering the priesthood. Special mention was made of the unique needs of older candidates for the priesthood and the possibility of adapting aspects of the formation process for them, without minimizing its rigor.[183]

[181] See ibid., 54.
[182] See ibid.
[183] See ibid., 63-64.

Due to the decline in minor seminaries in the later twentieth century and the changing social and cultural environment, the document argued that the contemporary context called for a new model of pre-seminary formation in order to provide sufficient preparation for the major seminary, both in spiritual development and basic knowledge of the Catholic faith and practice. The exact details and contours of such a pre-seminary program, however, were left undefined and so this inaugurated a period of experimentation as to what would be the most effective form of a "propaedeutic period."[184] Even today, the appropriate structures of such programs are being adjusted according to local circumstances.

Among the attempts to meet the needs of pre-seminary formation were pre-theology programs at major seminaries, in which priestly candidates with an undergraduate degree but without prior philosophical or formational experience were enrolled. During the pre-theology program, candidates were introduced to priestly formation while concurrently undertaking a two-year study of philosophy and the foundations of the Catholic faith. After the pre-theology program, seminarians would enter the four-year theology program proper to the major seminary. During the 2018-2019 academic year, seminarians in pre-theology programs made up 24 percent of all seminarians enrolled in major seminaries.[185]

While the pre-theology programs sought to respond to the educational and formational lacunae of many seminarians, they did not generally meet the goal of providing pre-seminary human and spiritual formation called for by *Pastores Dabo Vobis*. They were most often an overlapped combination of introductory formation and introductory studies, rather than a separate and initial step in the priestly formation journey prior to entering a major seminary. Preserving the

[184] See ibid., 62.
[185] See Michal J. Kramarek and Mary L. Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019* (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, Georgetown University, 2019), 6, https://cara.georgetown.edu/StatisticalOverview201819.pdf.

distinct integrity of a propaedeutic stage focusing on human and spiritual formation was a priority of the 2016 *Ratio Fundamentalis*, *The Gift of the Priestly Formation*, which will be considered later in this chapter.

The seminary is in fact the site of a great deal of priestly formation. *Pastores Dabo Vobis* defined the nature of the major seminary as an ecclesial community of formation, a community that educates and accompanies candidates for the priesthood in their vocational discernment, in their response to that discernment, and in their preparation for ordination and priestly ministry. This characterization was significant because it framed the communal nature of the seminary, in which the bishop is present through the rector and those involved in the seminary mission, where members of the community contribute to the life of the whole in their own way, respective of their part in the community. This presentation of the seminary was different from the institutional or hierarchical dimensions that were emphasized in earlier periods, or even from the common but incomplete view of the seminary as a place where candidates for the priesthood live and study. "The seminary can be seen as a place and a period in life. But it is above all an educational community in progress: It is a community established by the bishop to offer to those called by the Lord to serve as apostles the possibility of re-living the experience of formation which our Lord provided for the Twelve."[186]

Within the seminary community, theology professors played a special role recognized by *Pastores Dabo Vobis*. Their regular and consistent contact with seminarians in the classroom left a lasting impression on their formational journey. John Paul II insisted that, prior to embarking on teaching responsibilities, professors should appropriate an understanding of the nature of theology, including its ecclesiological and Christological dimensions, as well as the ultimate purpose of the

[186] See John Paul II, *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, 60-61.

seminary, distinct from all other educational settings. Professors were to understand their part in the entire process of priestly formation, and to collaborate through their role in the endeavor of promoting the unity of the seminary. Theological instructors were to recognize their expertise and teaching as "not simply the communication of doctrine - even though it be sacred doctrine - but [as] above all the presentation of the point of view which unifies, in the plan of God, all the different branches of human knowledge and the various expressions of life."[187]

In *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, John Paul II provided substantial theological reflection on the nature and mission of the priesthood and the formative process of preparing candidates for its exercise. He identified the distinct but related dimensions of formation, and how they were to mold a priest for pastoral ministry in the church in the modern world. Intellectual formation, including the formal study of philosophy and theology in the major seminary, played a significant part in his vision of priestly formation and helped equip the priest to carry out the "new evangelization" called for by the circumstances at the end of the twentieth century. In this formational journey, the major seminary served as a community of education and formation in the process of discernment and following the vocational call to the priesthood.

B. *Directives Concerning the Preparation of Seminary Educators*

Soon after the 1992 publication of *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, which substantially treated all aspects of priestly formation for the contemporary world, the Congregation for Catholic Education published *Directives Concerning the Preparation of Seminary Educators*. This document marked an effort to supplement the church's renewed focus on priestly formation with a more sustained

[187] See ibid., 67.

reflection and practical suggestions about preparing formation personnel for seminary ministry. In this text, the term "educators" was used to apply to all of those involved in the formation process, including the seminary rector, spiritual directors, and professors. Our consideration of this document will focus on its treatment of aspects directly impacting intellectual formation.[188]

Drawing from past experience, the Congregation held that effective seminary formators must possess a balance of personal qualities and acquired skills. They must be first and foremost individuals of faith, sustained by deep prayer and love of the sacraments, teaching through personal example before words. Pastoral concern should infuse their approach to all aspects of the seminary program, including in the classroom. "In particular the professors, without detriment to the proper academic character of their task, should stress the pastoral value of study. . . ." Formators must also be persons of communion with the church and with the formational community of the seminary, operating as a unified body in the work of priestly formation. They were to possess a heightened level of personal and affective maturity, able to communicate with other formators and students clearly and openly, appropriate to their respective relationship.[189]

The document highlighted the need for professors to view themselves as an essential part of the formation faculty and to collaborate in the unified project of holistic priestly formation. They should be attentive to teaching their subject within the framework of the unity of the curriculum, while still treating the specific issues and questions pertinent to their field.[190] The acquired skills of professors consisted of both academic training, demonstrated by the completion of an advanced degree, and the use of effective pedagogical methods, including the ability to

[188] See Congregation for Catholic Education, *Directives Concerning the Preparation of Seminary Educators* (November 4, 1993), 5, http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/preparation.pdf.
[189] See ibid., 26-29, 31, 33, 37.
[190] See ibid., 46-47.

engage students in the classroom. The Congregation drew attention to the need for ongoing formation of professors through regular professional updating in their field, continued development in effective teaching practices, and an awareness of the current state of their disciplines and of the pastoral needs of their region.[191]

The Congregation raised several concerns with the then-current status of seminary educators, including professors, across the universal church. They cited a serious shortage of well-qualified candidates to serve in seminary priestly formation, a problem especially acute in regions of the world with growing numbers of aspirants to the priesthood. Moreover, those already engaged as seminary personnel often lacked a demonstrable ability to serve as part of a unified formation team. Others were assigned to ministry in the seminary on account of general personal qualities, rather than any specific desire or training to prepare for a formation role in seminary ministry, with an optimistic hope for on-the-job training. "Generally, one is content with a solid theological and spiritual formation and a good psychological equilibrium, trusting in the formation to be acquired successively through teaching experience and attendance at meetings and encounters." The Congregation published these directives as a way to address concerns with seminary educators overall.[192]

Despite these issues regarding the quantity and quality of formational personnel in seminaries, the Congregation's document still clearly envisioned these roles being filled almost exclusively by priests. Only two paragraphs mentioned the possibility of the laity (both women and men) or permanent deacons contributing to the formation program. Religious priests were mentioned throughout the document, but neither religious women nor non-ordained religious brothers were mentioned. Perhaps this omission was an oversight, or maybe religious sisters and

[191] See ibid., 62, 65, 68.
[192] See ibid., 6, 8, 10-12

brothers were intended to be included with the mention of lay women and men, but it is still a point worth noting.[193]

However, even when the laity or permanent deacons were mentioned, the implication was that their contributions ordinarily would be supplemental and not part of the core academic program. The document did mention the enrichment brought by these individuals to the seminary program, but limited their sphere of expertise to "those areas in which the lay faithful and deacons normally have a particular competence such as family spirituality, the difficult questions of the sciences, bioethics, ecology, the history of art, the means of social communication, and classical and modern languages." The typical ecclesiastical subjects of philosophy, theology, or canon law were not mentioned as areas of their possible contribution.[194]

The Congregation concluded its consideration of seminary educators by making two recommendations regarding faculty planning and the number of seminaries. First, the document urged seminaries to adequately plan as far in advance as possible to ensure a smooth transition of its faculty. This strategic planning would minimize threats to faculty stability and ensure expertise in key subject areas each year. This approach would include the identification of potential candidates and support of their proper academic training to build the faculty as a regular course of action, rather than trying to fill urgent needs as they arose. Second, the Congregation recommended the consolidation of resources into fewer, more robust seminaries, rather than more numerous, smaller communities. These interdiocesan seminaries could take the shape in national, regional, or provincial models.[195]

[193] See ibid. 20.
[194] See ibid.
[195] See ibid., 80-81.

The Congregation for Catholic Education's *Directives Concerning the Preparation of Seminary Educators* encouraged several key aspects promoting the enhancement of intellectual formation in major seminaries. It reaffirmed the community role of professors and their place in the broader formational ministry of the seminary officers. It highlighted the importance of the ongoing formation of professors in both their specific academic area and general professional development with respect to teaching methods and pastoral matters. The document was also helpful in identifying challenges facing seminaries in their pursuit of qualified formators who would competently serve the church in priestly formation, and by offering a number of qualities that should be sought in an ideal candidate for formational work. However, the Congregation was also limiting itself in its pool of qualified candidates for such seminary roles by focusing almost exclusively on recruiting priests to serve in these positions, although it did suggest an openness, albeit limited, to the possible positive contributions of the laity and permanent diaconate to the task of priestly formation.

C. American Seminaries at the Turn of the Century

By 1999, the total number of American seminaries forming candidates to the priesthood fell to forty-two, with an additional two schools of theology educating solely lay students. During the 1996-1997 academic year, these institutions enrolled slightly over three thousand seminarians, nearly three-quarters of whom were diocesan seminarians. In addition to seminarians, there was roughly an equal number of students not pursuing priestly ordination, including members of religious communities and the laity. Two-thirds of seminaries articulated a mission of preparing candidates for both ordained and lay ecclesial ministry, while 14 percent identified priestly

formation as the singular institutional purpose. The remainder stated a main focus of forming candidates for the priesthood, but offered at least some programs for other students. About 60 percent of diocesan seminarians participated in an academic program with other students not pursuing ordination, due largely to the overall decrease in the number of seminarians and seminaries from the previous decade.[196]

With respect to faculty, the overall number decreased over the 1990s, which was not unexpected given the decrease in seminarian numbers and the closing of seven theological seminaries. By 1997, priests occupied about two-thirds of seminary faculty positions with the remainder held by women religious, lay women, and lay men. The percentage of seminary faculty possessing a doctoral degree rose to nearly 75 percent, with the most common degrees still being the Ph.D. (about 55 percent of all doctorates) and the S.T.D. (about 30 percent of all doctorates), though the percentage of those with the ecclesiastical doctorate in theology dropped. Faculty members more often completed their studies at American Catholic (46.1 percent) and non-Catholic (21.3 percent) universities than in European schools (32.6 percent). However, when compared with the 1980s, the overall percentage of seminary faculty earning ecclesiastical degrees from Roman universities remained about the same, 23.2 percent from 1995-1997 compared with 25.7 percent in 1985-1987.[197]

Seminary faculty continued to be expected to assume substantial responsibilities beyond the classroom, such as participating in administrative committees, curricular development, and other aspects of the seminarian formation program. In the midst of these varied expectations,

[196] See Katarina Schuth, *Seminaries, Theologates, and the Future of Church Ministry: An Analysis of Trends and Transitions* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999), xvi-xvii, 56-59.
[197] Ibid., 111-113.

research and scholarship remained generally underemphasized and promoted at only a small number of seminaries.[198]

The overall student profile of the seminarian in 1999 was one of diversity, generally limited understanding of the fundamentals of the Catholic faith, and a slightly older demographic than in past periods, seminarians typically being in their thirties. In terms of racial and ethnic diversity, by 1997, almost one-quarter of major theologians in American seminaries were black, Asian, or Latino, almost twice the proportion from the late 1980s. Moreover, increasing numbers of candidates came from Europe, including Poland and Italy, to study in American seminaries for future ordained ministry in the United States. Approximately 20 percent of seminarians in American institutions spoke English as a second language.[199] The increasing racial, ethnic, and national diversity of seminarians training for ministry offered hope of new opportunities for the future of the American church, but also raised issues of cultural awareness and sensitivities in adjusting the formation program for their particular needs.

The religious backgrounds of seminarians were also quite diverse, and often fell into one of three main categories: those with a demonstrated history of involvement and engagement with the Catholic faith throughout their lives, those who experienced a recent conversion experience, and those with very limited ties to the life of the church. A fourth group, overlapping with the other three, were those who held a rigid and uncompromising understanding of the Catholic faith and elements of the former siege mentality against the threats of the modern world. Seminarians also came from a variety of educational and professional backgrounds, and possessed diverse

[198] Ibid., 115.
[199] See William V. D'Antonio, et al., *Laity American and Catholic: Transforming the Church* (Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1996), 87-88; Schuth, *Seminaries, Theologates, and the Future of Church Ministry*, 66-67, 73-74, 80.

intellectual interests and abilities.[200] Formation programs, including the academic curriculum, were expected to be mindful of these different backgrounds.

The normative academic degree for ordination in the United States in 1999 remained the Master of Divinity, the standard for professional ministry. The distribution of courses across the five major areas of biblical studies, historical studies, systematic theology, pastoral studies, and liturgical studies remained nearly the same from the late 1980s, with a slight increase in systematic theology and elective courses. Other common degree programs included the Master of Arts in Theology, offered at 90 percent of theologates, and the more recent Master of Arts in Pastoral Studies/Ministry, offered specifically for lay students at one-third of seminaries. Five schools of theology in the United States possessed the ability to grant ecclesiastical degrees in theology themselves, up to and including the doctorate, and three seminaries were able to grant the S.T.B. through affiliation with a Roman university.[201]

The academic programs at American seminaries during the late 1990s included both strengths and weaknesses. Positive aspects of these programs consisted of faculty openness to a variety of teaching methods beyond the standard lecture/discussion approach, curricula that provided a comprehensive grounding in the fundamentals of Catholic theology for ministry, and appropriate sensitivities to pastoral contexts. Remaining challenges to the academic programs included inadequate educational preparation of seminarians prior to commencing theology, especially with respect to the basics of the Catholic faith, the proliferation of courses to try to

[200] See Schuth, *Seminaries, Theologates, and the Future of Church Ministry*, 74-77, 79-82. See also Eugene F. Hemrick and James J. Walsh, *Seminarians in the Nineties: A National Study of Seminarians in Theology* (Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, Seminary Department, 1993).
[201] Schuth, *Seminaries, Theologates, and the Future of Church Ministry*, 154-155, 157.

address these lacunae, and the lack of realizing the necessity for on-going academic formation beyond ordination.[202]

The twenty-first century began with two significant events impacting both the life of the church generally and the seminary specifically. The first event was the widespread awareness of the clergy sexual abuse scandal in the United States that came about during the early 2000s. These devastating revelations brought renewed attention to the life of priests and their formation in the seminary. Rightfully, elements of human, spiritual, and psychological formation took on new importance in seminary life. A risk in responding to these urgent needs of priestly formation in the wake of the sexual abuse crisis, however, was de-emphasizing intellectual formation in relation to the other dimensions in a corrective movement rather than emphasizing the interrelation of all aspects in a unified whole.

The second significant event was the death of Pope St. John Paul II in 2005. For many seminarians during this period, John Paul II was the only pope in their living memory. Without any conscious recognition, the papacy was often equated with his charismatic persona as the visible representation of the church in the popular imagination. The end of his historically long papacy introduced an extensive experiential change not known by many students in the seminary environment of the early 2000s. Coupled with the vocational discernment of the priesthood in an age of decreasing clerical numbers and the profound wounds of the abuse scandal, these factors would continue to impact the subsequent period of American seminary formation.

[202] Ibid., 188-189, 191-192.

D. *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*

The United States Conference of Catholics bishops issued the *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition* (*PPF*) in 2006 based on the universal norms for priestly formation to be used in all American seminaries. Building on the tradition of the earlier editions of the document, the *Fifth Edition* embodied the reflections on the priesthood and formation as presented in *Pastores Dabo Vobis* with special attention given to each of the four pillars of priestly formation. Drawing from Vatican II's *Optatam Totius* and the recent guidance of both John Paul II and the Congregation for Catholic Education issued over the previous decades, the American bishops also incorporated feedback received through a series of voluntary visitations of American seminaries beginning in 1995. Responding to the contours of American church life at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the *Program* sought to better respond to the needs of the church in appropriately forming future priests for pastoral ministry in the United States.[203] Although the updated *Program of Priestly Formation: Sixth Edition* is finished and awaiting final approval, as of the time of writing, the *Fifth Edition* remains in effect in the United States to the present day.

Between *Pastores Dabo Vobis* and the USCCB's *Fifth Edition*, a significant revelation came to light profoundly impacting the context of the Catholic Church in the United States: the awareness of the clerical sexual abuse scandal. These revelations shook the foundation of the American church and brought renewed attention to the critical importance of priestly formation and life in seminaries. An important strength of the *Fifth Edition* was its understanding of the necessity of a pastoral context for framing seminary formation. This concern was especially

[203] See United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition* (Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2006), 1-5, http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/ProgramforPriestlyFormation.pdf.

important if there were to be any hope of ministering in the post-scandal period when the view of the church and some of its ministers was deeply marred: "Priestly formation takes place in a given ecclesial and historical context. Identifying that context is a critical task for giving specific shape to particular programs of formation."[204]

Attention was paid to both the context of the church throughout the world, and the particular context of the church in the United States. Some of the contextual characteristics identified by the *Fifth Edition* were envisioned by Vatican II and the mission of the "new evangelization" amidst the forces of secularization, relativism, and religious indifference. Other challenges included the sexual abuse scandal and the concrete renewal of credibility needed within the church in the United States. The *PPF* reflected an awareness of the varied backgrounds of candidates for priestly formation, including diversity of family and cultural backgrounds, age, education, religious encounter, and professional experience. By framing the social environment and characteristics of the church in the United States, the American bishops hoped to more effectively respond to these conditions as they related to priestly formation and future pastoral ministry.[205]

The document's text was divided into seven chapters, treating the topics outlined by *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, including the nature of the priesthood, priestly formation in general, and the seminary community. The consideration of priestly formation, including intellectual formation, was treated in the fourth chapter, the center of the organizational structure of the whole.

Following the post-conciliar tradition of recommendations for seminary training, the *PPF* emphasized the cohesiveness of all aspects of priestly formation, and organized the various dimensions of formation into the human, spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral, all distinct yet

[204] See ibid., 10, 12.
[205] See ibid., 11-12.

interrelated. The bishops proposed the "core of the faith" as the integrating principle for the entire formation program, perhaps as framed in the Creed. In presenting formation as a whole, the *Program* cautioned against a reductionist understanding of priestly preparation, in order to ensure committed personal growth and transformation in light of the candidate's relationship with God and the church. Formation easily could be misunderstood as limited only to job training or to the pursuit of an academic degree, especially in the American environment of professional graduate school training, but the text made clear that "[f]ormation is first and foremost cooperation with the grace of God." The overall goal of priestly formation was threefold: to prepare future priests broadly aware of the general human condition, able to engage in a lifelong reciprocal process appropriating revelation through reason and faith, and able to communicate this experience broadly in their pastoral ministry in service to the church.[206]

The *PPF: Fifth Edition* presented intellectual formation as a particular element of discipleship, of being a student and follower of Christ. Within the seminary and beyond, intellectual formation was to be directed both toward the future priest's own human and spiritual growth, and also toward the ecclesial service of pastoral ministry, a prime exercise of which was the art of preaching. "The doctrinal, educational, catechetical, and apologetic aspects of a candidate's training are to prepare the seminarian to be a faithful, loyal, and authentic teacher of the Gospel."[207]

The text identified three common challenges for candidates entering the intellectual formation program of a seminary, further recognizing the importance of context for the particular pursuit of academic studies. First, many potential candidates already possessed a high level of education but often with a narrow and specialized focus, lacking the general education usually

[206] See ibid., 14, 68-73, 138.
[207] See ibid., 137-139.

gained in a broad liberal arts program that would appropriately prepare for seminary studies. Second, many candidates arrived at a decision to enter the seminary at a more mature age than in the past, therefore having the positive qualities of more professional and life experience, but also the potential struggles in returning to the structure of a formal learning environment. Finally, many candidates from outside of the United States, volunteering to commit themselves to ministry in an American diocese, required additional support in adjusting to American society, culture, and the English language for both theological study and pastoral ministry. Realities of the American church, such as collaborating with lay ministers, including women, were different from the experience of the church in many of these seminarians' home countries. By identifying these initial challenges to intellectual formation in the American context at the start of the twenty-first century, the *PPF* was making seminary faculty aware of these needs that needed to be met in the programs for intellectual training.[208]

Documents issued by the American bishops divided the entirety of intellectual formation into three main stages. The first stage was to prepare for the study of theology, providing background formation and academic exposure in both the liberal arts and philosophy at the undergraduate level in order to be adequately prepared to begin theological studies. The *Program* described four different levels at the initial preparatory stage of intellectual formation: the high school seminary program, the college seminary program, the pre-theology program for those with a college degree already but lacking study in these prerequisite areas, and the cultural preparation program for those candidates from outside of the United States. The second stage of intellectual formation was the study of theology at the graduate level in a major seminary, culminating in the Master of Divinity (M.Div.) or Bachelor of Sacred Theology (S.T.B.) degree. Finally, the third

[208] See ibid., 140; see also Katarina Schuth, *Seminary Formation: Recent History -- Current Circumstances -- New Directions* (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2016), 81-82.

stage of intellectual formation in priestly training was regularly planned ongoing formation beyond ordination, which is outside of the scope of this dissertation. The *Program of Priestly Formation* provided detailed provisions for the content of both the preparatory and theological dimensions of intellectual formation.[209]

The stage of preparatory studies, whether pursued in the college seminary or the pre-theology program, consisted of two main areas of focus: the liberal arts and philosophy. Exposure to the breadth of the first area, the liberal arts, ensured that the priestly candidate possessed the basic foundations of a general education. This process would help the student form habits of serious study and develop both critical thinking and clear communication skills. A special dimension to the study of the liberal arts was a focus on language, both classical and biblical languages, such as acquiring a sufficient knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, or Latin that would enrich future theological study. Modern languages that might serve a pastoral purpose were also to be pursued, especially Spanish in most parts of the United States. As part of this general education period, candidates ought to study the introductory elements of the Catholic faith, especially the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* and Scripture, for a minimum of twelve credit hours.[210]

The second area of the preparatory program was the study of philosophy in the Catholic tradition. Building on the intellectual formation in the liberal arts, the study of philosophy would help the priestly aspirant to better understand the relationship between faith and reason and to explore the perduring questions of the human person, freedom, and truth. The study of philosophy in priestly formation was broken into two components. The first covered a comprehensive exposure to the history of philosophy, treating the periods of ancient, medieval, modern, and

[209] See United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*, 141-163, 370-371.
[210] See ibid., 147-150, 179, 182, 187, 189.

contemporary thought. Focus on the historical development of philosophy served the pastoral aim of providing witness to the engagement with culture throughout time. The *Program* also suggested a consideration of American philosophy to better prepare candidates for the "new evangelization" by understanding the philosophical tradition in the United States.[211]

The second component of the study of philosophy consisted of courses in the systematic philosophical categories of nature, metaphysics, logic, epistemology, ethics, philosophical anthropology, and natural theology. In presenting this substantive philosophy program, teachers were to provide sufficient treatment of St. Thomas Aquinas, both in its original context and subsequent development. While giving a prominent place to Aquinas, the *Program* also allowed for the treatment of other philosophical schools in the Catholic tradition, including those of Church Fathers, such as Saints Gregory of Nazianzus and Augustine, medieval Doctors of the Church, such as Saints Anselm and Bonaventure, and more modern philosophers, such as Saints John Henry Newman and Edith Stein. The complete philosophy curriculum, whether covered in the college seminary or the pre-theology program, ought to last for two years, and require thirty credit hours. The *Program* recommended that graduates of the college seminary program should earn the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree, and those who completed the entirety of the pre-theology program should receive the Bachelor in Philosophy (Ph.B.).[212]

While philosophy has been traditionally viewed as the most appropriate discipline to study in preparation for theology, the *Program of Priestly Formation* did provide for the possibility of the study of other alternative disciplines on a case by case basis. "Other liberal arts may be appropriate fields of concentration for some students." The text did not elaborate further, but at

[211] See ibid., 152-153, 155.
[212] See ibid., 156-157,175-176, 178, 185-186, 190; see also John Paul II, *Fides et Ratio* (September 14, 1998), 74, http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_14091998_fides-et-ratio.html.

least the suggestion was made for the possibility of other areas of focus, such as history, psychology, or sociology, that might also serve the priestly candidate's future seminary studies in theology and in his future pastoral ministry. Whether in philosophy or these other related subjects in the humanities or social sciences, one possible area for improvement in the preparatory intellectual formation program would be to provide qualified students, such as candidates in a pre-theology program, an option to pursue a master's level degree in these preparatory areas rather than an undergraduate level degree.[213]

The *PPF* presented the study of theology as the heart of intellectual formation in American seminaries. The curriculum was to have three key aspects, namely that it be unified, pastorally directed, and ecclesial. The coherence of all aspects of the theology program, and the unity of the preparatory studies with the study of theology, was a top priority. Seminary theology was to be rooted in faith and prayer, nourishing the spiritual life of the seminarian and of the broader community, and fueling pastoral charity to be expressed in future priestly service. The study of theology was also to be carried out in light of its ecclesial relationships of communion within the universal and particular church, including with the teaching authority of the church and tradition.[214]

The content of the overall theology curriculum presented by the *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition* was divided into twelve core theological areas. Within each of these areas, the American bishops called for specific foundational elements that were to be included in their presentation. It was not clear whether these subunits were supposed to be entire courses themselves, or topics to be substantially treated in some flexible manner in the presentation of the other courses. Since the *Program* has been the normative authority for the theological programs at

[213] See United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*, 151.
[214] See ibid., 163, 194-196, 225-226

American seminaries since its promulgation in 2006, it is important to consider its arrangement of core areas and their subdivisions.

Fundamental theology was the first central area mentioned by the *Program*. Dealing with the topics of revelation and its transmission, it was recommended as an introductory course to theological studies and an appropriate bridge to them from the prior sequence of courses in philosophy.[215]

The second core area, following its renewed place given by the Second Vatican Council, was Scripture, "the point of departure and soul of all theology." The presentation of Scripture in the seminary was to include intense study of the Old Testament, treating the Pentateuch, the historical books, wisdom literature, and the prophets, and the New Testament, including the Synoptic Gospels, the Johannine and Pauline writings, and the other epistles. Introduction to modern exegetical methods should be made, with a special consideration of the preparation of homilies, but the strengths and limits of the historical-critical method should be made manifest. In addition, other hermeneutical approaches should be presented when appropriate.[216]

Study of the Fathers of the Church was proposed as the third core area of the theology program. Similar to the role of Scripture as a continuous source for theological development, the writings of the Fathers of the East and West provided resources for theological reflection and examples of applied pastoral theology. The treatment of the Fathers in the seminary ought to include both a study of the writings and lives of the major figures, referred to as patrology, and the study of their theological contributions, referred to as patristics.[217]

[215] See ibid., 197.
[216] Ibid., 198-200.
[217] Ibid., 201.

The fourth major discipline within the theology curriculum was dogmatic theology. Reflective of its dominant position in the past tradition of seminary study, dogmatics was to include treatment of some ten topics. The subunits of dogmatic theology according to the *Program* were: Trinitarian theology; Christology; ecclesiology; Creation and the Fall; redemption and grace; sacramental theology; eschatology; missiology; Mariology; and a course treating the nature and ministry of the priesthood. This substantial menu ensured the central and significant place of dogmatic theology within the entire intellectual formation program. Despite being listed fourth in order of theological disciplines, dogmatic theology remained the most important area of the curriculum in terms of credit hours, at about 29 percent of the total credit allotment in the average theology program in 2015.[218]

Moral theology, the fifth core area of theological study, was to consist of four principal topics, namely fundamental moral theology, bioethics, Catholic social teaching, and sexual morality. The teaching of moral theology courses was to draw from both Scripture and tradition, consider the contributions of the sciences, and "refer[] to the natural law and absolute moral norms." Special attention was to be given to the relationship between moral theology and the future pastoral ministry of priests in the Sacrament of Reconciliation.[219]

The sixth and seventh core areas of theological study treated by the *Program* were church history and canon law, respectively. Church history courses should include a comprehensive presentation of the history of the universal church to the present day, as well as treatment of the history of the church in the United States. The study of canon law was to cover both a general introduction to the *Code of Canon Law*, and also canonical consideration of the sacraments,

[218] See ibid., 202; see also Schuth, *Seminary Formation: Recent History -- Current Circumstances -- New Directions*, 182.
[219] United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*, 205.

including but not limited to, marriage. Other recommended areas included courses on the canonical norms for temporal goods and the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*.[220]

The five remaining core areas presented in the *Program of Priestly Formation*'s vision for the theology curriculum all included theoretical elements coupled with practical application. Within spiritual theology, the topic of spirituality was to examine the main currents of the Catholic spiritual tradition, whereas spiritual direction concentrated on assisting others in discernment and development of their own spiritual lives. Liturgical studies included consideration of the theological, historical, and pastoral dimensions of the liturgy, and practice in the concrete act of celebrating the sacraments and rites of the church in accord with the normative texts. Likewise, homiletics trained students in the preparatory process in crafting a homily with exegetical and catechetical care, and also the methods of effective public speaking, developed through regular practice and feedback. The American bishops also recognized ecumenism as an eleventh core course in the theological curriculum that must be sufficiently treated, with a concern for both the ecumenical principles articulated at the Second Vatican Council and current approaches and issues in dialogue between Christians. Finally, pastoral theology treated the theology of ministry and theological reflection on pastoral experience and concrete practice in the essentials of pastoral counseling.[221]

In addition to clearly identifying the above twelve core areas that must be treated in the theological formation of priestly candidates, the text of the *Program* also mentioned twelve themes that were to be interwoven throughout the courses of the curriculum. Some of these themes overlapped directly with core areas, while others were unique and not treated comprehensively in courses of their own. The implied themes were: Scripture; approaches for effective evangelization

[220] Ibid., 210-211.
[221] Ibid., 212-217.

and catechesis; the respect for human life; homiletics and preaching; ecumenism; interreligious dialogue; marriage and family; theological pluralism and the privileged place of St. Thomas Aquinas; awareness of theological methodology; the life, theology, and tradition of the Eastern Churches; the pastoral needs of multicultural communities; and the Church's social teaching.[222]

This comprehensive theological curriculum was generally to be completed in four years of full time study. The *Program* called for all seminaries in the United States to be accredited to grant civil academic degrees, usually by the Association of Theological Schools. In accord with professional ministry standards in the United States, the document recognized the Master of Divinity (M.Div.) degree to be the normal degree earned upon completion of the theology program in intellectual formation. Other degree programs, such as a Master of Arts (M.A.) degree, should be offered when possible to encourage deeper scholarly pursuits in a particular area of interest. Seminaries should also explore the possibility of granting the ecclesiastical degrees of the Bachelor of Sacred Theology (S.T.B.), the equivalent of the Master of Divinity, and the second cycle Licentiate of Sacred Theology (S.T.L.), a more advanced degree beyond the master's level. These ecclesiastical degrees could be granted either by coordinating with the Congregation for Catholic Education for the ability to do so within the seminaries' own institution, or by affiliating with an existing ecclesiastical faculty. During the 2018-2019 academic year, six American seminaries were able to grant ecclesiastical degrees in theology through their own recognized faculty, and another eight were able to do so through affiliation with another institution. The requirements and norms of academic degrees certainly set a high professional standard for the level of theological study and accomplishment in the seminary during priestly formation.[223]

---

[222] See ibid., 198, 203, 206, 215-216, 218-220, 223, 228-229.
[223] See ibid., 191, 231-232; see also Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 9-10.

The immense responsibility of carrying out this highly detailed plan for intellectual formation through the study of philosophy and theology as part of priestly training falls to the rector and entire seminary community, but especially the Director of Intellectual Formation (also called the Academic Dean or Dean of Studies) and members of the teaching faculty. The Director of Intellectual Formation, according to the *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*, was primarily responsible for the entire academic curriculum and its courses, the performance of both students and teachers, and the recruitment and development of qualified faculty. The person in this position was to possess a terminal academic degree in a relevant field and, ordinarily, was expected to be a priest.[224]

Members of the teaching faculty ought to view themselves as integral components of the formation community of the seminary, and to be aware of the influence of their example to seminarians in their regular contact in the classroom. The teaching faculty as a whole should also see itself as a unified body engaged in the shared task of priestly formation. The unity of the faculty was to be normally exercised through regularly meeting as a body to review both the seminary program itself and its elements, and also to grow individually and collectively through a faculty review process.[225]

General prerequisite characteristics for members of the teaching faculty included pastoral experience, a committed faith, and professional academic training, which meant advanced degrees in their appropriate disciplines. Teachers in the core areas of the philosophy or theology curriculum were to possess at least the licentiate from an ecclesiastically recognized institution. Like the Director of Intellectual Formation, the normal expectation put forth by the *Program of Priestly Formation* was that the majority of professors in the major seminary would be priests. Mention

[224] See ibid., 334.
[225] See ibid., 351, 358-361.

was made of the possibility of enlisting the assistance of "outstanding laypersons and/or non-ordained religious," but the document suggested that the best area for their contributions might be in liberal arts education in the high school or college seminary. Again, this seemed to limit the pool of candidates available for faculty recruitment to only the ordained. However, mention was made of the possibility of involving non-ordained religious men and women in the project of seminary formation, something not included in the Congregation for Catholic Education's 1993 document *Directives Concerning the Preparation of Seminary Educators*, treated above. It should be noted that many of the prescriptions called for by the *PPF*, including with respect to the qualifications for members of the seminary faculty, are not followed in practice.[226]

Within the classroom and in their teaching, the *Program* highlighted the responsibility of faculty members to present their material in accord with church teaching. Professors should also clearly distinguish between established church teaching and their own personal-professional opinions. Coupled with this responsibility of the faculty members, the seminary also was called to the correlative responsibility of allowing the faculty the freedom of inquiry necessary for meaningful scholarly research.[227] The degree to which this was put into practice, however, was likely minimal, given the limited value placed on producing scholarship by many diocesan seminaries in the United States and the wide-ranging responsibilities of seminary professors outside of the classroom, leaving little time or energy for such endeavors.

The allowance for "freedom of inquiry" was not to be understood as promoting the taking of public stances contrary to the faith, such as denying the virgin birth of Christ. Instead, it was to be understood as simply indicating an openness (perhaps only on paper and not in practice) for seminary faculty to engage with the broader academic theological world, an intentional position

[226] See ibid., 344, 346-348, 350.
[227] See ibid., 364-366.

of contrast with the more insular nature of Catholic theology in the pre-conciliar period. In other words, research and publication *should* be part of the life of seminary professors and the seminary ought to support this as part of the role. However, in reality the multiple responsibilities of seminary faculty becomes a limiting factor in realizing this; many professors, especially priests, in diocesan seminaries have numerous formational/ministerial responsibilities outside of the classroom, so engagement with scholarship is not often a priority, given limited time and energy.

One particular provision of the *Program of Priestly Formation* has recently taken on tremendous importance in a world of social distancing. Referring to educational approaches that should be used in the classroom, the text noted that "[c]ontemporary pedagogical methods that incorporate technological advances should be encouraged." Certainly, the originally intended scope of this provision was likely mainly audio-visual aids such as slides, images, and recordings. However, in light of contemporary health concerns and the need for physical separation away from the seminary for uncertain periods of time, the urgency with which technological solutions should become familiar to, and utilized by, faculty members is imperative. Even when priestly candidates return to seminaries for in-person classes, elements of online learning, both synchronous and asynchronous, should be built into all seminary courses. These tools are common elements of higher education throughout the American landscape. The ability to meet remotely in the event of an emergency, whether a common natural event such as a snowstorm or the more extreme case of a global pandemic, would allow for the effective continuation of intellectual formation even in non-ideal circumstances.[228]

Ongoing faculty recruitment and development were special points of emphasis in the U.S. bishops' *Program*. This meant including the identification of qualified candidates and assisting

[228] See ibid., 234.

existing members of the faculty in their professional growth in their field and in the art of teaching. The text gave attention to recruiting faculty from "diverse ethnic, racial, and cultural backgrounds." Two significant sources of diversity missing from this description, not entirely surprising given the stated expectation that most faculty members should be priests, were the contributions of women and those of diverse vocations, such as the married, members of religious communities, and permanent deacons.[229]

The treatment of intellectual formation in the *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition* was comprehensive and detailed. By specifically outlining the extensive elements of preparatory intellectual formation, namely the study of the liberal arts and philosophy, and the core and supplemental areas of the theological curriculum, the document provided a roadmap for effective intellectual formation in U.S. seminaries. Sensitive to the particular context of the church in the United States at the beginning of the twenty-first century, the document was a meaningful and concrete application of the universal principles of priestly formation considered above. The new and upcoming edition of the *Program of Priestly Formation: Sixth Edition* will likely recalibrate seminary formation for the immediately contemporary context of the 2020s, but it will also likely draw much value from its predecessor. The primary influence on the next edition, however, will be the updated *Ratio Fundamentalis* issued in 2016 and governing seminary formation throughout the universal church, to which we turn in a future section of this chapter.

[229] See ibid., 349, 354.

E. Implementing *PPF V* and the Roman Visitation

The model priest for this period is the priest who serves as a bridge. In the wake of the clergy sexual abuse scandal and declining active participation in the life of the church by American Catholics, the priest's pastoral ministry must be a bridge for others to encounter and experience Christ. A bridge provides a means of connection over apparent obstacles, and this image aptly describes the mission facing the diocesan priest in the contemporary context. The academic element of seminary formation is directed toward this pastoral aim of connecting others to the church through the ministry of the priest.

Ongoing consideration of seminary academics in the wake of the *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*, will be presented in two parts: first, the findings of the 2008 Roman visitation of American seminaries as a snapshot of theological studies in the first decade of the twenty-first century; and, second, a brief review of some of the data from Katarina Schuth's 2016 study of U.S. seminaries as a presentation of realities in the decade since the adoption of the *Fifth Edition*.

In 2008, the Congregation for Catholic Education concluded an apostolic visitation of American seminaries. Overall, its final report placed strong emphasis on seminarians' spiritual devotion and discipline, frequent reception of the sacraments, and fidelity to official church teaching. This emphasis was not unexpected, as the visitation occurred in the wake of the public revelation of the clergy sexual abuse scandal. Nevertheless, the report's findings on the quality of intellectual formation were an informative assessment of the state of academic quality in diocesan seminaries during the first decade of the 2000s, judged from the Roman perspective.

In terms of seminary purpose and mission, the final report articulated a concern that some seminaries did not present a clear understanding of the ordained ministry and its distinction from other forms of ministry within the church. The problem could be a lack of clarity on the nature of the ministerial priesthood that focused on the functional elements of what a priest does rather than the broader context of who the priest is.[230]

The report warned of the risks involved with trying to provide theological education to ordination and non-ordination track students in the same seminary, namely the risk of distorting the "specifically *priestly* formation" central to the seminary mission. In seminaries that did educate lay students, the Congregation recommended that the programs be physically separated from the seminary program when at all possible. This suggestion showed that the question of providing formation to seminarians and lay students present since the 1980s was still not satisfactorily resolved from the Roman perspective. The Congregation also affirmed the validity of the question as to the appropriate number of seminaries needed in the United States, and whether seminaries should be consolidated to provide more effective formation. However, it argued that the USCCB was the more fitting body to investigate the question and to propose possible solutions.[231]

With respect to seminary faculty, the report reiterated that formation faculty, including the rector, spiritual directors, and pastoral director, must be priests, whereas members of the teaching faculty could be "suitable" lay persons and religious, so long as the majority of the teaching faculty remained priests. The Congregation found that instructors often were adequately qualified, but many lacked an ecclesiastical degree. The report noted the challenges American seminaries faced in faculty retention and in finding enough qualified faculty members. It raised concerns over the

---

[230] See Congregation for Catholic Education, *Final Report: Apostolic Visitation of American Seminaries* (December 15, 2008), II.1, http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/Final-Seminary-Visitation-Report.pdf.
[231] Ibid., II.1-II.2.

manifold duties carried out by faculty outside of the seminary, to the detriment of the seminary formation program. Due to staff shortages, professors sometimes were found to teach outside of their area of expertise and they often did not have the opportunity to stay current with scholarly developments in their field.[232]

The Congregation identified some key characteristics of the seminarians they encountered. They came from a variety of cultural, ethnic, and family backgrounds. However, many were found lacking in terms of basic knowledge of and lived experience in the Catholic faith.[233]

The report praised the overall quality of the academic programs as "laudably high" and the positive academic dispositions of students. Theology programs were described as "usually well-thought out." The Congregation encouraged a broad, comprehensive theological education in the basics of Catholic theology and discouraged excessive elective courses. Moral theology especially was held out for its pastoral use in preaching and hearing confessions. Theology courses were urged to demonstrate connection with spiritual and pastoral issues. Interestingly, the report did not treat biblical studies in its conclusions on intellectual formation. This omission is especially surprising because of the restored centrality of Scripture in theological studies in the post-conciliar era, although it may also reflect overall satisfaction with the treatment of Scripture in U.S. seminaries so as not to need mentioning. The report identified areas for curricular improvement as including Mariology, patristics, and Latin.[234]

Turning from the 2008 Roman visitation report to the state of American seminaries in the past decade, as of the 2018-2019 academic year, the total number of major seminaries offering priestly formation in the United States was forty-one, with an average enrollment of about seventy-

[232] Ibid., II.2, II.7.
[233] Ibid., II.4.
[234] Ibid., II.7.

five seminarians each. Thirty-two of these major seminaries enrolled at least some diocesan seminarians. The total number of seminarians studying in major seminaries in the United States was 3,529, almost exactly the ten-year average of about 3,561 major seminarians per year between 2009-20010 and 2018-2019.[235]

As of 2015, half of the seminaries serving diocesan candidates were diocesan owned and operated institutions, whereas around a quarter were diocesan owned but entrusted to religious communities to operate. Five seminaries for diocesan candidates did not admit non-ordination students, whereas the remaining twenty-five provided formation programs for lay ecclesial ministers, either separate from or in conjunction with the ordination program. Nearly 40 percent of seminaries were intimately involved with other institutions of Catholic higher education, marking a meaningful departure from the self-sufficient freestanding seminary model so common in the pre-conciliar tradition.[236]

The total number of seminary faculty in 2015 almost returned to the level of 1985 (871 in 2015, 898 in 1985) despite the closure of thirteen seminaries since that time. In 2015, priests made up 56 percent of faculty, a decrease from 66 percent in 1995 attributable largely to the retirement of religious priests who began teaching at diocesan seminaries when religious communities consolidated their theologates in late 1960s and 1970s. The proportion of lay faculty rose to almost 40 percent, while the percentage of women religious fell to under 5 percent. Three-fourths of seminary faculty possessed a doctorate, with over 70 percent studying at American universities,

[235] Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 3-7.
[236] See Schuth, *Seminary Formation: Recent History -- Current Circumstances -- New Directions*, 35, 39-40, 61, 175.

whether Catholic or non-Catholic. Faculty continued to maintain diverse responsibilities outside of the classroom.[237]

Seminarian demographics continued to reflect wide diversity. The period marked a shift relative to age. In terms of ordinations to the priesthood, the average age was around 35 years old. The age distribution of seminary students in the 2010s was 16 percent over forty, roughly 31 percent in their thirties, and slightly more than half (54 percent) under the age of thirty. This trend of younger seminarians would likely result in younger ordination ages, presenting a generational contrast and potential pastoral challenge in ministry with the increasing age of the practicing Catholic population. The racial and ethnic diversity of seminarians in the 2010s had also increased, with Latino (15 percent), Asian (10 percent), and black (4 percent) students making up a significant proportion of the population at 29 percent, up from 22 percent in the late 1990s. During the 2014-2015 academic year, 22 percent of the seminary student body was born outside of the United States, with the most common countries of origin being Mexico, Colombia, Vietnam, the Philippines, Poland, and Nigeria.[238]

The standard academic degree earned from the seminary theology program remained the Master of Divinity, with other master-level degrees available to both seminarians and lay students. Six seminaries possessed the right to grant ecclesiastical degrees through their own faculties, whereas an additional eight affiliated with other institutions for the ability to grant the ecclesiastical bachelor's degree and licentiate in sacred theology. The most significant course areas in terms of credit hours generally remained Scripture, dogmatic/systematic theology, and pastoral studies.[239]

[237] Ibid., 60, 62-66.
[238] Ibid., 78-81.
[239] Ibid., 102-103, 183-84.

Course Distribution by Area, 1997 compared with 2015[240]

	Scripture	Dogmatic	Moral	Church History	Pastoral	Field Placement	Electives
Average Credit Hours Required in Seminaries, 1997	17.1	30.5	10.5	8.9	22.5	10.8	11.9
Average Credit Hours Required in Seminaries, 2015	17.8	34.2	11.8	9.8	24.1	10.0	9.8

These brief remarks on the state of academic formation in seminaries after 2005 provide a preliminary sketch of some key characteristics of the period. Aspects highlighted in the 2008 Roman visitation of American seminaries, including renewed attention to spiritual devotion and discipline, frequent reception of the sacraments, fidelity to official church teaching, and a clear and distinct understanding of priestly ministry harken back to an earlier period of seminary formation. The academic program in seminaries, at the same time, strove to present a comprehensive yet meaningful engagement of true theological study for pastoral use in the contemporary world.

F. *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation*

In 2016, the Roman Congregation for the Clergy issued the third updated edition of the *Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis*, the highest directive on priestly formation in the universal church to which all national programs and individual seminary programs were expected

[240] See ibid., 182.

to conform. The document's title was *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation*, and it framed the entire topic of priestly formation within the context of the vocational gift of the priesthood from, to, and for the church. Surprisingly, only two previous versions of the *Ratio* were issued, the first in 1970, responding to the call of the Second Vatican Council's *Optatam Totius* to create the first *Ratio Fundamentalis*, and the second in 1985, which updated the text to correspond with the recently revised and released *Code of Canon Law*. When the third version was issued in 2016, it was published by the Congregation for the Clergy, which recently received responsibility over seminary formation from the Congregation for Catholic Education, within whose scope it had previously been treated.[241]

Twenty-four years had passed since the publication of *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, so an updated *Ratio* was needed and long overdue, reflecting the insights of John Paul II's document and the intervening near quarter-century of experiences in seminary formation. The world had changed significantly during that time period, especially as a result of the growing awareness of the clergy sexual abuse scandal in countries throughout the world. In light of this awareness, there was a consequent broad focus on the need to renew priestly formation and ministry to adjust to the changing contours of the "new evangelization" and the need to bring healing to a wounded church. Priestly formation in general, and intellectual formation in particular, were due for a reshaping to better respond to the contemporary landscape.

Following the recent tradition of church documents on seminary training, the 2016 *Ratio* aimed to present priestly formation as a single integrated process flowing from the initial call received in baptism and unfolding in a lifelong commitment as a disciple of Christ, discerning and

[241] See Congregation for the Clergy, *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation: Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis* (Vatican City: L'Osservatore Romano, 2016), Introduction.1, http://www.clerus.va/content/dam/clerus/Ratio%20Fundamentalis/The%20Gift%20of%20the%20Priestly%20Vocation.pdf.

responding to the possible call to the priesthood. This journey was carried out within the context of the church community, because it was from the church in which the call was first received, through the church that the seminarian was formed in discipleship, and for the church that he was to be sent as a priest to minister with pastoral and missionary zeal. "The fundamental idea is that Seminaries should form missionary disciples who are 'in love' with the Master, shepherds 'with the smell of the sheep', who live in their midst to bring the mercy of God to them."[242]

A new and significant structural framework for the singular journey of discipleship involved in priestly formation was introduced by the updated *Ratio*. The document identified two key phases in this lifelong journey, a stage of initial formation and a stage of ongoing formation. The first, initial phase, overlapped with the time spent before and during seminary, up until ordination to the priesthood. It was divided further into four stages: the propaedeutic or introductory stage; the discipleship or philosophy stage; the configurative or theology stage; and finally, the pastoral stage that was to synthesize all prior formation in immediate preparation for priestly ordination. The second phase of this integrated process in discipleship was ongoing formation, from ordination through the rest of the priest's life in ministry. The two most significant additions to the overall formation program in this framework were, first, the requirement of the initial propaedeutic stage of intense spiritual formation and transition prior to entering the seminary, and, second, the necessary time of pastoral formation after completing the seminary program but before ordination to the priesthood. Whereas something akin to these elements were suggested in earlier documents, the new *Ratio* made them essential elements of the priestly formation program going forward.[243]

[242] See ibid., Introduction.3.
[243] See ibid.

Overall, this renewed formational framework presented by *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation* aimed for a dynamically reflective and integrated process of gradual growth in the life of discipleship and priestly identity. In many ways, it is analogous to the steps of spiritual growth of progress through the purgative, illuminative, and unitive stages referred to throughout the Catholic tradition. The time frames mandated for each stage in the process outlined by the *Ratio* emphasized the challenging work and required time for genuine formation to take place: one to two years of spiritual foundation in the propaedeutic stage; at least two years in the discipleship stage focusing on the study of philosophy; at least four years in the configuration stage spent in theological study; and at least six months in the pastoral stage, after completion of the seminary program and before ordination to the priesthood, for a total of at least seven and a half to eight and a half years of intentional formation.[244]

Advancement through these stages was to be dependent on true progress in priestly formation. "That is to say, one should not arrive 'automatically' at the priesthood merely by reason of having followed a series of pre-established stages in chronological order and set out beforehand, independently of the actual progress that has been achieved in overall integral maturity." This meant that successful completion of the academic elements of these stages was a necessary but not sufficient qualification for continuation in the overall program. As a point of reference, 74 percent of the seminarian class which began the study of theology in American seminaries during the 2015-2016 academic year was ordained in 2018-2019, although this number does not account for the specific reasons for a candidate's withdrawal, such as involuntary removal or voluntary vocational discernment.[245]

[244] See ibid., 58-59, 66, 76.
[245] See ibid., 58; see also Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 12.

During each phase and every stage of the single integrated formation process of ordained discipleship envisioned by the updated *Ratio*, the four dimensions of priestly formation presented by *Pastores Dabo Vobis*, the human, spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral, were to be continually cultivated in an integrated fashion. In terms of the treatment of each pillar, the revised *Ratio* spent the most time on the spiritual dimension (fifteen paragraphs), about equal time on the human (eight paragraphs) and pastoral (six paragraphs) dimensions, and the least time on intellectual formation (three paragraphs).[246]

Within this context, intellectual formation was concerned with preparing the priestly candidate with adequate general liberal arts, philosophical, and theological education to be able to minister effectively in the contemporary context. Intellectual formation was also aimed to form candidates as listeners, both of the Word of God and of the church community. While emphasizing the need for serious commitment by seminarians to their studies, the *Ratio* highlighted the priority to the overall formation process, of which intellectual formation was only one part. "Yet, while it is necessary on the one hand, not to neglect a solid and adequate intellectual formation, on the other hand, one needs to remember that the successful completion of the requirements of study cannot be the only criterion for determining the length of the formative *iter* of the candidate for the priesthood." The challenge in putting this into practice would be properly balancing the integrity of formation in its entirety while at the same time not sacrificing the necessary rigor of meaningful intellectual formation nor its central place within the seminary. A major concern in following this approach would be to maintain the seriousness of studies within the formation program in an effort to be pastoral, as if pastoral ministry was somehow anti-intellectual. Since intellectual formation in the seminary was to overlap with the four stages of initial formation,

[246] See Congregation for the Clergy, *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation*, 89-124.

especially the propaedeutic, discipleship, and configuration stages, we will consider the purpose of each and their respective academic curriculum as presented by *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation*.[247]

The first stage of initial priestly formation described by the updated *Ratio* was the propaedeutic stage. Focused primarily on discernment and spiritual growth, this was presented as a new and entirely separate stage before beginning in a major seminary. Intellectual formation at this preparatory level should consist of familiarity with the whole of Scripture and Catholic teaching through an introductory study of the Bible, the documents of the Second Vatican Council, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, and various liturgical books. Since spiritual development was the focus of this stage, presentations of the Catholic spiritual tradition and the reading of classic spiritual texts were also important elements of study. Other areas of more general education, including in history, literature, and basic psychology would also be included. The curriculum for this stage was largely that of the preparatory liberal arts studies presented in previous formation programs, but with a heightened focus on spiritual foundations and growth, with a key difference being the structural, and, if possible, physical separation of the propaedeutic stage from the place of philosophical studies. The propaedeutic stage therefore provided the dedicated time required for a necessary foundation for future priestly formation or, subject to discernment, an opportunity to follow a different vocation before progressing in the program.[248]

The second stage of the *Ratio*'s vision of initial formation was called the discipleship or philosophy stage. Building on the spiritual foundations gained in the propaedeutic stage, the overall focus in the discipleship period was especially human formation and a growing commitment in friendship with Christ. While focusing on such areas of psycho-social development

[247] See ibid., 116-118.
[248] See ibid., 59, 156-157.

within the formation community, the candidate was also to engage in the study of philosophy and the human sciences. The philosophy curriculum was to be divided into the traditional areas of systematic study and the history of philosophical development. Within this course of studies, however, the *Ratio* also emphasized the special personal and pastoral importance of examining metaphysics and the problem of evil. The inclusion of the human sciences, especially elements of sound pedagogy, psychology, and sociology, with the study of philosophy, reflected a growing awareness of the importance of these disciplines in overall human development in the preparation of future priests, and not simply as possible aids in the future study of theology.[249]

The third, configurative, stage focused on specific spiritual formation for priestly identity, life, and ministry, especially the ecclesial dimension of commitment to ministry within a particular church community. During this four year process of spiritual configurement to Christ the Good Shepherd, the seminarian was to undergo intellectual formation through theological study, "a fundamental and qualifying stage of the programme of intellectual formation." The theological curriculum was divided into three main parts: core theological areas, "ministerial subjects," and the creative and flexible specialization for pastoral offices.[250]

The core areas of the theological curriculum, unsurprisingly, continued the key disciplines from the post-conciliar tradition of priestly intellectual formation, albeit with a few novel emphases reflective of the contemporary pastoral needs of the twenty-first century world and the particular priorities of Pope Francis, such as theological ecology and a heightened concern for those at the margins of society. The updated *Ratio* identified at least twelve integral areas within the theological formation program. Biblical studies should present a unified approach to the entirety of Scripture, with gradual introduction to the principles of exegesis and use of critical

[249] See ibid., 62-63, 65-67, 159-163.
[250] See ibid., 69, 71, 73.

methods. Toward this end, the study of Greek, Hebrew, and the cultural contexts of the Old and New Testaments were stressed as important for engaging the original sources directly, which would be beneficial for both academic growth and future preaching. The *Ratio* highlighted the importance, through rigorous and detailed study of the individual blocks of material within Scripture, of the pastoral importance of connecting and synthesizing the entire narrative of salvation history and its pastoral application, especially in preaching.[251]

Dogmatic theology was to utilize the four-step process called for by *Optatam Totius*, namely proceeding from Scripture, the Fathers of the Church, later historical development, and finally speculative reflection on the mysteries of the faith. Fundamental and sacramental theology were critical subsets of dogmatics. Spiritual theology was to provide a comprehensive grounding in the spiritualities of vocations within the church, not only the priesthood but also the call to religious life and the laity. The text provided for a meaningful treatment of ecology within the broader area of the church's social teaching, because "it will be necessary for future priests to be highly sensitive to this theme." The other core theological areas that must be covered in the curriculum outlined by *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation* were liturgy, moral theology, pastoral theology, missiology, church history, canon law, ecumenism, and a history of world religions.[252]

The post-conciliar shift in emphasizing Scripture and history within the seminary curriculum was to be applied through procedure and method rather than strictly credit allotment. For example, in dogmatic theology, *Optatam Totius* called for a method of proceeding in dogmatic courses from, first, Scriptural roots, then treatment by the Fathers and later historical development through the centuries, and only finally to "speculative" theology. The language of this specific procedure/method is picked up again in the 2016 *Ratio*, so perhaps that points to a perception that

[251] See ibid., 166.
[252] See ibid., 167-175.

it was neglected and needed to be re-emphasized. It was not that dogmatic theology courses were no longer presented as important in the church documents following the Second Vatican Council, but rather that the method in approaching them ought to incorporate Scriptural foundations and historical consciousness throughout, rather than the earlier manualist approach of appearing to fall out of the sky, ready-made. The same process/method would be applied to moral theology.

In addition to the core areas of the theological curriculum, the *Ratio* called for intellectual formation in "ministerial" subjects, which tended to focus on pastoral practice, aesthetics, and language learning. Practical training in homiletics and the celebration of the liturgy, especially practice in offering the Sacrament of Reconciliation, spiritual direction, and the discernment of spirits, were called for. Other critically important and practical subjects to be presented in the seminary included the administration of temporal goods and effective use of social media in pastoral ministry. In terms of aesthetics, an introductory exposure should be offered in both sacred art and sacred music. Finally, beyond a sufficiently solid foundation in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew to be of use in deeper theological study, the *Ratio* "earnestly recommended that seminarians know at least one modern language, taking account of the languages spoken in the countries in which they will exercise the priestly ministry." This category of "ministerial" subjects within intellectual formation certainly was presented as essential toward the pastoral application of the core theology curriculum in direct communication and ministry.[253]

The third element of intellectual formation proposed by the revised *Ratio* was that of "specialized" studies. While including consideration for further advanced study within the traditional ecclesiastical subjects, this category also offered the flexibility to design specific training courses for a future pastoral need in which a given seminarian might be sent to serve. "By

[253] See ibid., 176-183.

the way of example one could mention courses for the training of those who will work in Ecclesiastical Tribunals, of Seminary formators, of those engaged in the field of *mass media*, of those involved in the administration of ecclesiastical goods, and in catechesis." The significance of this provision was to permit room for creative formulation of training that would benefit the pastoral needs in the conditions of a particular church, encouraging flexibility to design programs that would be maximally effective in pursuit of pastoral service.[254]

With respect to seminary professors, *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation* presented many of the elements included in the earlier documents on priestly formation. Professors should view themselves as part of a unified body of teachers and seminary personnel, united in the comprehensive project of priestly formation. They must possess the required academic preparation in their fields, demonstrated by the minimum degree of the licentiate or its equivalent, and the ability to teach effectively. It is interesting to note that the description of degree requirements did not include the added stipulation that they had to be earned from ecclesiastically recognized institutions, whether or not this omission was intended or accidental. The *Ratio* continued to hold that a majority of the faculty should be priests "who can also ensure a pastoral approach in their own subject." While the preference for a majority of priest professors in the training of future priests certainly makes formational sense, doing so on account of their ability to "ensure a pastoral approach" seemed to overlook or discard the immense pastoral experience possessed by well-qualified non-ordained religious and lay candidates. Welcome appreciation was expressed, however, for the possibility of professors in other vocations contributing to the seminary formation program. "Through the diversity of vocations, each professor should be able to present the

[254] See ibid., 185.

seminarians with a knowledge of his or her own charism," thus helping to form future priests in touch with the numerous gifts of the ecclesial community.[255]

The vision of priestly formation sketched out in the updated *Ratio Fundamentalis* emphasized the integrity and lifelong journey of the entire formation process. The new organizational structure of the four stages of initial formation will profoundly impact the life of seminaries throughout the world, including the United States. The entire program, start to finish, will take place over a longer period of time, giving ample opportunity for genuine formational growth to take root. The requirement of the one to two year propaedeutic stage will likely mean that many discerning candidates will arrive at the further stages of formation with a stronger sense of their vocational certitude and personal familiarity with the process of formation. This will perhaps allow for more focused attention on the elements of philosophical and theological formation at the discipleship and configuration stages, therefore elevating the effectiveness and quality of intellectual formation. Also, the adoption of the six month pastoral stage of vocational synthesis after the completion of the seminary theology program but before ordination will likely give seminarians the necessary time to allow them to finish their theological studies completely before transitioning to the immediate preparations for ordination.

However, there is a risk of superficiality in seminary intellectual formation because of the increasing expectations of the curriculum by the church documents. Additional course requirements are often added to the existing structure without necessarily rethinking the "whole" of the theology curriculum or how all of the parts fit together. A common result of this is a multiplication of courses and, perhaps, unrealistic expectations for what is possible in such a modest amount of time because the list of curricular content is ever growing. The church

[255] See ibid., 142-144.

documents on seminary intellectual formation, as a whole, should be read as sketching out guidelines for the theology curriculum, a "map" with key landmarks pointed out or a "wish list" that should be aspired to in ideal circumstances, but might not be possible to implement in every detail or dimension.

Another concern is that intellectual formation will further fall in importance amidst all of the other formational elements of the seminary. There is a finite "bandwidth" of energy on the part of seminarians and formators and, with all that is expected to happen in the seminary years, it is possible for intellectual formation to get a smaller piece of the pie. There is a hope, however, which is mentioned above, that the new *Ratio*'s call for a formal propaedeutic period before ever stepping foot in the major seminary will help parse out foundational elements of initial priestly formation from the focused time of theological study, something like an aspirancy or novitiate for religious life. This would, in turn, create more "space" for serious intellectual engagement and growth within the seminary itself.

Chapter 5: A Snapshot of American Seminary Theologates Today

The first four chapters of this dissertation outlined the contours of intellectual formation in American seminaries throughout the history of the United States. This study included attention to the issue of academic studies from official church authority, universally and in the local American context, and on the ground in the American seminaries themselves.

This chapter turns to the concrete programs of study in six American seminaries during the 2019-2020 academic year to see how the project of theological formation is being pursued in the present setting. All of these seminaries are committed to the training of candidates for the diocesan priesthood. The six seminaries chosen are not meant to be exhaustive nor are they meant to speak for all Catholic seminaries in the United States. Instead, they are meant to be representative of geographical diversity and varying institutional structures across the American landscape.

The six seminaries chosen for this examination fall into two broad categories: those owned and operated by archdioceses or dioceses and those owned and operated by religious communities. In the first category, those in the hands of an archdiocese or diocese, a further diversity of institutional structure is present between these freestanding seminaries, meaning they primarily form candidates for the priesthood and some lay students in graduate programs, and those that are in some relationship with an undergraduate college for non-clerical candidates, which we will call a "mixed" model.

We will examine two seminaries in each category. First, the freestanding diocesan seminaries under consideration are St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie in Yonkers, New York and St. Patrick's Seminary and University in Menlo Park, California. Second, the "mixed" model diocesan seminaries being examined are The Saint Paul Seminary in Saint Paul, Minnesota, and

Immaculate Conception Seminary in South Orange, New Jersey. Third, the two seminaries being studied that are owned and operated by religious communities are, St. Mary's Seminary and University in Baltimore, Maryland, and Mount Angel Seminary in St. Benedict, Oregon.[256]

The following analysis of the intellectual formation programs at the six seminaries included in this chapter is drawn from publicly available, written information on their respective programs published by each seminary. This analysis does not include information drawn from in-person visits or interviews at any of the seminaries. A strength of this approach is that it is based on the objective presentation of the programs described in official publications, such as course catalogs. A limitation of this approach is that the descriptions of the elements of the intellectual formation programs might not be realized exactly in practice. While acknowledging this methodological limitation and recognizing that personal visits and interviews would be an important part of a more expansive project in the future, the scope of this dissertation benefits from an analysis of the publicly available information on its face.

The examination of the intellectual formation program, and especially the study of theology, at each seminary considers a variety of elements. First, is to consider the degree programs offered and whether these programs include or are separate from non-ordination students. Second, is to explore the overall structure of the theology curriculum and its course distribution by asking: "What, if any, is its discernible integrating principle?"[257] Third, is to identify unique elements of the intellectual formation program at the particular seminary that might be instructive for programs

[256] Technically speaking, the priests of the Society of St. Sulpice, or Sulpicians, who operate St. Mary's Seminary, are a community of diocesan priests committed to the formation of seminarians and are not, in the canonical sense, religious. However, their operation of seminaries is more similar to that of religious communities than that of priests of a particular diocese, so for our purposes they are considered in effect as religious communities.

[257] Each seminary uses slightly different terminology for its theology curriculum, for example "dogmatic" versus "systematic" theology. The terminology used by a given seminary is adhered to in its respective profile in this chapter, as far as possible.

at other seminaries. Fourth, is to consider the makeup of the seminary faculty, including vocation, academic degrees, and place of post-Master's study.[258] Finally, is to identify the overall strengths and areas for possible growth in the intellectual formation program at each seminary.

Before proceeding to the intellectual formation programs at specific seminaries, it is helpful to understand the broad, overall makeup of the seminarian student body enrolled in theologates across American Catholic institutions. During the 2018-2019 academic year, relative to age, 59 percent of the major seminarians in the United States were under thirty, and an additional 21 percent were between thirty and thirty-four years old. In terms of racial and ethnic backgrounds, 56 percent were white/Anglo/Caucasian, compared with 79 percent in 1993. The next largest proportions of racial and ethnic backgrounds during the same years were Hispanic/Latino, at 15 percent, Asian/Pacific Islander, at 10 percent, and black/African American, at 4 percent, with an additional 15 percent identifying as "other." Twenty percent of seminarians in American theologates were born outside of the United States during 2018-2019, which was down from 30 percent in 2009-2010. Of seminarians born outside the United States, 61 percent were preparing for ministry within an American diocese after ordination.[259]

The 2019-2020 academic year did not go as planned. With the Coronavirus pandemic outbreak in the United States and subsequent social distancing beginning in March 2020, American seminaries shared in the disruption experienced by all levels of American education. Though a shift to distance learning was adopted by most seminaries as a necessity, the planned program

[258] Information regarding faculty vocation, academic degrees, and place of study is based on the information published by their respective seminaries, to the best of the present author's ability. The intended usefulness of this data is to glean trends and characteristics of faculty makeup.
[259] See Michal J. Kramarek and Mary L. Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019* (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, Georgetown University, 2019), 13-14, https://cara.georgetown.edu/StatisticalOverview201819.pdf.

articulated in the respective seminary catalogues remained invaluable sources of their particular vision for the intellectual dimension of priestly formation.

A. Freestanding Diocesan Seminaries

A.1. St. Joseph's Seminary, New York

St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie in Yonkers, New York is the major seminary for the Archdiocese of New York. Originally founded in 1896 by the Archdiocese and entrusted to the Sulpicians, it was known as a leading center of theological study and priestly formation for the first decade of its existence (mentioned in Chapter 1 of this dissertation). After 1906, the faculty was composed mostly of priests of the Archdiocese of New York. More recently, since 2011, St. Joseph's Seminary has become the main seminary for the Dioceses of Brooklyn and Rockville Centre, in addition to the Archdiocese of New York, and, since 2013, is the single institution granting diocesan sponsored graduate theological degrees in the southern portion of New York State. Beyond these main supporting dioceses, St. Joseph's Seminary also serves priestly candidates from the broader New York metropolitan region, including dioceses in Connecticut and New Jersey, and internationally.[260]

The primary mission of St. Joseph's Seminary is to form candidates for the Catholic priesthood. In support of this primary goal, the seminary also offers graduate academic formation

[260] See *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*, 2-4, 7-8, https://d2y1pz2y630308.cloudfront.net/16540/documents/2019/12/StJosephs_Bulletin_2019_LR.pdf. For an excellent history of the seminary from its founding to the early 1990s, see also Thomas J. Shelley, *Dunwoodie: The History of St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, New York* (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1993).

in philosophy and theology for a wider pool of candidates, including candidates for the permanent diaconate, members of religious communities, the laity, and priests seeking enrichment and opportunities for further study. All of the programs are infused by a "spirit of service to the Church" and a "profound sense of ecclesial communion." This language indicates the priority of pastoral ministry in all programs offered by the seminary, including the priestly formation program.[261]

St. Joseph's Seminary offers four academic programs to serve these primary and secondary missions. These programs are physically located across four campuses, a consequence of collaboration and consolidation across the three main dioceses supporting the seminary.

The Master of Divinity and ecclesiastical Bachelor of Sacred Theology programs are offered for seminarians at Yonkers, New York, the site of St. Joseph's Seminary itself and the theologate for priestly formation. The Bachelor of Sacred Theology degree is offered through affiliation with the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas in Rome.

The Master of Arts in Catholic Philosophical Studies (M.A.C.P.S.) degree is offered at Douglaston, New York, the site of the Cathedral Seminary House of Formation and the pre-theology program for seminary candidates, for both seminarians and other qualified students. For seminarians, the M.A.C.P.S. degree is the culmination of the pre-theology program in philosophy preparing for the study of theology.

Finally, the Master of Arts in Theology program is offered to seminarians, permanent diaconate, religious, and lay candidates across the campuses in Yonkers and Douglaston, as well as at Huntington, New York, the site of the former Seminary of Immaculate Conception, and at Somers, New York. All three of the academic programs offered by St. Joseph's Seminary itself

[261] See "Mission Statement," in *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*, 4.

are accredited by the New York State Education Department, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, and the Association of Theological Schools. During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Seminary enrolled seventy-two seminarians in its formation program.[262]

Theological formation for priestly candidates at St. Joseph's Seminary occurs across the Master of Divinity, Bachelor of Sacred Theology, and Master of Arts in Theology programs over four academic years, or eight semesters, all taking place at the Yonkers campus. Upon enrollment in the seminary, all seminarians are registered for the three programs because the theological course requirements for ordination, identified in the *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*, are interwoven across these programs, especially, the Master of Divinity and the Master of Arts in Theology. The Bachelor of Sacred Theology, granted through affiliation with the Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas in Rome as the first cycle in the ecclesiastical degree system, largely overlaps with the Master of Divinity program.[263]

The entire theology curriculum is made up of 126 credits, 87 of which go toward the Master of Divinity/Bachelor of Sacred Theology and 39 toward the Master of Arts in Theology. In the spring semester of the third year of study, students must pass written and oral comprehensive examinations for the Master of Divinity/Bachelor of Sacred Theology. During the fourth year of theology, qualified students can petition to write a fifty-page thesis for the Master of Arts in Theology degree, in one of four areas of specialized concentration: Scripture, dogmatic theology,

---

[262] See *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*, 7-8, 13; Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 7; and see also the entry for "St. Joseph's Seminary" on the website for the Association of Theological Schools, https://www.ats.edu/member-schools/st-josephs-seminary%20.

[263] See *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*, 20-21. There is no "double dipping" of credits between the civil Master of Divinity (87 credits) and Master of Arts in Theology programs (39 credits) because the entirety of the ordination curriculum (126 credits) includes the distinct credit requirements of both degrees. Since the civil degree requirements and the ecclesiastical degree requirements are part of separate educational systems, these credits can overlap. In other words, the Bachelor of Sacred Theology can be earned concurrently with the civil degrees earned through the ordination curriculum.

moral theology, or church history. The stated integrating principle for the theology program as a whole is the pastoral ministry from and for the church, in "offering a challenging curriculum that is faithful to the Church's Magisterium and prepares students to respond to the needs of God's people in the Postmodern culture of Twenty-first Century America."[264]

The three areas requiring most credits during the 2019-2020 academic year were Scripture (twenty-one credits or 16.7 percent of the total), liturgical and sacramental theology (twenty credits or 15.9 percent of the total, and including courses in both theory and practical application), and dogmatic theology (seventeen credits or 13.5 percent of the total). The least number of credits were required in canon law and homiletics, both at six credits or 4.8 percent of the total. The overall program is highly organized, with required courses scheduled each semester, leaving room for only four elective courses over the entire theology program. In other words, 90.5 percent of the credit allotment is required of all seminarians.[265]

Two elements in the intellectual formation program at St. Joseph's Seminary that complement the core theological curriculum are especially unique in relation to the pastoral focus of the entire program. The first is the pastoral language program. Every seminarian is expected to attain pastoral proficiency in at least a second modern language before ordination to the priesthood; for native English speakers, this second language is to be Spanish, and for non-native English speakers, English is to be the second language. Language courses in the program are to be taken each of the eight semesters of the theologate. The program focuses on creating foundational cultural awareness in future priests, with the goal of gaining the ability to celebrate the sacraments and pastorally engage with native Spanish speakers. Responding to the pastoral needs of the greater New York area in particular and the whole of the United States in general, the pastoral language

[264] See ibid., 27.
[265] See ibid., 28. See also Figure 5.1 in "Appendix C."

program aims at both ministering to the needs of Spanish-speaking communities and also providing the means for the gifts of these communities to enrich the entire local church. While language programs in seminaries are not uncommon, the length of the pastoral language program at St. Joseph's Seminary is a unique effort to seriously meet the pastoral needs of the community.[266]

The second unique element is the liturgical formation program. Building on coursework in liturgical theology, seminarians are expected to take a lead in planning and directing the liturgical celebrations of the entire seminary community. For example, seminarians organize and lead the daily celebration of Morning and Evening Prayer. As seminarians receive the liturgical ministries of lector, acolyte, and deacon, they progressively take more responsibility in leading liturgical celebrations. Rather than simply taking direction from priest faculty, this responsibility fosters a spirit of pastoral initiative that will serve well in parish liturgical celebrations in future priestly ministry. Stand-alone formation sessions on liturgical topics regularly given by the seminary's Director of Liturgy complete formation in important pastoral areas such as liturgical music, praying the Liturgy of the Hours within the busy rhythm of parish life, and celebrating the sacraments with those with disabilities.[267] These two unique elements, the pastoral language program and the liturgical formation program, strengthen the theology curriculum by adding further dimensions to its emphasis on pastoral ministry.

The academic faculty of St. Joseph's Seminary is made up of nineteen full-time members, from the two categories of "Professor" and "Associate Professor."[268] The main difference between those who are "Professors" and those who are "Associate Professors" appears to be the possession of a degree from an ecclesiastical faculty or university; of the fifteen "Professors," thirteen possess

[266] See *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*, 29.
[267] See ibid., 30-32.
[268] Information regarding adjunct professors is not considered for the purposes of this chapter.

either the ecclesiastical doctorate or licentiate, and the remaining two earned a Ph.D. from an ecclesiastical university, whereas the four "Associate Professors" do not hold an ecclesiastical degree. Nearly three-quarters of all faculty members possessed a doctoral degree of some kind, with the most common being an ecclesiastical doctorate (eight total or 42.1 percent). Over two-thirds of all faculty members with post-Master's level degrees earned them from Roman universities, and slightly over 21 percent studied at American Catholic institutions. St. Joseph's Seminary also provides nine endowed chairs in core theological disciplines, such as Scripture, medical ethics, and church history.[269]

In terms of vocational makeup, the teaching faculty of St. Joseph's Seminary is composed of twelve priests (63.2 percent) and seven from other vocations (36.8 percent). Of the priest faculty, eleven are diocesan priests and only one is a member of a religious community. Lay women (four total or 21.1 percent) and lay men (two total or 10.5 percent) make up a majority of the non-priest body of faculty. Only one non-ordained religious brother, and no women religious or permanent deacons, serve on the full-time seminary teaching faculty.[270]

In conclusion, at least two strengths and two areas for future growth can be identified in the intellectual formation program at St. Joseph's Seminary. With respect to strengths of the program, first, a high degree of academic rigor is to be commended. One expression of this is the expectation of graduate level work throughout the program and the pursuit of accredited graduate degrees. As mentioned earlier, the culmination of the pre-theology program in philosophy before arriving at the theology program is the Master of Arts in Catholic Philosophical Studies degree. Not uncommonly in other seminary programs, completion of the pre-theology philosophy program

[269] See ibid., 10-12, 41. See also Figures 5.3 and 5.4 in "Appendix C."
[270] See *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*, 10-12, 41. See also Figure 5.2 in "Appendix C."

leads to a non-degree certificate or Bachelor of Philosophy degree. The expectation that seminarians receive a Master's level degree upon completion of the pre-theology program at St. Joseph's sets a high bar. Moreover, the fact that all seminarians in the theology program are enrolled in both the Master of Divinity and the Master of Arts in Theology programs shows an expectation of intellectual engagement expected of graduate programs rooted not only in pastoral development but also academic research and efforts to produce scholarly work. A second overall strength of the intellectual formation program is the pastoral focus in such dimensions as the pastoral language program and liturgical formation program, considered above. These programs help round out the pastoral formation of future priests to meet the needs of communities they will be called to serve in future ministry.

Two areas for possible future growth in the intellectual formation program are creating more room for electives and growing the vocational diversity of the teaching faculty. First, as was mentioned when discussing the theology curriculum, only four elective courses can be taken in the entire four year theology curriculum. By providing more flexibility for the pursuit of topics of interest, seminarians might be able to broaden the horizon of their intellectual formation as they consider other areas of study. This might be done through increased course offerings or through individual directed study with a faculty member. Moreover, the course offerings might be expanded to include subjects such as world religions or theological ecology, in keeping with the updated 2016 *Ratio Fundamentalis* to consider these important pastoral topics.[271]

A second area for improvement to the intellectual formation program is to increase the vocational diversity of the faculty. As mentioned, almost two-thirds of the faculty is composed of

[271] See Congregation for the Clergy, The Gift of the Priestly Vocation: Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis (Vatican City: L'Osservatore Romano, 2016), 167-175, http://www.clerus.va/content/dam/clerus/Ratio%20Fundamentalis/The%20Gift%20of%20the%20Priestly%20Vocation.pdf.

priests, with all but one being diocesan priests. While some balance is achieved by the presence of religious priests, lay women, and lay men on the teaching faculty, concerted efforts to recruit qualified women religious and permanent deacons to the faculty would help bring important and currently missing perspectives on priestly formation. Their personal, professional, and vocational presence would contribute to the future pastoral ministry of the seminarians, who will be called to minister with and to people from a variety of vocations.

A.2. St. Patrick's Seminary and University, California

St. Patrick's Seminary and University is the major seminary for the Archdiocese of San Francisco, located in Menlo Park, California. Opening in the fall of 1898, the seminary was operated by priests of the Society of St. Sulpice from its beginning until the summer of 2017, when the Sulpicians withdrew from the seminary after the Archdiocese removed the Sulpician rector. It primarily served dioceses in the Pacific Coast region of the western United States by providing priestly formation for their sponsored candidates.[272]

The exclusive mission of St. Patrick's Seminary and University is the formation of candidates for the priesthood. Therefore, St. Patrick's does not offer any programs for non-ordination candidates. The entire priestly formation program, including the theological curriculum, is infused with the goal of forming candidates under the rubric of "Spiritual Fatherhood." This integrating principle, directed toward the pastoral ministry, is further supplemented by the goal of forming seminarians in the values of fidelity, holiness, wisdom, evangelization, resiliency, and

[272] See *St. Patrick's Seminary & University, Academic Catalog 2019-2021*, 7, https://www.stpsu.edu/site-images/2019-2021-Academic-Catalog-Final.pdf. For a readable history of the seminary through the early 1990s, see James P. Gaffey, *Men of Menlo: Transformation of an American Seminary* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1992).

compassion. These values are presented as components of the priestly, teaching, and shepherding dimensions of the priesthood of Jesus Christ.[273]

With the mission of forming priests sensitive to the pastoral needs of their future ministries in mind, St. Patrick's Seminary offers five academic programs. Two of the programs are geared toward preparatory studies in the liberal arts and philosophy at the undergraduate level to prepare for the study of theology. The first, the Pre-Theology Program, prepares those students with a college degree but without prior seminary formation and those lacking previous philosophical training. It is a two-year non-degree program that provides the background formation and study required by the *Program of Priestly Formation* prior to entering the theologate. The second preparatory program is a Bachelor of Arts Completion Program, which is offered for seminarians who have completed two years of college already but have not yet earned a college degree.[274]

The three remaining academic programs make up the graduate study of theology. The Master of Divinity is the main theological program for priestly formation, in which all seminarians are enrolled upon arriving at the theologate. During the final semester of study, students must pass a comprehensive oral examination to complete the requirements of the Master of Divinity. While pursuing the Master of Divinity, seminarians have the option of enrolling in two other separate programs. The first, the Bachelor of Sacred Theology, is offered through affiliation with the Pontifical Faculty of the Immaculate Conception at the Dominican House of Studies in Washington, DC. As the first cycle in the ecclesiastical system, the Bachelor of Sacred Theology can be earned concurrently with the Master of Divinity degree, with the addition of taking two semesters of Greek and passing oral and written comprehensive examinations in the final semester

[273] See *St. Patrick's Seminary & University, Academic Catalog 2019-2021*, 5. The central goal of forming "Spiritual Fathers" at least raises a tension with the accepted use of gender neutral language whenever possible across American higher education and academia.
[274] See ibid., 29-32.

of study. The second optional theology program is the Master of Arts in Theology, in which qualified and interested candidates take additional courses and write and defend a sixty to eighty-page thesis. The Bachelor of Arts, Master of Divinity, and Master of Arts in Theology degree programs are all accredited by Western Association of Schools and Colleges -- Senior College and University Commission and the two graduate theology programs are accredited by the Association of Theological Schools. As of the fall 2019 semester, fifty seminarians were enrolled in all graduate theology programs at St. Patrick's Seminary and University.[275]

The Master of Divinity degree is pursued over five years, divided into two years of theology, a year-long pastoral internship, and then a final two years of theology. The entire curriculum is organized around the pastoral year in three "sequences" or stages. The first sequence consists of establishing "Scriptural and Theological Foundations." Most of the courses in this stage are in Scripture, moral theology, and dogmatic theology. During the second-year of the theology program, the second sequence of "Pastoral Foundations" begins and includes a focus on pastoral topics such as homiletics and the liturgy. The second sequence culminates in the pastoral-year, a full-time ministerial assignment in a parish setting, usually in the seminarian's home diocese. During the pastoral year, the student takes two online courses in pastoral theology to supplement the direct experience of ministry. Finally, upon completion of the parish internship and a return to St. Patrick's, the third sequence of "Synthesis and Application" completes the theology program through the final two years of study, enriched by the lessons learned in the sustained practical experience of the internship.[276]

---

[275] See ibid., 8, 33-43; see also the entry for "St. Patrick's Seminary and University" on the website for the Association of Theological Schools, https://www.ats.edu/member-schools/st-patricks-seminary-and-university%20.

[276] See *St. Patrick's Seminary & University, Academic Catalog 2019-2021*, 34-35.

The content of the theological curriculum at St. Patrick's groups courses into four main subject areas: Scripture, moral and spiritual theology, dogmatic theology (which includes both liturgical theology and church history), and pastoral studies (which includes canon law). The Master of Divinity curriculum requires between 118 and 120 credits in total, depending on whether the seminarian takes Pastoral Spanish (a two credit course) or Field Education (a one credit course) each semester during the first year of theology. The complete Master of Divinity curriculum, however, does not meet the course requirements for ordination called for by the *Program of Priestly Formation*. To address these lacunae, seminarians must take four additional "ordination requirement" courses in the foundational areas of the "Synoptic Gospels," "Christology," "Moral Theology II: Virtues and Vices," and "Historical Theology I." Although these four courses are required for ordination but are not part of the Master of Divinity curriculum, they can be taken for credit toward the optional Master of Arts in Theology degree. This Master of Arts program requires forty total credits, twenty-one of which can be transferred from the Master of Divinity program and twelve of which can come from the four "ordination requirement" courses. The remaining credits toward the degree are fulfilled by a one-credit research and writing course, and the six credits earned for the writing and defense of a thesis.[277]

Taking the 118 credits of the Master of Divinity program (given that a pastoral language is not required) plus the twelve credits of "ordination requirement" courses, the total theology curriculum leading to priestly ordination is 130 credits. Parsing out the sub-categories of course

[277] See ibid., 34, 39-40, 43. The transfer of credits from the Master of Divinity program to the Master of Arts in Theology program is possible because the Master of Divinity program at St. Patrick's Seminary and University, like most Catholic seminaries in the United States, requires far more than the minimum 72-credits required by the Association of Theological Schools for the degree. See, for example, the Association of Theological Schools: Commission on Accrediting, *Degree Program Standards* (January 21, 2015), 24, https://www.ats.edu/uploads/accrediting/documents/degree-program-standards.pdf#pagemode=bookmarks.

groupings, the course distribution of theological areas is quite balanced.[278] Scripture (21 credits or 16.2 percent of the total), liturgical/sacramental theology (20 credits or 15.4 percent), dogmatic theology (19 credits or 14.6 percent), and moral/spiritual theology (18 credits or 13.9 percent) all receive roughly equal credit requirements. Moreover, with the central priority of forming pastorally capable priests, approximately thirty percent of the curriculum is devoted to elements of direct pastoral study. A serious deficiency of the program is the absence of space for elective courses in the curriculum.[279]

The organization of the theology curriculum at St. Patrick's Seminary and University into three sequences relating academic studies to pastoral ministry is one unique feature of the program. The inclusion of the year-long pastoral internship as a central feature of the priestly formation program is also unique, as pastoral years in other seminaries often depend more on the decision of the sponsoring diocese rather than being required as a key part of the seminary program.

A further key feature of the intellectual formation program at St. Patrick's is its priority in providing academic resources for seminarians. The seminary's English Language Center provides support to improve the writing ability of all seminarians, both native and non-native English speakers, through regular workshops and a peer proofreading program. In order to promote academic integrity in helping colleagues through proofreading, St. Patrick's requires the use of a "Editing/Proofreading Form" to make clear what outside help contributed to an individual student's work. Moreover, to further facilitate support in writing ability, the seminary produces clear standards to identify goals for written communication. Upon completion of the seminary

[278] For example, although St. Patrick's Seminary groups them together, historical theology and liturgical/sacramental theology are considered as separate from dogmatic theology in the data presented here.

[279] See *St. Patrick's Seminary & University, Academic Catalog 2019-2021*, 35. See also Figure 5.5 in "Appendix C."

theology program, all seminarians are expected to reach the level of "General Professional Proficiency" on the St. Patrick's Seminary "Institutional Writing Scale." Professors are also to use a standard "Writing Skills Rubric" to evaluate the written submissions of students. These academic resources and clear standards help strengthen the intellectual formation program at St. Patrick's by articulating clear expectations and providing the support necessary to reach them.[280]

The faculty of St. Patrick's Seminary and University is made up of twenty full-time members including the roles of administration, directors of formational areas, and several ranks of professors. The vocational makeup of the seminary faculty is quite balanced: fifty percent are priests, equally split between diocesan and religious priests, and fifty percent of the faculty are laity. However, the number of lay men (seven) is more than double the number of lay women (three); and there are no faculty members who are women religious or permanent deacons. In terms of academic credentials, 80 percent of the faculty possess a doctorate of some sort, with an equal share of those with ecclesiastical doctorates and Ph.D. degrees (seven each or 35 percent of the faculty with each type of degree). An equal share received their post-Master's level training at Roman universities or institutions and Catholic schools in the United States (six each).[281]

In summary, the intellectual formation program at St. Patrick's Seminary and University has several strong points and a few areas for possible improvement. Two major strengths of the program are the organization of the theology curriculum into three "sequences" toward the pastoral goal of forming "Spiritual Fathers" and the required element of a pastoral year. These two strengths work in concert to develop both pastoral sensitivity in priestly training and opportunities for future growth before ordained ministry. All of the pieces of the theology programs fit together through

[280] See *St. Patrick's Seminary & University, Academic Catalog 2019-2021*, 12, 57-60, 63-64.
[281] See "St. Patrick's Seminary and University Faculty Directory" at https://www.stpsu.edu/faculty. See also Figures 5.6, 5.7, and 5.8 in "Appendix C."

this lens of building up to, carrying out, and reflecting on the pastoral year and ultimately preparing for priestly ministry beyond ordination. The heightened focus on pastoral formation is especially important in light of the fact that the seminary only enrolls candidates for the priesthood in its academic programs, and does not offer formation for non-ordination track students. While this can be a deficiency if seminarians are not exposed to other forms of ministry with which they will be called to collaborate in future priestly service, the pastoral integration of the theology programs helps alleviate this deficiency by exposing priestly candidates to extended and sustained pastoral experiences in a parish as the center of the program.

Two areas for potential growth and improvement in the intellectual formation program are requiring a level of proficiency in a useful modern language for pastoral ministry and providing opportunities for elective course choices within the curriculum. Although two semesters of a Spanish language course are offered as an option to students, the courses are not required nor is there a stated expectation that a level of proficiency in using the language for ministry be reached. Developing a more rigorous pastoral language program in Spanish and/or other appropriate languages would only further the overall pastoral formation training held out as a priority in priestly formation at St. Patrick's. A second area for possible improvement is opening up the curriculum enough to create room for at least some elective courses. As it stands, there is no room for electives built into the theology curriculum. The addition of courses in important topics not treated in the plan of studies that would further enhance the intellectual formation program, such as ecumenism and interreligious dialogue, might both reasonably and meaningfully begin to address these issues.

B. "Mixed" Model Diocesan Seminaries

B.1. The Saint Paul Seminary, Minnesota

The Saint Paul Seminary is the major seminary for the Archdiocese of Saint Paul and Minneapolis in Minnesota, first opening in 1894. It is grouped together under the title of The Seminaries of Saint Paul along with Saint John Vianney College Seminary and The Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity at the University of St Thomas. The two seminaries, major and minor, along with the School of Divinity are located at the University of St. Thomas, a full undergraduate and graduate institution with a total of over ten thousand students.[282]

The mission of The Saint Paul Seminary is "[t]o provide integrated, Catholic formation for those called to serve as priests, deacons or lay leaders in their local Church." The mission is therefore inclusive of forming others than priestly ministers, and this is primarily done through the programs offered at the School of Divinity.[283] The Saint Paul Seminary itself, however, focuses on the formation of candidates for the diocesan priesthood. The integrating vision of the major seminary program, in addition to being the inspiration for the other programs, is active evangelization, "the Church on fire with the Holy Spirit, a world transformed in Jesus Christ."

[282] See the website for The Seminaries of Saint Paul, https://semssp.org/. For a comprehensive history through the year 2000, see Mary Christine Athans, *"To Work for the Whole People": John Ireland's Seminary in St. Paul* (New York: Paulist Press, 2002). See also the "Quick Facts" page on the website of the University of St. Thomas, https://www.stthomas.edu/about/quick-facts/index.html.

[283] It should be noted that The Saint Paul School of Divinity is a member of the ecumenical Minnesota Consortium of Theological Schools. One of the main benefits of enrollment in one of the schools in the consortium is the ability to cross register in courses across the other member institutions. The other members are St. John's School of Theology (the only other Catholic institution in the group), Bethel Seminary, Luther Seminary, and the United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities. See https://mncts.net/.

Thus, a zealous pastoral ministry is at the heart of the priestly formation program and its academic dimensions.[284]

The intellectual formation program for priestly formation at The Saint Paul Seminary is organized into two sections, pre-theology and theology. The pre-theology program is a two-year, non-degree program in philosophy and the liberal arts for those candidates with an undergraduate degree but without prior academic or personal formation for the theologate. The central theological program for priestly formation is the Master of Divinity program, offered through the School of Divinity. The Master of Divinity program is only open to seminarians preparing for priestly ministry. In addition to the Master of Divinity, interested and qualified seminarians can also pursue a Master of Arts in Theology which culminates in comprehensive examinations, and either a scholarly thesis or the submission of an academic portfolio. The Master of Arts in Theology program is open to non-ordination track students in addition to seminarians. The School of Divinity also offers programs leading to the Master of Arts in Pastoral Ministry and the Master of Arts in Religious Education for qualified students not in formation for the priesthood. During the 2018-2019 academic year, there were seventy-one students enrolled in graduate degree programs at the School of Divinity, all of which are accredited by the Association of Theological Schools, and eighty seminarians in the major theology program at The Saint Paul Seminary.[285]

The Master of Divinity program, the core of theological formation at The Saint Paul Seminary, is composed of a 122 credit curriculum over four years of study. The content of the curriculum is organized along traditional lines, with courses covering the main theological areas.

---

[284] See "The Saint Paul Seminary: Vision and Mission" at https://semssp.org/sps/mission/.
[285] See "The Saint Paul Seminary: Pre-Theology Program," https://semssp.org/sps/priestly-formation/pre-theology-program/; "The Saint Paul Seminary: Theology Program," https://semssp.org/sps/priestly-formation/theology-program/; "The Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity: Degree Programs," https://semssp.org/spssod/degree-programs/; "The Saint Paul Seminary 2018-2019 Annual Report," 4, https://semssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/SPS-Annual-Report-2018-2019-FINAL.pdf.

The main areas of Scripture, dogmatic theology, and sacramental theology receive equal treatment in terms of credit allotment (eighteen credits each or 14.8 percent of the total credit distribution). Pastoral theology, which includes canon law, preaching, and practical ministry assignments makes up about a quarter of the entire program. About ten percent of the program is left free for elective course choices, allowing at least some flexibility for students to pursue areas of further interest.[286]

The integrating principle of the entire curriculum is forming priests dedicated to pastoral ministry, and this emphasis is brought out through a number of unique seminars and programs to provide opportunities for growth in relevant skills for effective priestly ministry. These unique programs are offered either during the summer months or during a special January session between the fall and spring semesters.

Three such programs are especially worth mentioning. First, The Saint Paul Seminary offers a summer "Rural Ministry Practicum" in conjunction with the Catholic Rural Life organization. This program provides seminarians with the opportunity to participate in an experience of farming communities and their pastoral needs in rural settings, and also a deeper understanding of the environment. Second, the "Intensive Immersion Language Study Program" provides seminarians the opportunity to develop skills and confidence in using the Spanish language for pastoral ministry. The program takes place over eight weeks in Mexico, where the seminarian lives with a host family and engages in one-on-one tutoring with a Spanish instructor. Third, The Saint Paul Seminary provides three pilgrimages, one each in the second, third, and fourth years of theology, respectively, that provide opportunities for both spiritual and pastoral growth. The pilgrimage during the second year of theology is to Mexico City and focuses on

[286] See "The Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity: Master of Divinity Four Year Curriculum Overview," https://semssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/REVISED-MDiv-Curriculum-Overview_matriculating-2016-and-after_notes-removed.pdf. See also Figure 5.9 in "Appendix C."

ministering to those in extreme poverty. This experience is followed by specific engagement with the Latino community of the Saint Paul-Minneapolis area upon returning to the seminary. The pilgrimage experience during the third year of theology is to the Holy Land and focuses on the pastoral ministry of preaching prior to diaconate ordination. Finally, during the fourth year of theology, seminarians make a pilgrimage to Rome with the focus of making connections between the local church of the United States and their own particular dioceses and the universal church, through an emphasis on the themes of evangelization and missiology.[287]

The full-time faculty of The Saint Paul Seminary is made up of some twenty-one individuals serving in a variety of roles, both administrative and teaching. The vocational makeup of the current faculty body is balanced, with priests constituting slightly over half of those listed on the "Faculty" directory (ten total diocesan priests and one religious priest, for a total of 52.4 percent of the whole). The second most represented group is lay men (eight total or 38.1 percent) and lay women (two total or 9.5 percent). There are currently no non-ordained religious men nor religious women included on the active faculty, although a single religious sister is a "Professor Emerita." A major benefit held by The Saint Paul Seminary for both the recruitment of faculty and the support of other seminary programs is the resource of nearly fifty endowed funds for students established by generous benefactors.[288]

In terms of post-Master's level education, a little more than one-quarter of the entire faculty body studied at a Roman university or institution (six total or 28.6 percent). A higher proportion, one-third of the total faculty, was trained at Catholic institutions in the United States, with an additional 14 percent at non-Catholic American universities. The total proportion of the faculty

[287] See "The Saint Paul Seminary: Theology Program," https://semssp.org/sps/priestly-formation/theology-program/.
[288] See "The Saint Paul Seminary: Faculty & Staff," https://semssp.org/sps/faculty-staff-sps/. See also "The Saint Paul Seminary 2018-2019 Annual Report," 13. See also Figure 5.10 in "Appendix C."

with doctoral degrees of any kind is just over 60 percent (thirteen total), the lowest rate of the seminaries considered in this chapter.[289]

In conclusion, the theological program for intellectual formation at The Saint Paul Seminary has at least two strengths. First, the graduate School of Theology and its programs for non-seminarian students along with the Seminary's physical and institutional setting in close connection with the University of St. Thomas provides an ideal environment for priestly formation. The one School of Theology provides programs for seminarians and other students. The integrity of the unique nature of priestly formation is preserved through the primary focus of The Saint Paul Seminary itself and the Master of Divinity program reserved for seminarians, while the priestly candidates are still exposed to a variety of ministries and vocations through enrollment in the other School of Divinity programs and its relationship with the broader university community. With the seminary's emphasis on forming priests with a zealous commitment to the pastoral ministry, this setting seems to strike a perfect balance for forming priests for ecclesial ministry. Second, the unique programs offered to seminarians as part of their pastoral formation, such as the "Rural Ministry Practicum," the language immersion program, and the various pastorally-oriented pilgrimages, also impact their intellectual formation by connecting the content studied in the classroom with concrete experiences of both ministerial and spiritual growth. These programs highlight the interconnection of all aspects of priestly formation, and how the intellectual, pastoral, and spiritual dimensions interact in forming a priest equipped to minister to the needs of the contemporary context.

Two areas where the intellectual formation program could improve are, first, increasing the course offerings in church history within the theology curriculum and, second, considering

[289] See ibid. See also Figures 5.11 and 5.12 in "Appendix C."

how it might be possible to create a graduate degree path for the pre-theology program. First, in the currently constituted theological curriculum, there are only three required courses in church history, a two-semester survey of the entirety of the field and another course on the Catholic Church in the United States. In total, this amounts to less than eight percent of the total credit allotment in the Master of Divinity program. While this situation is similar to that in other seminaries, additional required courses in, for example, the Fathers of the Church would only strengthen the overall curriculum. These additional courses might already be offered in other graduate programs at the School of Divinity, but adding more variety to the church history offering of the seminary curriculum would contribute to a heightened intellectual formation.

A second possible area for improvement to the intellectual formation program at The Saint Paul Seminary would be creating a graduate degree track for candidates in the pre-theology program. As currently constituted, the pre-theology program is a non-degree program that prepares seminarians for entry into the Master of Divinity program. It seems that with the resources and personnel available between the School of Divinity and the University of St. Thomas Philosophy Department, some type of graduate program might be able to be developed. Perhaps this might also be possible through affiliation with another institution, such as an ecclesiastical faculty of philosophy. The benefit of providing this option would be to provide capable students in the pre-theology program a more rigorous engagement with the study of philosophy and the ability to earn a graduate degree.[290]

[290] For example, "The Saint Paul School of Divinity: Complete Course Listing, Fall 2016," the most recent version included on the School's website, lists twelve total courses under the area of historical studies. See https://semssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/2016-8-11CompleteCourseListing-branded.pdf.

B.2. Immaculate Conception Seminary, New Jersey

The Immaculate Conception Seminary is the major seminary for the Archdiocese of Newark, providing priestly formation for seminarians sponsored by six dioceses and six religious communities during the 2019-2020 academic year. It is also the School of Theology for Seton Hall University, providing both undergraduate and graduate programs for ordination and non-ordination track students. Originally founded in 1860 as part of Seton Hall University, Immaculate Conception Seminary moved to a separate campus in 1927 before moving back to affiliation with Seton Hall in 1984.[291]

The mission of Immaculate Conception Seminary is, therefore, two-fold. First, the Seminary itself is a comprehensive place of formation for candidates for the Catholic priesthood, providing them the "personal, academic, ministerial and spiritual formation essential for their conversion to Jesus Christ and for their commitment to a life of service to the Church." Second, in its role within the broader University, the School of Theology offers academic, pastoral, and spiritual formation for qualified candidates through its undergraduate and graduate academic programs. These programs are offered for those studying for the permanent diaconate and lay students interested in serving the church through various pastoral ministries within parishes, dioceses, and Catholic schools and higher education. The two-fold mission of the Seminary is, therefore, directed toward the pastoral ministry of priests, deacons, religious, and the laity and is

[291] See "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology," in *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 306, https://www.shu.edu/academics/upload/Graduate-Catalogue-2019-2020.pdf. See also the statistics for the Master of Divinity program during the current academic year on the seminary website, https://www.shu.edu/academics/master-divinity.cfm.

reflected throughout its program offerings, especially the academic program for priestly formation.[292]

As a means of fulfilling this pastoral mission, the School of Theology provides four degree programs, an undergraduate program leading to a Bachelor of Arts in Catholic Theology and three graduate theology programs. The graduate programs are the Master of Divinity, the Master of Arts in Theology, and the Master of Arts in Pastoral Ministry. The Master of Divinity program follows the course of studies preparing for ordination to the priesthood. It is ordinarily for candidates for the priesthood, but in exceptional cases non-ordination students can be accepted into the program. The Master of Arts in Theology program can be pursued in one of two tracks, either a general, terminal graduate degree or a research option that culminates in a scholarly thesis and prepares for future doctoral studies. This program is open to seminarians as an optional supplement to their enrollment in the Master of Divinity program, candidates for the permanent diaconate program through the Center for Diaconal Formation, and any other qualified students. The Master of Arts in Pastoral Ministry program is open to any qualified candidate, but does not enroll seminarians as part of their academic formation. In addition, a two-year, non-degree pre-theology program is offered for seminarians already possessing a college degree prior to beginning the study of theology. The four degree programs are accredited by the Association of Theological Schools and the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. During the 2019-2020 academic year, the School of Theology enrolled 267 students in all of its graduate programs, including seventy-eight seminarians in the Master of Divinity program.[293]

---

[292] See "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology," in *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 306.

[293] See "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology," in *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 306-310, 312-313; the statistics for the Master of Divinity program during the current academic year, https://www.shu.edu/academics/master-divinity.cfm; and the entry for the "Immaculate Conception Seminary of Seton Hall University" on the website of the Association of Theology Schools, https://www.ats.edu/member-schools/immaculate-conception-seminary-seton-hall-university%20.

The center of the intellectual formation of priestly candidates at Immaculate Conception Seminary is the Master of Divinity curriculum. The credit allotment of the degree program consists of seventy-four credits of coursework, and twelve credits of direct pastoral formation, for a total of eighty-six credits. However, since more courses are required by the *Program of Priestly Formation* than by the Master of Divinity curriculum, the seminarians of Immaculate Conception take a 126-credit "Academic Program for Priesthood Candidates," which fulfills both the course requirements for ordination and all of the elements of the Master of Divinity program. The credits earned in the ordination curriculum give qualified and interested seminarians the option of applying them toward the Master of Arts in Theology program.[294]

The content of the ordination curriculum at Immaculate Conception Seminary is spread over four years and is divided into five subject areas: Scripture, systematic theology (which also includes liturgical/sacramental theology), moral theology, church history, and pastoral theology (which also includes spiritual theology, canon law, and homiletics). Dividing these subject areas according to the number of credits required shows the following: pastoral theology (twenty-two credits or 17.5 percent of the total credit allotment), systematic theology (twenty credits or 15.9 percent), and an equal treatment of Scripture, liturgical/sacramental theology, and moral theology (18 credits each, or 14.3 percent of the total). Taken as a whole, the combined areas of pastoral theology and its related pastoral subjects makes up nearly thirty percent of the curriculum, an expression of the focus on pastoral ministry at the heart of the priestly formation program. The ordination curriculum leaves room for five elective courses, but one elective each must be within the specific areas of moral theology, systematic theology, spiritual theology, and church history, leaving only one truly "open" elective option in any field of interest. Pastoral Spanish is offered

[294] See "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology: Master of Divinity," in *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 310-312.

for those seminarians who are native English speakers and are sponsored by dioceses which require Spanish for their formation, but it is not a required part of the general program.[295]

A major feature of the theological formation program at Immaculate Conception Seminary is the sheer size and scope of course offerings provided by the School of Theology across all of its programs. Whereas the ordination curriculum at the School of Theology calls for seminarians to take forty-four courses, which includes thirty-nine core courses, four subject-specific electives, and one elective of the student's choice, the School of Theology as a whole offered 201 graduate classes during the 2019-2020 academic year. The critical mass of the student body in all programs and the size of the faculty allows for a diversity of course offerings that provide significant options for seminarians in their elective selections. This creates a uniquely rich selection of courses for theological study during the major seminary program.[296]

The Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology full-time graduate faculty is composed of twenty members across the roles of administration, professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. The largest vocational group across the faculty is diocesan priests (twelve total or 60 percent), followed by lay men (six total or 30 percent). Only one lay woman is listed as a full-time faculty member and no female members of religious communities are included on the faculty. Eighty-five percent of the faculty members hold a doctoral degree of some type. Fifty percent of the faculty received their post-Master's education at a Roman university or institution, and over one-third studied at Catholic universities in the United States.[297]

---

[295] See ibid., 311-312. See also Figure 5.13 in "Appendix C."
[296] See "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology: Course Descriptions," in *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 314-327.
[297] See the "Theology Faculty" directory at https://www.shu.edu/theology/faculty.cfm. See also Figures 5.14, 5.15, and 5.16 in "Appendix C."

To conclude, the intellectual formation program at Immaculate Conception Seminary has several strong points and a few areas in which it could become even stronger. In terms of strengths of the program, two especially stand out.

The first strength is the Seminary's setting both within a large graduate School of Theology and the broader Seton Hall University community, an invaluable environment in which seminarians are to be formed. Similar to the benefits mentioned in the profile of The Saint Paul Seminary, Immaculate Conception Seminary provides a context for future priests to be exposed to a variety of colleagues in different forms of ministry and a representative body of the faithful for whom they will be called to serve. Moreover, the expansive course offerings and large faculty provide a number of opportunities for enriched intellectual formation.

The second strength is the manner in which Immaculate Conception Seminary organizes its elective system within the ordination curriculum of the Master of Divinity, which merits consideration at other seminaries. A regular tension in seminary theology programs is between the amount of material that must be covered to meet the requirements of the universal church and the directives of the American bishops and the limited amount of time available within the seminary years. This tension often results in a set program of studies without much room for flexibility. The elective system at Immaculate Conception, however, seems to strike an appropriate balance between student choice in selecting courses of particular interest to them, while also meeting core area requirements. This goal is achieved, as mentioned, by permitting choice within a given specific area for four electives, and allowing another unrestricted elective choice. This fosters balance in the scope of the program and an opportunity for a seminarian to enter more deeply into a topic of interest, thus strengthening the overall level of intellectual interest and engagement.

Two areas in which the intellectual formation program at Immaculate Conception Seminary might become stronger are, first, working to improve the vocational diversity of the graduate faculty at the School of Theology and, second, similar to the suggestion for improvement at The Saint Paul Seminary, trying to think of creative ways to add a graduate degree option for the pre-theology program. First, as was mentioned in considering the vocational makeup of the faculty at the School of Theology, recruiting more women to the faculty, both religious and lay, would bring a critically important perspective to the theological formation of future priests. As currently constituted, the total graduate theology faculty body is composed of 95 percent men. Second, the academic programs of the broader University might be able to provide supplemental intellectual formation that could occur during the pre-theology stage of formation. Seton Hall University does not offer a Master's degree in philosophy, so either a new program or affiliation with another institution might be worth considering to provide a graduate degree track in this field. Alternatively, perhaps an additional degree program in an ancillary field such as education or psychology, while not replacing the study of philosophy at the heart of pre-theology, might also meaningfully prepare for future priestly ministry in a variety of ways. Creative ideas such as these should be promoted considering the numerous resources available through the university setting of Immaculate Conception Seminary.[298]

[298] See the "Theology Faculty" directory at https://www.shu.edu/theology/faculty.cfm.; see also "Seton Hall University: Graduate Degree Programs," at https://www.shu.edu/academics/graduate-programs.cfm.

C. Seminaries Run by Religious Communities

C.1. St. Mary's Seminary and University, Maryland[299]

St. Mary's Seminary and University in Baltimore, Maryland, was the first Catholic seminary in the United States, dating back to 1791 and entrusted to the priests of the Society of St. Sulpice from its foundation and throughout the entirety of its existence. St. Mary's has formed more priests for pastoral ministry in the United States than any other American seminary. In the present day, its seminarians are sponsored mainly from some fifteen dioceses across the eastern portion of the United States. The institution of St. Mary's Seminary and University as a whole is divided into three sections: the Seminary itself, which continues to focus on the formation of candidates for the Catholic priesthood; the Ecumenical Institute, which provides academic formation for all qualified candidates from diverse religious backgrounds and traditions; and the Center for Continuing Formation, which provides programs of ongoing formation for priests throughout their life.[300]

The primary mission of St. Mary's is "to provide an outstanding spiritual, intellectual, and pastoral preparation of candidates for the Roman Catholic priesthood." This mission is pursued through the Sulpician emphasis on the spiritual development of seminarians within an entire community of formation based in collegiality and collaboration and directed toward the pastoral ministry. Other lay ministers and non-Catholic students are formed through the Ecumenical

[299] See Footnote 1 of this Chapter.

[300] See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 2-3, http://www.stmarys.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SOT-catalog-2019.revB_.pdf; see also the "About Us" and the "Dioceses & Students" pages on the Seminary's website, http://www.stmarys.edu/seminary/about-us/ and http://www.stmarys.edu/seminary/about-us/dioceses-students/.

Institute, but the sole focus of the Seminary division is on priestly formation. The priority of forming pastorally effective priests sensitive to the pluralistic context of the American environment is thus the integrating principle of the seminarian's theological curriculum. Despite their distinct purposes and student bodies, the priestly candidates from the Seminary are required to take at least one course through the Ecumenical Institute during their studies as a means of enriching their intellectual and pastoral formation through exposure to a more diverse student body and to the broader pastoral needs of different ecclesial communities.[301]

St. Mary's Seminary and University offers several academic programs for seminarians during their formation across two teaching bodies, the School of Theology, which grants civil academic degrees, and the Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty, which has been able to grant ecclesiastical degrees in theology up through the doctorate since 1822, the first American institution able to do so. A two-year, non-degree pre-theology program is offered to prepare candidates with an undergraduate degree but without experience in priestly formation and sufficient preparation in philosophy. The School of Theology also offers a Bachelor of Arts/Master of Arts in Theology program for seminarians who have some college credits but do not have an undergraduate degree to complete both philosophy and theology studies prior to ordination in a six-year cycle. This Master of Arts in Theology program offered at the Seminary is ordinarily for students without an undergraduate degree upon arrival at St. Mary's, for those who withdraw from the seminary program prior to earning the Master of Divinity degree, or for those in the Master of Divinity program with advanced standing. The Master of Arts in Theology program is, therefore, not an option typically open to all seminarians as it is in other seminaries. The central program of

[301] See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 4-6, 23-24.

theological formation for candidates for the Catholic priesthood is the four-year Master of Divinity program.[302]

In addition to the programs at the School of Theology, the Ecumenical Institute also offers the Master of Arts in Theology, the Master of Arts in Church Ministries, a Master of Divinity partnership with Lancaster Theological Seminary, and a Doctor of Ministry. Again, the academic programs at the Ecumenical Institute are not open to priestly candidates in the Seminary, but they do contribute to the overall theological atmosphere of St. Mary's and form a unique feature of the intellectual formation environment for seminarians, especially in terms of ecumenical and interreligious relations. During the fall 2019 semester, 171 students were enrolled across all of the graduate theology programs at St. Mary's Seminary and University and its Ecumenical Institute, and fifty-six seminarians were in formation during the 2018-2019 academic year. All degree programs are accredited by either the Middle States Commission on Higher Education or the Association of Theological Schools.[303]

The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty of St. Mary's Seminary is a further distinctive feature of the intellectual formation program. The Faculty is able to grant the entire ecclesiastical degree sequence in theology, the Bachelor of Sacred Theology, the Licentiate of Sacred Theology and the Doctorate of Sacred Theology. Since the Master of Divinity program at St. Mary's (which will be considered in more detail below) provides the standard curriculum for ordination to the priesthood and requires more credits than the typical three-year Bachelor of Sacred Theology, the two degrees are earned concurrently. Qualified students interested in the Licentiate of Sacred

---

[302] See ibid., 12-20.

[303] See the "Academics" page on the Ecumenical Institute website, http://www.stmarys.edu/ecumenical-institute/academics/; "Accreditation & Educational Effectiveness" on the Seminary website, http://www.stmarys.edu/seminary/accreditation-educational-effectiveness/. See also the entry for St. Mary's Seminary and University on the website for the Association of Theological Schools, https://www.ats.edu/member-schools/st-marys-seminary-and-university%20; Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 7.

Theology program, which is an advanced degree of specialization culminating in a major research paper of between seventy-five and one hundred pages in length, can begin elements of the two-year program during the final year of the Master of Divinity program. At St. Mary's, licentiate students can specialize in the fields of biblical, moral, or systematic theology. The Bachelor and Licentiate of Sacred Theology programs are regular options for interested and qualified seminarians to pursue. While St. Mary's Seminary is able to grant the Doctorate of Sacred Theology, it limits enrollment in the program depending on the alignment of student's research interests with the available faculty willing to work with them. The ability to grant ecclesiastical degrees in theology within its own faculty is a special feature of St. Mary's Seminary and University compared with most other seminaries in the United States. Often, other American seminaries that offer, for example, the Bachelor of Sacred Theology, do so only through affiliation with another ecclesiastically recognized faculty rather than through their own recognized faculty.[304]

The Master of Divinity program is the central course of study for theological formation at St. Mary's Seminary and University. It is made up of a 122-credit curriculum over four academic years and culminates in written and oral comprehensive examinations. The content of the course offerings is broken into five traditional sections, namely Scripture, moral theology, and church history, with systematic and liturgical theology grouped together, and the pastoral subjects of canon law, homiletics, field education, and pastoral theology also combined. It is interesting to note that although sacramental theology is organized along with liturgical theology as a subdiscipline of systematic theology, the course on the Sacrament of Reconciliation is considered

[304] See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 12-15.

under the topic of moral and spiritual theology, an expression of the long-standing link between seminary moral theology and the hearing of confessions.[305]

The three areas requiring most credits in the core theology curriculum at St. Mary's Seminary are, first, systematic theology (twenty-four credits or 19.7 percent of the entire program), second, Scripture (22.5 credits or 18.4 percent), and third, moral theology (eighteen credits or 14.8 percent). Although the pastoral ministry of the priesthood is the integrating principle of the entire curriculum, specifically pastoral subjects make up only a quarter of the whole course of studies. Of course, this distribution of credits could be explained by the emphasis on the pastoral dimension of all subjects brought up in each class, but it is still a point worth noting.[306]

The teaching faculty of St. Mary's Seminary and University is made up of seventeen full-time members with the titles of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. The vocational diversity of the Seminary faculty includes over 41 percent Sulpician priests (seven total), with an additional three other diocesan priests and three religious priests (17.7 percent each). Three lay men serve on the full-time faculty (17.6 percent), but there are no lay women or religious men or women. Addressing the lack of women on the Seminary faculty ought to be a priority in recruitment. In light of the Seminary's ecumenical concerns, a Protestant minister serves on the full-time faculty as well.[307]

The academic credentials of the St. Mary's Seminary and University faculty is as impressive as its vocational diversity. All but one member of the full-time faculty possess a doctorate of some sort, and several faculty members have earned multiple doctorates themselves in different fields. Over 80 percent received their post-Master's training at American institutions,

[305] See ibid., 17, 30.
[306] See ibid., 17, 6. See also Figure 5.17 in "Appendix C."
[307] See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 56-58. See also Figure 5.18 in "Appendix C."

with about 47 percent of the total faculty studying at Catholic and over one-third at non-Catholic American universities. A little over one-third of the faculty studied for advanced degrees at Roman universities or institutions. There is a noticeable preference for American over European training among the faculty of St. Mary's, which is an inverse of the more typical breakdown among faculty at the other American seminaries considered.[308]

To conclude the profile of the intellectual formation program at St. Mary's, two particular strengths of the program and two areas for continued growth are noteworthy. The first strength is the Seminary's status as an ecclesiastical faculty and the extensive expertise of its faculty members. The ability to grant theological degrees up through the ecclesiastical doctorate is a tremendous opportunity for deep intellectual engagement by seminarians in formation, though few enroll in these programs in practice.[309] Whereas other seminaries typically offer a Master of Arts option in conjunction with the standard Master of Divinity program, both of these degree programs are of the same "Master's" level, albeit with different emphases. The ability of a student at St. Mary's to begin pursuing the higher level Licentiate of Sacred Theology during the theologate is a distinct opportunity, although completing the two-year S.T.L. would extend beyond the seminary years.[310]

A second strength of the St. Mary's Seminary program is the presence of the Ecumenical Institute and the attention it brings to ecumenical and interreligious issues for the priest-in-training. These topics were special emphases of both the Second Vatican Council and the 2016 revised

---

[308] See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 56-58. See also Figures 5.19 and 5.20 in "Appendix C."
[309] During the 2018-2019 academic year, four seminarians were enrolled in the Licentiate of Sacred Theology program at St. Mary's; none were enrolled in the Doctorate of Sacred Theology program. See Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 10.
[310] In addition to St. Mary's, six other U.S. seminaries had students enrolled in ecclesiastical licentiate programs during the 2018-2019 academic year. See Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 10.

Ratio Fundamentalis, and the activity of the Ecumenical Institute brings these issues to concrete application in the life of St. Mary's Seminary and University as a whole. These perspectives help situate the overall theological training at St. Mary's within the pluralistic setting of the United States, an important element of the overall pastoral context in which priests will be called to minister.

Two areas in which the intellectual formation program could improve are, first, through more robust requirements for pastoral language proficiency and, second, through strengthening the course offerings in church history. First, with respect to pastoral languages, the Seminary offers two semesters of Pastoral Spanish during the pre-theology program and regularly celebrates the liturgy in Spanish as a seminary community. This is an excellent start to building a foundation in the practical and pastoral use of the language but a higher threshold requirement would be beneficial to expand the effectiveness of the seminarian's future pastoral ministry. Other seminaries offer intense immersion programs or more requirements, which might be adapted and adopted in some form to strengthen the overall intellectual and pastoral formation program at St. Mary's. Second, with respect to church history, St. Mary's Seminary currently offers only three courses, all required parts of the core curriculum. There is a two-course sequence covering the entirety of church history, the first course covering the early church through medieval periods and the second course spanning from the Reformations through the present day, and then an additional course on "American Catholicism." Further elective offerings in church history would provide a beneficial dimension to the overall curriculum for intellectual formation.[311]

[311] See ibid., 27, 39, 49.

C.2. Mount Angel Seminary, Oregon

Mount Angel Seminary in Saint Benedict, Oregon, provides priestly formation at the undergraduate and graduate levels for dioceses and religious communities largely in the western portion of the United States and also graduate theological formation for qualified lay candidates. The Seminary was first opened in 1889 by Benedictine monks from the adjoining Mount Angel Abbey, who continue to operate it to the present day. The monastic community arrived in Oregon after being forced to flee their monastery in Switzerland during the *Kulturkampf* in 1882. During the 2018-2019 academic year, some sixty-seven seminarians were enrolled in its theologate.[312]

The primary mission of forming candidates for the Catholic priesthood at Mount Angel Seminary is carried out across its two institutional divisions, the College of Liberal Arts and the Graduate School of Theology. In addition to forming seminarians, the Graduate School of Theology also offers programs for other students. All of the degree programs granted by Mount Angel Seminary's College of the Liberal Arts and the Graduate School of Theology are accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities and the Association of Theological Schools.[313]

The College of Liberal Arts provides a complete four-year Bachelor of Arts degree program for those priestly candidates without an undergraduate degree. For those seminarians who enter seminary formation with an undergraduate degree already, the College offers two options for meeting the prerequisite studies requirement in advance of entering the theology stage. First, there

[312] See "History of Mount Angel Abbey and Seminary," in *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 11-13, https://www.mountangelabbey.org/wp-content/uploads/MAS-CATALOG-2019-2020-C.pdf; see also the entry for "Mount Angel Seminary" on the website for the Association of Theological Schools, https://www.ats.edu/member-schools/mount-angel-seminary%20; Kramarek and Gautier, *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*, 7.
[313] See *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 5, 10.

is a two-year, non-degree pre-theology program, covering the foundational thirty-credits of philosophy and twelve-credits of undergraduate religious studies called for by the *Program of Priestly Formation*. Second, for interested and qualified seminarians, there is an option to fulfill these pre-theology requirements through a two-year Master of Arts in Philosophy program. The seminarians in the Master of Arts in Philosophy program take the standard pre-theology core, an additional six-credits of philosophy electives, and complete the program by passing an oral comprehensive exam and writing a fifty to seventy page thesis. This option provides an opportunity for more in-depth intellectual engagement within the philosophical studies program while also meeting the formational goals of preparing for the study of theology.[314]

The Graduate School of Theology offers three academic degree programs of its own, and a fourth program through affiliation with an outside institution. The four-year Master of Divinity program is offered exclusively for seminarians and makes up the Seminary theological curriculum. While completing the Master of Divinity program, interested students have the option of concurrently completing the first cycle ecclesiastical degree of the Bachelor of Sacred Theology through Mount Angel's affiliation with the Pontifical Athenaeum of Sant' Anselmo in Rome. The Master of Arts in Theology program is open to qualified seminarians and also qualified lay students. Candidates for the Master of Arts in Theology program can specialize in either Scripture or systematic theology, and the program culminates with a comprehensive examination and a scholarly thesis. The third degree program offered by the School of Theology, the Doctor of Ministry, is its most recent program and is open to ordained, religious, and lay students with extensive experience in active ministry. The program has a three-fold focus on Scripture, systematic and liturgical theology, and pastoral theology. It is designed to be completed over at

[314] See ibid., 44-54, 81-85, 114.

least three years during intensive summer sessions to accommodate the active ministry commitments of its target audience, culminating in a substantial doctoral project or dissertation.[315]

A major unique feature of the intellectual formation program at Mount Angel Seminary is its emphasis on the integrative principle of all its theology programs, including the Master of Divinity for priestly formation: "Communion Ecclesiology." In fact, Mount Angel Seminary provides the most theological reflection on the overall structure of its curriculum than any other seminary included in this study. The principle of "Communion Ecclesiology," rooted in the liturgy and the celebration of the Eucharist, holds together all of the parts of the academic curriculum as well as the entirety of priestly formation. Their description of the program is as follows: "The 'shape' of the Eucharistic celebration images for us who God is and who we are: God is a communion of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and we are all together caught up into this communion. Our ongoing formation aims at ever more concretely embodying this image of communion in our way of being, loving, and working together." While other seminaries point to the integrative principle of the pastoral ministry within the theology curriculum, Mount Angel Seminary brings its Benedictine tradition of liturgical depth to bear on the formation of priests and offers a distinct and more foundational emphasis for the study of theology rooted in the believer called to communion with the Triune God and with other believers in the community of the church.[316]

The central principle of "Communion Ecclesiology" finds concrete expression in the four-year curriculum of the Master of Divinity program by organizing each year around a different theme that develops this integrating principle. In the first year of theological study, students focus on building foundations in theological methodology, the liturgy, and history, both scriptural and ecclesiastical. The second year examines the theme of persons for communion, focusing on both

[315] See ibid., 86-99, 115-121.
[316] See ibid., 86.

the human person and the divine persons of the Trinity, especially in Christology. The third year of theology aims at a synthesis of the "Communion Ecclesiology," which finds its main expression in "the Eucharist as it makes the Church and of the Church as it makes the Eucharist." Finally, the fourth year of theology culminates in the pastoral implications of this "Communion Ecclesiology" as the candidates approach priestly ordination and their future pastoral ministry. This schema, of course, is not meant to be a rigid segmentation of the four years of study, but rather to provide a unitive structure to the entirety of theological formation flowing from the identity of the seminarian and future priest as a believer within the context of the church responding to the love of God. It is an impressive articulation of an integrative principle that fits the common call of the universal church for the project of theology to be carried out in Christological and ecclesiological relationship.[317]

Returning to the details of the theology curriculum for seminarians with its overall framework of "Communion Ecclesiology," it is made up of the 104-credits of the Master of Divinity degree program plus an additional thirteen credits required by the *Program of Priestly Formation* for a total of 117-credits over four academic years. The program culminates in oral and written comprehensive examinations in the final year of study. While a year-long pastoral internship in a parish is not part of the theological program at Mount Angel Seminary, it is highly recommended between the second and third year of theology. The three subjects requiring most credits are, first, systematic theology (nine courses for about 19 percent of the total credits), second, Scripture (seven courses for about 15 percent), and, third, courses that fit with the Benedictine emphasis on the liturgy, preaching and presiding (five courses for almost 13 percent).[318]

[317] See ibid., 89-94.
[318] See ibid. See also Figure 5.21 in "Appendix C."

The faculty of Mount Angel Seminary, its Graduate School of Theology and philosophy programs, is made up of sixteen members in full-time teaching and administration capacities. In terms of vocational makeup, the faculty is quite diverse. Although no religious women are represented, every other vocational group is included. The two highest proportions belong to lay men (six total or 37.5 percent) and lay women (four total or 25 percent of the whole). Given its monastic context, one would expect the presence of religious priests (two total or 12.5 percent) and religious brothers (one total or 6.3 percent) to be more numerous, but their presence still adds an important and unique perspective to the teaching faculty. Perhaps most surprising, since many of the seminarians are studying for the diocesan priesthood, is the low percentage of diocesan priests involved in intellectual formation (two total or 12.5 percent).[319]

The educational background of the teaching faculty at Mount Angel Seminary is also diverse. Three-quarters of the faculty has a doctoral degree of some kind (twelve members total), although only one faculty member holds an ecclesiastical doctorate (an additional four hold an ecclesiastical licentiate). In terms of the setting in which faculty themselves were trained, most received their post-Master's level educational training at European universities outside of Rome (six total or 37.5 percent) with another five (or 31.3 percent) studying at Catholic institutions in the United States. Three faculty members (18.8 percent of the total) earned advanced degrees in Rome.[320]

To close consideration of the intellectual formation program at Mount Angel Seminary, we will identify two strengths of the program and two areas for improvement. The first strength is the option for qualified students in the pre-theology program to earn a Master of Arts in Philosophy

[319] See *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 131-137. See also Figure 5.22 in "Appendix C."
[320] See "Faculty" in *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 131-137. See also Figures 5.23 and 5.24 in "Appendix C."

degree while completing the prerequisites for entering the theological stage of formation. This option both creates a path for interested students to engage in a more rigorous study of philosophy, while not making it a requirement for everyone. The second strength of the intellectual formation program is the integrating principle of "Communion Ecclesiology" at the heart of the theology curriculum. This principle brings together the course of study in a meaningful way that relates to the identity of the future priest as first and foremost a believer within the community of faith.

With respect to areas in which the intellectual formation could improve, two areas regarding the composition of the faculty are apparent. The first is by increasing the percentage of faculty with an advanced ecclesiastical degree in their field. While the possession of an ecclesiastical degree is no guarantee of effective teaching for priestly formation, it is encouraged by the church documents and could easily be addressed. A second area for growth in the intellectual formation program with respect to faculty is to increase the percentage of diocesan priests involved in the program at Mount Angel Seminary. Since most seminarians are studying for the diocesan priesthood, the presence of more diocesan priest faculty members would be an important complement to the monastic setting of the Seminary. Diocesan priests could be recruited to the faculty from dioceses sponsoring seminarians at Mount Angel.

Conclusion

This dissertation addresses the overall question of the point and purpose of theological education of diocesan priests in the United States and how it has been understood and pursued over time. In concluding this final chapter examining the intellectual formation programs at six seminaries in the United States forming candidates for the diocesan priesthood during the 2019-

2020 academic year, the profile of each school shows the diversity of ways the goal of forming priests for the pastoral ministry in the context of the contemporary world is being pursued. While the content of courses within the theological program are largely set by directives of both the Vatican and the American bishops, these norms are incarnated in different ways at different seminaries. Drawing from these examples, features of an "ideal" intellectual formation program come to light and form the basis of the following recommendations. These recommendations might not be possible to adopt in every seminary, but taken together they represent steps that could be taken to continue to improve the intellectual formation of diocesan priests in the United States. These "ideals" are recommendations of the author of this dissertation based on this study of the history of seminary formation in the United States and the concrete programs at the six seminaries considered in this chapter. They are not "ideals" in the sense of universally agreed upon principles shared by the broader seminary community of the United States.

The ideal intellectual formation program for priestly formation would take elements from the programs surveyed here. It would have a Master's degree option for the pre-theology program so that qualified students could engage in a higher level of intellectual formation in philosophy and earn a graduate degree to show for the effort, such as in the programs at St. Joseph's Seminary and Mount Angel Seminary.

The documents from the Holy See and the American bishops on priestly formation, as shown throughout this dissertation, lay out a multitude of requirements for the theological formation of priestly candidates. It is a challenge to fit in all of these requirements during the four years of theological study within the seminary. In the United States, the Master of Divinity degree, the standard for ministry in all Christian denominations throughout the country, is the typical degree conferred upon completion of the theology curriculum at American Catholic seminaries.

Though this degree is usually earned over a three-year program at most non-Catholic institutions in the United States, in Catholic diocesan seminaries four years of theological study are mandated. As part of the four years, some programs add "ordination" courses to the Master of Divinity requirements. Therefore, the ordination curriculum for priestly formation further points to why the four-year format of the degree is usually required.

While the four-year Master of Divinity program should remain the norm in American seminaries because of the number of demands on the seminary theological curriculum and the range of academic interests and abilities of the seminarian student body, a three-year option ought to be offered for qualified students interested in beginning advanced theological studies in the fourth year of the major seminary. This option gives capable students the opportunity to enter into a deeper intellectual engagement and to specialize in a particular area of theology within the privileged time of focused study that is the seminary years prior to substantial pastoral responsibility after ordination. Efforts to accomplish this goal are currently met through the optional Master of Arts in Theology or similar programs offered at many seminaries, but these programs are on the same Master's level as the Master of Divinity program that forms the foundation of seminary studies. By providing a three-year option for the core Master of Divinity program, students could begin the pursuit of a post-Master's level degree such as the civil Master of Theology (Th.M.) or the ecclesiastical Licentiate of Sacred Theology, perhaps through affiliation with another institution if a given seminary does not have the resources to offer these advanced programs. Coupled with providing a Master's degree option for the pre-theology requirements in philosophy, these options for advanced study would raise the level of intellectual pursuit in American seminaries.

The ideal program would have a clearly stated principle of integration for the entire theology curriculum, whether focusing on the formation of "Spiritual Fatherhood" aimed at the pastoral ministry, such as at St. Patrick's Seminary and University, or emphasizing the "Communion Ecclesiology" of the church gathered around the Eucharistic celebration, as at Mount Angel Seminary. Given all of the components of and expectations for priestly formation programs, it is important for seminaries to develop a clear overall theme or integrating principle to unite all elements of the program into a unified effort, including intellectual formation. It is clear from the church documents and the catalogues of the seminaries considered here that the pastoral ministry of the priesthood is the ultimate purpose for both the seminary institution and its academic dimension. This pastoral ministry is exercised from, to, and within the church, so it is also inherently an ecclesiological reality. Two of the seminaries considered here, St. Patrick's Seminary and University and Mount Angel Seminary, articulated a more focused expression of the pastoral ministry in their integrating principles of "Spiritual Fatherhood" and "Communion Ecclesiology," respectively. Integrating principles such as these can help provide an intentionally intelligible structure to the years of theological study toward the end goal of pastoral ministry within the life of the church in the modern world.

The creative formulation of such principles can help bring together what might otherwise seem fractured, and the unity of the entire seminary curriculum and formation program is a priority clearly called for by the church documents. There are many ways in which integrating principles could be articulated. Two additional proposed themes or integrating principles might represent the type of imaginative integration that is possible.

A first possible integrating theme is the "Priest as both Sheep and Shepherd." This theme points to the relationship between the priest and the entirety of the church as the community of

believers, rooted in the priestly candidate's baptismal call. It emphasizes the identity of the priestly candidate as first a member of the church through baptism and, as such, a member of the flock while also highlighting the formation of a specific priestly identity, flowing from the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation, in the role of shepherd. This theme is not meant to minimize or to confuse the distinctive role of the ordained priesthood, but rather to point out the context of interrelationship between the community of believers and ordained priestly ministry. It would provide a particularly ecclesiological and pastoral lens with which to approach all of the courses in the theology curriculum.

A second possible integrating principle is the "Drama of Salvation History." While by no means original, a clear formulation of this integrating principle would help show the unfolding of salvation history in Scripture and the life of the church through history. This theme would also unite the theological subjects studied in the classroom with the personal appropriation of faith and continuing conversion in the life of the priestly candidate as well as the framework from which he will preach the Good News in future ministry.

The ideal intellectual formation program would provide opportunities for interested students to pursue advanced studies while within the years of seminary theology and introduce seminarians to ecumenical and interreligious concerns, such as St. Mary's Seminary and University. The ideal program would also insist on a pastoral year in a parish setting within the years of theological study, such as at St. Patrick's Seminary and University, and offer unique programs for enhanced pastoral growth for effective priestly ministry after ordination, such as those offered at The Saint Paul Seminary. The ideal setting for intellectual formation during the seminary years is in some relationship with others engaged in study but not pursuing ordination, whether within the context of a broader university or a graduate school of theology, such as at

Immaculate Conception Seminary and The Saint Paul Seminary. One way in which the benefits of many seminaries might be shared is through a seminarian-exchange program, in which a candidate for ordination might experience the formation program at a different seminary in a different part of the country. A program of this sort would contribute to reinvigorating his own seminary upon his return and to broadening his understanding of ministry as a future priest within the church in the United States, and not just his own individual diocese.

The pastoral challenges of the coming decades will call for the formation of priests adequately prepared to meet them. As the history of seminary formation in the United States shows, the distinct vocation of priesthood calls for a specialized preparation. While the human, spiritual, and pastoral dimensions are part of the unified whole of ongoing formation, the meaningful intellectual formation of diocesan priests will help provide them the skills to bring the ministry of the church to bear on the contemporary context. By molding the minds of shepherds, seminary formators will be participating in the renewal of the church called for by the Second Vatican Council, "fully aware that the desired renewal of the whole Church depends to a great extent on the ministry of its priests."[321]

[321] Vatican II, *Optatam Totius* (October 28, 1965), http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_optatam-totius_en.html.

Appendix A: Clerical Education Before and After Trent

There were three main institutional settings for the education of clerical candidates in the Middle Ages. The first institution, the monastic school, grew from the spread of Benedictine monasteries throughout Europe and their custom of educating young candidates first in the classical liberal arts and later in philosophy and theology, as those disciplines developed. The Carolingian renaissance of the eighth and ninth centuries elevated the standards for all priests, requiring their ability to read, to write, and to carry out the duties associated with their ministry. Flowing from its location, the life of the monastic school was naturally rooted in monastic spirituality and the ideals of prayer and work. [322]

The second and parallel institution was the cathedral or episcopal school. Whereas the monastic school centered around the religious community of the monastery, the cathedral school, following in the earlier example of St. Augustine, centered around the life of the diocesan cathedral and bishop, at his initiative. The content of instruction, however, was similarly the *trivium* and *quadrivium* as preparation for the higher studies of philosophy and theology. The schools operating from the cathedrals of Paris, Chartres, and Seville, for example, were leading intellectual centers during the period. The two institutions of the monastic school and the cathedral school were entirely dependent on their individual monastery or diocese, respectively, for their rigor and survival and lacked universal standards of uniformity in curricula. With respect to theological

[322] See Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, Vol. I*, ed. F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), 29.

study and reflection, the most important texts were the Scriptures, *The Sentences* of Peter Lombard, and excerpts from the Church Fathers.[323]

The third medieval institution where clerical education took place was the university. Arising in a variety of European cities under a number of different circumstances, sometimes from the local cathedral school, the universities brought a new degree of standardization across the educational world. The university standardized courses of study in both the lower liberal arts and the higher faculties of law (both canon and civil), medicine, and theology and granted degrees in these disciplines, providing a level of professionalization not available before. The university held a close connection with the church, as many universities and faculties were founded by ecclesiastical initiative. Within the field of theology, the church granted the *licentia docendi* to some university graduates which gave rights and privileges throughout Europe. Moreover, theological reflection developed a new depth and dimension with the rediscovery of Aristotle and its application to theology by university faculty in the thirteenth century.[324]

Despite the critical importance of the university, the number of university students preparing for ordination was always small and many were unable to remain for the completion of a degree, due to the extensive length of time to get to, and then to complete, the theology program, which could last, beginning to end with prerequisites, some sixteen years. Since a university degree was not required for ordination, many priests who spent some time at a university were ordained with very little formal theological education. Also, the university provided only academic formation to the clerical candidate, and not any spiritual or pastoral formation.[325]

---

[323] See John Tracy Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: I – The Apostolic Age to Trent," in *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, ed. James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz (Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965), 8-9.
[324] Ibid., 9-12.
[325] Ibid.

By the sixteenth century, the decrees of the Council of Trent on priestly formation formed a rough outline of the purpose and structure of the novel seminary institution. The students were to wear clerical dress and study practical, foundational subjects such as grammar, singing, and Scripture relevant to future ministry as priests, whether or not they would ever receive ordination. Beyond some general topics, the educational content of these courses was left vague and open ended.

The location of the seminary at the cathedral meant easy access to the liturgical life of the central diocesan church, and the Tridentine decree called for frequent reception of the sacraments and participation in the liturgy, under the direction of the bishop. In responding to the circumstances of the Reformations, the Council of Trent also solidified its teaching on the seven sacraments, including the sacred character of the priesthood as qualitatively different from the unordained. The seminary was not made a mandatory requirement for ordination, because the council left open the possibility of candidates with means to receive their intellectual formation in the university, but still the conciliar decree was the first of its kind providing systematic universal norms for priestly formation throughout the church.[326]

The decrees of an ecumenical council are one thing, and their implementation throughout the universal church quite another matter. In France, where the modern seminary took its most immediate shape, the decrees were only accepted by the clergy in 1615, more than fifty years after Trent. When the conciliar teachings were accepted, however, a renewal of spiritual life was unleashed in France, a central focus of the renewal being seminaries and formation of diocesan priests. The organizational outlines of the Tridentine seminary, however, gave way to more

[326] See Henry J. Schroeder, ed., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Charlotte, NC: TAN Books, 1978), 177-178. See also James A. O'Donohoe, *Tridentine Seminary Legislation: Its Sources and Its Formation*, Bibliotheca Ephermeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, Vol. 9 (Louvain, 1957), 89-162.

practical adaptations to fit the needs of the French Church. The most influential group on American seminary life was the French Society of St. Sulpice, so this element of the "French Tradition," flowing from Trent and its earlier influences in clerical education, will be most important in our further study.[327]

The so-called "French Tradition" of priestly formation centered around the figures of Pierre de Bérulle, founder of the French Oratory, Jean Jacques Olier, founder of the Society of St. Sulpice, and St. Vincent de Paul, founder of the Congregation of the Mission. The main articulator of the French spirituality of the diocesan priest was Bérulle, while Olier and St. Vincent de Paul spread its use and popularity in their work forming priestly candidates immediately prior to ordination.

Olier and Vincent de Paul began the French seminary tradition not on the Tridentine model of educating children centered around the cathedral, but rather as brief retreats for those priestly candidates about to be ordained, with a special focus on the spirituality espoused by Bérulle. The choice of focusing on older students was born of experience with the difficulty of younger students continuing through the years of formation to ordination. These candidates would have already completed their theological study at a university which, as previously mentioned, solely focused on intellectual formation. The seminary program of undetermined, but brief, length offered by Olier and de Paul helped round out the clerical preparations by presenting a spirituality specifically geared toward diocesan priesthood, centered on self-denial and the supernatural character of orders, identifying with Christ. In 1642, Olier established his seminary at his parochial church, St. Sulpice, in Paris, becoming the namesake of his community dedicated to seminary formation.[328]

---

[327] See John Tracy Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," in *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Historical Investigations*, ed. John Tracy Ellis (Collegeville, MN: Saint John's University Press, 1971), 12.

[328] See Joseph M. White, "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed," in *Reason for the Hope: The Futures of Roman Catholic Theologates*, by Katarina Schuth (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989), 12-13.

Over time, both Sulpicians and Vincentians, members of de Paul's Congregation of the Mission, were invited by bishops throughout France to establish similar seminary programs in their dioceses. Depending on the environment of the local church, candidates either completed their intellectual formation at a university or, where that was not possible, the seminary program was lengthened to include basic presentations in theology and sacramental ministry, with a practical focus, ranging in time from a few months to a few years. The goal was not so much imparting an intellectual or academic theological knowledge, but rather forming the seminarian in the *esprit ecclésiastique* or "clerical culture." In focusing on knowledge practical for priestly life and ministry, there was an implied fear of the vanity of learning and, at its extreme, a risk of anti-intellectualism.[329]

With the lengthening of the seminary course, the Sulpician and Vincentian seminaries required texts for use in the classroom. Beginning around 1680, clearly written texts or manuals were composed for use in seminary instruction, with special focus on comprehensively presenting Catholic teaching, rather than focusing on controversial questions or topics. Over the next century, the manuals tended to grow in size as the length of programs increased, and they generally reflected rigorist positions in moral theology and Gallican positions in ecclesiology.[330]

The broader intellectual climate of France during this time period of seminary development is important to mention, at least in passing. The conflicts between the Jansenists and Jesuits in the French Church, the emphasis on the rights and liberties of the French Church vis-à-vis the papacy in Gallicanism, and the hostile forces toward the church as a whole brought by rationalism and the Enlightenment, left the church in a tenuous position by the end of the 18th century and the

[329] Ibid., 13.
[330] See Joseph M. White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to the Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 18-20.

tremendous change brought by the French Revolution. The intellectual formation of diocesan priests in France was not geared toward directly confront these changing frontiers, as it was focused on applying the French spirituality of the priest and the Tridentine emphasis on sacramental and liturgical ministry. It was this "French Tradition," building on the emphases of Trent and the earlier models of clerical education, that was brought to Maryland and the beginning of American seminary formation.[331]

[331] See Walter J. Burghardt, "Towards an American Theology," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CLIX (September 1968), 184. See also Ellis, "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective," 13-14.

Appendix B: The Founding of the Catholic University of America and Clerical Formation

The first few decades of the Catholic University of America were a period of tension between the ideal and the real, between the hopes of those passionate about its founding of what it could be and the limited use that was made of it in practice. It was a period of tension between opening up to the advances of modern scholarship and continuing a tradition of clerical studies steeped in apologetic defense of the faith.

The founding of the university coincided with other educational breakthroughs both at home and abroad. On the American scene, non-Catholic universities were adapting scholarly methods from leading German universities and emphasizing research in higher education. For example, Johns Hopkins University was founded in 1876 as a modern university dedicated to the scientific pursuit of new knowledge. In a similar way, graduate schools were established at the leading existing universities, such as Chicago, Harvard, and Stanford, to pursue advanced research. In Europe, 1870s France saw the founding of new Catholic pontifical institutions, separate from the university, at Angers, Lille, Lyons, Paris, and Toulouse. In this context of broader academic advance, Catholic University was born. However, the new institute was also tethered to its past and the tradition of prior practice in American seminary life.

From the start, several factors curtailed the influence of the Catholic University to initiate the intellectual renaissance among American clergy it was hoped to carry out. First, there was limited support by American bishops. From the start, the university was associated with the Americanist wing of the hierarchy. Bishops John Keane, its first rector, and John Ireland of St. Paul, were some of its most committed supporters, figures who also advocated for the adaptation of the church to the unique circumstances of the United States, including support for the public

school system. The university, and especially its location in Washington, was naturally opposed by their ideological opponents, led by leaders such as Archbishop Corrigan of New York and Bishop McQuaid of Rochester. Moreover, German Catholics followed the lead of Archbishop Heiss of Milwaukee in opposing the university as not representing perspectives central to their cultural identity. The university saw a declining enrollment in its first three years of existence, an objective indicator of its lack of episcopal support, and few students returned for a second year after attending for a first. Enrollment concerns were only alleviated when university programs were expanded to include an undergraduate program and schools of philosophy and social work were established, drawing both lay students and members of religious communities.

A second factor in the university's limited initial impact was its identity conflict as to its central purpose. The founding vision was for it to be a place of advanced theological study for priests, a theological graduate school for those who had already completed the normal seminary course. This model followed the broader American movement for focused graduate study on the one hand, and also avoided immediate competition with other established American seminaries on the other. Roman authorities, however, envisioned the university as including also priestly candidates as in a typical seminary, awarding the typical Roman theological degrees of the bachelor's after two years, the licentiate after three, and the doctorate after four years of study. Pope Leo XIII's formal approval of the university statutes included the expressed hope that the university would accept seminarians and also affiliate with seminaries and other colleges to help promote Catholic intellectual life.

A third factor impeding broad popularity was found in day-to-day life at the early university, in the tension between being a graduate school for priests yet treating the priest-students as if they were seminarians, emphasizing discipline and good behavior over all else. The rigorous

rule of life mirrored what many of the priests experienced during their seminary studies, with most hours filled with spiritual devotion and practices, both individual and communal, following the French Sulpician tradition. Bishop Ireland argued that the quasi-military routine was meant to instill confidence in sending bishops that their priests would maintain spiritual discipline, but it was more often an obstacle to the stated purpose of advanced theological study, being more an extension of the seminary than a higher level of scholarly pursuits.

A fourth factor in its limited success was the limited pool of candidates to make use of its academic programs. A benefit of the university theology program was the awarding of pontifical degrees, up to and including the doctorate after as much as four years of study beyond the ordinary seminary course. Many diocesan priests who might have been candidates for the type of study at Catholic University were sent abroad for their seminary studies, earning the same degrees in a shorter period of time. Efforts to affiliate the university with other seminaries and institutions, especially under the rectorship of Thomas Conaty, did not yield many long-lasting results, other than the various religious communities who established houses around the university. Moreover, American religious priests from larger communities were often sent to their order's university in Rome for advanced studies rather than Washington.

Despite these shortcomings, the academic program offered at Catholic University attempted to provide meaningful theological engagement for its students to broaden their intellectual horizons. Admission into the program presupposed at least three years of foundational theological study at the seminary level, and in the first semester at the university students were given a comprehensive examination with written and oral components to demonstrate proficiency in this material, successful completion of which granted the bachelor of sacred theology degree. After the second year of study, qualifying students were able to sit for the licentiate of sacred

theology exam and, a few years into the history of the university, a dissertation requirement and oral defense of theological positions were added. The doctorate of sacred theology was earned after two additional years of study, a dissertation, and public defense of theological theses.

Students were to follow courses offered in two of four main theological areas, Scripture, dogmatic theology, moral theology, and history, with degree students choosing a specialty area. However, the academic offerings revealed a fifth factor limiting the success of the university in cultivating the theological intellect of American priests: many of the students in the program were ill-prepared for higher studies by their own seminary intellectual formation. These lacunae naturally led to professors having to lower the level of their courses to fill these lacunae, often effectively arriving at the level of a typical seminary course.

The model priest of the period, the community leader and professional, was perhaps not best pursued in the university context, focused on theological advancement and refinement. The intellectual improvement required of American clergy was not strictly academic, but rather pastorally aimed at the type of professional leadership exhibited in the parochial setting. Perhaps this distinction was a main reason why the Catholic University of America did not immediately flourish and provide the renaissance hoped for by the American church.[332]

[332] See Joseph M. White, *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to the Present* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989), 160, 189-208.

Appendix C: Figures on Seminary Curriculum and Faculty, 2019-2020

(Companion to Chapter 5)

A.1. St. Joseph's Seminary, New York

Figure 5.1: St. Joseph's Seminary -- 2019-2020 Course Distribution by Area (Total of 126 Credits)[333]

	# of Courses in Curriculum	Credits Required in Curriculum	% of Total Theology Curriculum Credits
Scripture	8	21	16.7
Dogmatic Theology	6	17	13.5
Moral Theology	5	12	09.5
Liturgical/Sacramental Theology	10	20	15.9
Church History	4	10	07.9
Canon Law	2	6	04.8
Homiletics	3	6	04.8
Pastoral Language	8	8	06.4
Pastoral Field Education	7	7	05.6
Electives	4	12	09.5
"Other" Areas	4	7	05.6

[333] See *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*, 28, https://d2y1pz2y630308.cloudfront.net/16540/documents/2019/12/StJosephs_Bulletin_2019_LR.pdf.

Figure 5.2: St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Vocational Makeup[334]

	Professor	Associate Professor	Total	% of Teaching Faculty
Diocesan Priests	10	1	11	57.9
Religious Priests	1	0	1	05.3
Permanent Deacons	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Women	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Men	1	0	1	05.3
Lay Women	1	3	4	21.1
Lay Men	2	0	2	10.5
Total	15	4	19	x

[334] See ibid., 10-12, 41.

Figure 5.3: St. Joseph's Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Highest Level Degrees[335]

	Professor	Associate Professor	Total	% of Teaching Faculty
Ecclesiastical Doctorate (includes candidates)	8	0	8	42.1
Ecclesiastical Licentiate (includes candidates)	3	0	3	15.8
Ecclesiastical Licentiate + Other Doctorate (includes candidates)	2	0	2	10.5
PhD	2	1	3	15.8
Other Doctorate	0	1	1	05.3
Master's Degree	0	2	2	10.5

[335] See ibid.

Figure 5.4: St. Joseph's Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Institution of Post-Master's Study[336]

	Professor	Associate Professor	Total	% of Teaching Faculty
Roman University/ Institution	13	0	13	68.4
Other European University	0	0	0	00.0
American University - Catholic	3	1	4	21.1
American University - non-Catholic	1	1	2	10.5

[336] See ibid.

A.2. St. Patrick's Seminary and University, California

Figure 5.5: St. Patrick's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Course Distribution by Area (Total of 130 Credits)[337]

	# of Courses in Ordination Curriculum	Credits Required in Ordination Curriculum	% of Total Theology Ordination Curriculum Credits
Scripture	7	21	16.2
Moral/Spiritual Theology	6	18	13.9
Dogmatic-Liturgical-Historical Theology	Dogmatic Theology -- 7 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 7 Historical Theology -- 5	Dogmatic Theology -- 19 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 20 Historical Theology -- 14	Dogmatic Theology -- 14.6 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 15.4 Historical Theology -- 10.8 Combined Total -- 40.8
Pastoral Studies	Pastoral Theology -- 4 Canon Law -- 2 Field Education/Pastoral Year/Practica -- 12 Homiletics -- 3	Pastoral Theology -- 9 Canon Law -- 6 Field Education/Pastoral Year/Practica -- 16 Homiletics -- 7	Pastoral Theology -- 06.9 Canon Law -- 04.6 Field Education/Pastoral Year/Practica -- 12.3 Homiletics -- 05.4 Combined Total -- 29.2
Electives	0	0	00.00

[337] See *St. Patrick's Seminary & University, Academic Catalog 2019-2021*, 35, https://www.stpsu.edu/site-images/2019-2021-Academic-Catalog-Final.pdf.

Figure 5.6: St. Patrick's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Vocational Makeup[338]

	Administration/ Directors[339]	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Diocesan Priests	5	0	0	0	5	25.0
Religious Priests	3	0	1	1	5	25.0
Permanent Deacons	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Women	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Men	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Lay Women	1	1	0	1	3	15.0
Lay Men	2	1	0	4	7	35.0
Total	11	2	1	6	20	x

[338] See "St. Patrick's Seminary and University Faculty Directory" at https://www.stpsu.edu/faculty.
[339] A faculty member is placed into this category if they do not have a specific teaching title.

Figure 5.7: St. Patrick's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Highest Level Degrees[340]

	Administration/ Directors	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Ecclesiastical Doctorate (includes candidates)	3	1	1	2	7	35.0
Ecclesiastical Licentiate (includes candidates)	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Ecclesiastical Licentiate + Other Doctorate (includes candidates)	0	1	0	0	1	05.0
PhD	3	0	0	4	7	35.0
Other Doctorate	1	0	0	0	1	05.0
Master's Degree	3	0	0	0	3	15.0

[340] See ibid.

Figure 5.8: St. Patrick's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Institution of Post-Master's Study[341]

	Administration/ Directors	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Roman University/ Institution	3	1	1	1	6	30.0
Other European University	0	1	0	1	2	10.0
American University - Catholic	2	0	0	4	6	30.0
American University - non-Catholic	1	0	0	0	1	05.0
"Other"	1	0	0	0	1	05.0

[341] See ibid.

B.1. The Saint Paul Seminary, Minnesota

Figure 5.9: The Saint Paul Seminary -- 2019-2020 Course Distribution by Area (Total of 122 Credits)[342]

	# of Courses in Ordination Curriculum	Credits Required in Ordination Curriculum	% of Total Theology Ordination Curriculum Credits
Scripture	6	18	14.8
Dogmatic Theology	6	18	14.8
Moral Theology	4	12	09.8
Church History	3	9	07.4
Spiritual Theology	2	5	04.1
Pastoral Theology	Pastoral Theology -- 3 Field Education/Practica -- 8 Special Programs/Seminars -- 4 Canon Law -- 2 Homiletics -- 2	Pastoral Theology -- 6 Field Education/Practica -- 8 Special Programs/Seminars -- 6 Canon Law -- 5 Homiletics -- 5	Pastoral Theology -- 04.9 Field Education/Practica -- 06.6 Special Programs/Seminars -- 04.9 Canon Law -- 04.1 Homiletics -- 04.1 Total -- 24.6
Sacramental Theology	7	18	14.8
Electives	4	12	09.8

[342] See "The Saint Paul Seminary School of Divinity: Master of Divinity Four Year Curriculum Overview," https://semssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/REVISED-MDiv-Curriculum-Overview_matriculating-2016-and-after_notes-removed.pdf.

Figure 5.10: The Saint Paul Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty[343] -- Vocational Makeup[344]

	Administrators /Directors/ Formators[345]	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total	% of Faculty
Diocesan Priests	6	0	1	1	2	10	47.6
Religious Priests	0	0	0	0	1	1	04.8
Permanent Deacons	0	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Men	0	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Lay Women	0	2	0	0	0	2	09.5
Lay Men	3	3	1	1	0	8	38.1
Total	9	5	2	2	3	21	x

[343] The faculty statistics used in these charts for The Saint Paul Seminary does not include those listed as "Professors Emeriti" and "Affiliate Faculty," the former, because they are retired from full-time teaching service, and the latter, because they are largely from the University of St. Thomas Philosophy Department.

[344] See "Saint Paul Seminary: Faculty & Staff," https://semssp.org/sps/faculty-staff-sps/.

[345] A faculty member is placed into this category if they do not have a specific teaching title.

Figure 5.11: The Saint Paul Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Highest Level Degrees[346]

	Administrators /Directors/ Formators	Professo r	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total	% of Faculty
Ecclesiastical Doctorate (includes candidates)	1	1	0	1	0	3	14.3
Ecclesiastical Licentiate (includes candidates)	2	0	1	0	1	4	19.0
Ecclesiastical Licentiate + Other Doctorate (includes candidates)	0	0	0	0	2	2	09.5
PhD	1	4	1	1	0	7	33.3
Other Doctorate	1	0	0	0	0	1	04.8
Master's Degree	4	0	0	0	0	4	19.0

[346] See "The Saint Paul Seminary: Faculty & Staff," https://semssp.org/sps/faculty-staff-sps/. See also "The Saint Paul Seminary 2018-2019 Annual Report," 13.

Figure 5.12: The Saint Paul Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Institution of Post-Master's Study[347]

	Administrators /Directors/ Formators	Professo r	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total	% of Faculty
Roman University/ Institution	3	0	1	1	2	6	28.6
Other European University	0	1	0	0	0	1	04.8
American University - Catholic	1	3	1	1	1	7	33.3
American University - non-Catholic	1	1	0	0	1	3	14.3

[347] See ibid.

B.2. Immaculate Conception Seminary, New Jersey

Figure 5.13:Immaculate Conception Seminary -- 2019-2020 Course Distribution by Area (Total of 126 Credits)[348]

	# of Courses in Ordination Curriculum	Credits Required in Ordination Curriculum	% of Total Theology Ordination Curriculum Credits
Scripture	6	18	14.3
Systematic Theology	Systematic Theology -- 7 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 6	Systematic Theology -- 20 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 18	Systematic Theology -- 15.9 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 14.3 Total -- 30.2
Moral Theology	6	18	14.3
Church History	4	12	09.5
Pastoral Theology	Pastoral Theology -- 8 Spirituality -- 1 Canon Law -- 2 Homiletics -- 3	Pastoral Theology -- 22 Spirituality -- 3 Canon Law -- 6 Homiletics -- 6	Pastoral Theology -- 17.5 Spirituality -- 02.4 Canon Law -- 04.8 Homiletics -- 04.8 Total -- 29.5
Electives[349]	1	3	02.4

[348] See "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology: Master of Divinity," in *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 311-312, https://www.shu.edu/academics/upload/Graduate-Catalogue-2019-2020.pdf.

[349] As mentioned in the body of the text of Chapter 5, there are technically five electives built into the ordination theology curriculum, but one elective must be chosen from each of the four theological areas of moral theology, spirituality, church history, and systematic theology. These four "area" electives are included on this chart in the course requirements from their respective fields.There is, therefore, only one "free" elective that does not have to fall within a specific subject area. See "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology: Master of Divinity," in *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 312.

Figure 5.14: Immaculate Conception Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty[350] -- Vocational Makeup[351]

	Administration/ Directors[352]	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Diocesan Priests	3	3	3	3	12	60.0
Religious Priests	0	0	1	0	1	05.0
Permanent Deacons	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Women	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Men	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Lay Women	0	0	0	1	1	05.0
Lay Men	0	1	3	2	6	30.0
Total	3	4	7	6	20	x

[350] The faculty statistics used in these charts for Immaculate Conception Seminary does not include those listed as faculty for undergraduate theology programs.
[351] See the "Theology Faculty" directory at https://www.shu.edu/theology/faculty.cfm.
[352] A faculty member is placed into this category if they do not have a specific teaching title.

Figure 5.15: Immaculate Conception Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Highest Level Degrees[353]

	Administration/ Directors	Professo r	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Ecclesiastical Doctorate (includes candidates)	0	2	3	3	8	40.0
Ecclesiastical Licentiate (includes candidates)	0	0	0	1	1	05.0
Ecclesiastical Licentiate + Other Doctorate (includes candidates)	1	1	2	0	4	20.0
PhD	0	1	2	2	5	25.0
Other Doctorate (includes candidates)	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Master's Degree	2	0	0	0	2	10.0

[353] See the "Theology Faculty" directory at https://www.shu.edu/theology/faculty.cfm.

Figure 5.16: Immaculate Conception Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Institution of Post-Master's Study[354]

	Administration/ Directors	Professo r	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Roman University/ Institution	1	1	3	5	10	50.0
Other European University	0	1	2	0	3	15.0
American University - Catholic	1	2	3	1	7	35.0
American University - non-Catholic	0	1	0	0	1	05.0

[354] See ibid.

C.1. St. Mary's Seminary and University, Maryland[355]

Figure 5.17: St. Mary's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Course Distribution by Area (Total of 122 Credits)[356]

	# of Courses in Ordination Curriculum	Credits Required in Ordination Curriculum	% of Total Theology Ordination Curriculum Credits
Scripture	8	22.5	18.4
Systematic and Liturgical Theology	Systematic Theology -- 9[357] Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 4	Systematic Theology -- 24 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 14	Systematic Theology -- 19.7 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 11.5 Total -- 31.2
Moral and Spiritual Theology	Moral Theology -- 6[358] Spiritual Theology -- 1	Moral Theology -- 18 Spiritual Theology -- 1.5	Moral Theology -- 14.8 Spiritual Theology -- 01.2 Total -- 16.0
Church History	3	9	07.4
Pastoral Theology	Pastoral Theology -- 6 Canon Law -- 2 Homiletics -- 2 Field Education -- 4	Pastoral Theology -- 12 Canon Law -- 6 Homiletics -- 6 Field Education -- 6	Pastoral Theology -- 09.8 Canon Law -- 04.9 Homiletics -- 04.9 Field Education -- 04.9 Total -- 24.5
Electives[359]	1	3	02.5

[355] See Footnote 1 of Chapter 5.

[356] See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 11, 17, http://www.stmarys.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SOT-catalog-2019.revB_.pdf.

[357] The required courses in systematic theology include one elective.

[358] The required courses in moral theology include one elective and, interestingly, the core class on the Sacrament of Reconciliation.

[359] There are technically three electives built into the M.Div. ordination theology curriculum, but one elective must be chosen from each of the two theological areas of moral theology and systematic theology. These two "area" electives are included in the course requirements from their particular fields.There is, therefore, only one "free" elective that does not have to fall within a specific subject area. See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 17.

Figure 5.18: St. Mary's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Vocational Makeup[360]

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total	% of Faculty
Sulpicians	0	6	1	0	7	41.2
Diocesan Priests	0	2	0	1	3	17.6
Religious Priests	2	1	0	0	3	17.6
Permanent Deacons	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Protestant Ministers	1	0	0	0	1	05.9
Religious - Women	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Religious - Men	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Lay Women	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Lay Men	1	1	1	0	3	17.6
Total	4	10	2	1	17	x

[360] See *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 56-58.

Figure 5.19: St. Mary's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Highest Level Degrees[361]

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total	% of Faculty
Eccl. Doc.	1	4	0	0	5	29.4
Eccl. Doc. + other Doc(s).	1	2	0	0	3	17.6
Eccl. Lic.	0	0	1	0	1	05.9
Eccl. Lic. + other Doc(s).	0	4	0	1	5	29.4
PhD	2	0	1	0	3	17.6
Other Doctorate (includes candidates)	0	0	0	0	0	00.0
Master's Degree	0	0	0	0	0	00.0

[361] See ibid.

Figure 5.20: St. Mary's Seminary and University -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Institution of Post-Master's Study[362]

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor	Total	% of Faculty
Roman University/ Institution	2	3	1	0	6	35.3
Other European University	0	1	0	0	1	05.9
American University - Catholic	0	6	1	1	8	47.1
American University - non-Catholic	3	2	0	1	6	35.3
"Other"	1	0	0	0	1	05.9

[362] See ibid.

C.2. Mount Angel Seminary, Oregon

Figure 5.21: Mount Angel Seminary -- 2019-2020 Course Distribution by Area (Total of 117 Credits)[363]

	# of Courses in Ordination Curriculum	Credits Required in Ordination Curriculum	% of Total Theology Ordination Curriculum Credits
Systematic Theology	Systematic Theology -- 9 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 5 Moral Theology -- 4 Spiritual Theology -- 1	Systematic Theology -- 22 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 11 Moral Theology -- 11 Spiritual Theology -- 2	Systematic Theology -- 18.8 Liturgical/Sacramental Theology -- 09.4 Moral Theology -- 09.4 Spiritual Theology -- 01.7 Total -- 39.3
Scripture	7	18	15.4
Historical Theology	4	9	07.7
Canon Law	2	6	05.1
Pastoral Theology	Pastoral Theology -- 3 Preaching/Presiding -- 5	Pastoral Theology -- 7 Preaching/Presiding -- 15	Pastoral Theology -- 06.0 Preaching/Presiding -- 12.8 Total -- 18.8
Electives	3	6	05.1
Field Education	8	8	06.8
Comp. Exam	2	2	01.7

[363] See *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 89-90, 92-94, https://www.mountangelabbey.org/wp-content/uploads/MAS-CATALOG-2019-2020-C.pdf.

Figure 5.22: Mount Angel Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty[364] -- Vocational Makeup[365]

	Administrator/ Director[366]	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Diocesan Priests	0	0	1	1	2	12.5
Religious Priests	0	1	0	1	2	12.5
Permanent Deacons	0	1	0	0	1	06.3
Religious - Women	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
Religious - Men	0	0	1	0	1	06.3
Lay Women	2	0	1	1	4	25.0
Lay Men	0	3	3	0	6	37.5
Total	2	5	6	3	16	x

[364] The total faculty reflected in these charts includes those who teach in a full-time capacity in the philosophy and graduate theology programs with a title of at least assistant professor as listed in the *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 131-137.
[365] See “Faculty” in *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 131-137.
[366] A full-time faculty member is placed into this category if they do not have a specific teaching title.

Figure 5.23: Mount Angel Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Highest Level Degrees[367]

	Administrator/ Director	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Eccl. Doc.	0	1	0	0	1	06.3
Eccl. Lic.	0	1	0	1	2	12.5
Eccl. Lic. + other Doc(s).	0	0	2	0	2	12.5
PhD/ThD	0	2	4	0	6	37.5
Other Doctorate	1	1	0	1	3	18.8
Master's Degree	1	0	0	1	2	12.5

[367] See "Faculty" in *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*, 131-137.

Figure 5.24: Mount Angel Seminary -- 2019-2020 Faculty -- Educational Training: Institution of Post-Master's Study[368]

	Administrator/ Director	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Total	% of Faculty
Roman University/ Institution	0	1	1	1	3	18.8
Other European University	0	4	2	0	6	37.5
American University - Catholic	1	0	3	1	5	31.3
American University - non-Catholic	0	0	1	0	1	06.3
"Other"	0	0	1	0	1	06.3

[368] See ibid.

Bibliography

The 1917 or Pio-Benedictine Code of Canon Law in English Translation. Translated by Edward N. Peters. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2001.

Ahern, Niall. "Seminary Education According to the Second Vatican Council and *Pastores Dabo Vobis*." In *The Formation Journey of the Priest: Exploring* Pastores Dabo Vobis, edited by Bede McGregor OP and Thomas Norris, 142-61. Dublin: The Columbia Press, 1994.

Alzog, Johannes Baptist. *Manual of Universal Church History, 3 Volumes*. Cincinnati, 1874-78.

Athans, B.V.M., Mary Christine. *"To Work for the Whole People": John Ireland's Seminary in St. Paul*. New York: Paulist Press, 2002.

Barry, John A. "The Implementation by Episcopal Conferences of the Conciliar Decree *Optatam totius*." *Studia Canonica* 18 no. 2 (1984): 291-324.

Beal, John. "Catholic Theological Faculties in the United States." *Studia Canonica* 37, no. 2 (2003): 443-466.

Boadt, C.S.P., Lawrence E. "Biblical Studies in University and Seminary Theology." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 256-65. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Boere, John C. "A Survey of the Content and Organization of the Curriculum of the Theological Departments of Major Seminaries in the United States of America." M.A. thesis, Catholic University of America, 1963.

Boyle, Michael J. and Anthony Dosen. "Preparing Priests to Work with Catholic Schools: A Content Analysis of Seminary Curricula." *Journal of Catholic Education* 20, no. 2 (March 2017): 109-125.

Brennan, Joseph. "Women in the Seminary: A Roman Catholic Perspective." *Theological Education* 11, no. 2 (Wint 1975): 96-100.

Browne, Henry J., ed. "The Archdiocese of New York a Century Ago: A Memoir of Archbishop Hughes, 1838-1858." In *Historical Records and Studies* 49-50 (1950).

Burghardt, Walter J. "Towards an American Theology." *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CLIX (September 1968).

Busch, William. "Liturgy in Our Seminaries." *Orate Fratres* 22, no. 7 (May 1948): 291-297.

Byrne, Edward J. "The Curriculum of Scriptural Studies in Our Seminaries I." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (Jul 1939): 214-222.

------. "The Curriculum of Scriptural Studies in Our Seminaries II." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (Oct 1939): 333-341.

Callahan, Nelson J. *A Case for Due Process in the Church: Father Eugene O'Callaghan, American Pioneer of Dissent*. Staten Island, NY: Society of St. Paul, 1971.

Carey, Patrick W. *Catholics in America: A History*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004.

Cassidy, Francis P. "Catholic Education in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore I." *Catholic Historical Review* 35 (October 1948): 266-272.

Ciani, S.J., John. "Cardinal Camillo Mazzella, S.J." In *Varieties of Ultramontanism*, edited by Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., 103-17. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

Code of Canon Law: New English Translation. Washington DC: Canon Law Society of America, 1998.

Cone, Edward A. "The Diocesan Clergy in Secondary Education." M.A thesis, Catholic University of America, 1935.

Congregation for Catholic Education. *Directives Concerning the Preparation of Seminary Educators*. November 4, 1993. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/preparation.pdf.

------. *Final Report: Apostolic Visitation of American Seminaries*. December 15, 2008. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/Final-Seminary-Visitation-Report.pdf.

------. *Guidelines for the Study and Teaching of the Church's Social Doctrine in the Formation of Priests*. Washington, DC: Office for Publishing and Promotion Services, United States Catholic Conference, 1989.

------. *Instruction on Liturgical Formation in Seminaries* (1979). In *Liturgical Formation in Seminaries: A Commentary*. Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1984.

------. *Instruction on the Study of the Fathers of the Church in the Formation of Priests*. November 10, 1989. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/fathers.pdf.

------. *Norms for Priestly Formation: A Compendium of Official Documents on Training*

Candidates for the Priesthood. Washington, DC: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1982.

------. *The Theological Formation of Future Priests*. February 22, 1976. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/theological.pdf.

Congregation for the Clergy. *The Gift of the Priestly Vocation: Ratio Fundamentalis Institutionis Sacerdotalis*. Vatican City: L'Osservatore Romano, 2016. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.clerus.va/content/dam/clerus/Ratio%20Fundamentalis/The%20Gift%20of%20the%20Priestly%20Vocation.pdf.

Connelly, James. *The Visit of Archbishop Gaetano Bedini to the United States of America, June, 1853-February, 1854*. Rome: Universita Gregoriana, 1954.

Connors, Joseph Michael. "Catholic Homiletic Theory in Historical Perspective." Ph.D. diss., Northwestern University, 1962.

Copeland, M. Shawn. "Theological Education of African American Catholics." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 318-39. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Dansette, Adrien. *Religious History of Modern France*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961.

D'Antonio, William V., et al. *Laity American and Catholic: Transforming the Church*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1996.

de Ridder-Symoens, Hilde, ed. *A History of the University in Europe: Volume II, Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500-1800)*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

DeVito, Michael. *The New York Review (1905-1908)*. New York: United States Catholic Historical Society, 1977.

Dick, John A. "The Continuing Education of Priests and the American College." *Louvain Studies* 17 (1992): 10-17.

Dillon, J.T. *House of Formation: A Catholic Seminary in the 1950s*. Riverside, CA: University of California Riverside Press, 2003.

Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1985.

Doran, Austin C. "The Integration of Theology and Spirituality: a View from the Seminary." In

Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 308-17. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Downey, James. "The Creeping Curriculum." *African Ecclesial Review* 24, no. 6 (Dec 1982): 324-336.

------. "The Seminary Curriculum and the Ministry." *African Ecclesial Review* 19, no. 1 (Feb 1977): 23-31.

Dulles, S.J., Avery. "Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 10-22. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Egan, Keith J. "The Divorce of Spirituality from Theology." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 296-307. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Ellis, John Tracy. *American Catholicism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.

------. *Catholics in Colonial America*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1965.

------. "The Formation of the American Priest: An Historical Perspective." In *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Historical Investigations*, edited by John Tracy Ellis, 3-110. Collegeville, MN: Saint John's University Press, 1971.

------. *The Formative Years of the Catholic University of America*. Washington: American Catholic Historical Association, 1946.

------. "A Short History of Seminary Education: I -- The Apostolic Age to Trent." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 1-29. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

------. "A Short History of Seminary Education: II -- Trent to Today." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 30-81. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

Fogarty, S.J. Gerald P. "Cardinal William Henry O'Connell." In *Varieties of Ultramontanism*, edited by Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., 118-46. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

------. "The Vatican and the American Church Since World War II." In *The Papacy and the Church in the United States*, edited by Bernard Cooke, 119-40. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

------. *The Vatican and the American Hierarchy From 1870-1965*. Stuttgart, Germany:

Anton Hiersemann, 1982.

Ford, John C. “Teaching Liturgy in the Seminary.” *Orate Fratres* 21, no. 7 (May 1947): 289-299.

Fraser, James W. *Schooling the Preachers: The Development of Protestant Theological Education in the United States 1740-1875*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988.

Fuerst, Adrian, ed. *CARA Seminary Directory*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, 1984.

------, ed. *CARA Seminary Directory 1987: US Catholic Institutions for the Training of Candidates for the Priesthood*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate.

Gaffey, James P. *Men of Menlo: Transformation of an American Seminary*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1992.

Gagnon, Paul A. *France Since 1789*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Gannon, Michael V. “Before and After Modernism: The Intellectual Isolation of the American Priest.” In *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Historical Investigations*, edited by John Tracy Ellis, 293-383. Collegeville, MN: Saint John’s University Press, 1971.

George, Francis Cardinal. “The Promotion of Missiological Studies in Seminaries.” *Mission Studies* 16, no. 2 (1999): 13-27.

Gleason, Philip. “Catholic Higher Education as Historical Context for Theological Education.” In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 23-33. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

------, ed. *Documentary Reports on Early American Catholicism*. New York: Arno Press, 1978.

Goizueta, Roberto S. “Catholic Theological Education and U.S. Hispanics.” In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 340-50. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Good, James. “Vatican II and Seminary Training.” *African Ecclesial Review* 25, no 3 (1983): 134-46.

Guilday, Peter. *A History of the Councils of Baltimore*. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Hanley, Thomas O’Brien, ed. *John Carroll Papers*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame

Press, 1976.

Heck, O.S.B., Theodore. *The Curriculum of the Major Seminary in Relation to Contemporary Conditions*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1935.

Healey, S.J., Charles J. *Pope St. John XXIII National Seminary: The First Fifty Years (1964-2014)*. Weston, MA: The Seminary Press, 2014.

Heft, S.M., James L. "From the Pope to the Bishops: Episcopal Authority from Vatican I to Vatican II." In *The Papacy and the Church in the United States*, edited by Bernard Cooke, 55-78. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Heisey, Daniel J. *Saint Vincent Seminary From its Origins to the Present*. Latrobe, PA: Saint Vincent Archabbey Publications, 2006.

Hemrick, Eugene F. and James J. Walsh. *Seminarians in the Nineties: A National Study of Seminarians in Theology*. A Study Conducted by the National Catholic Educational Association and Funded by the Lilly Endowment, 1993.

------ and Dean R. Hoge. *Seminarians in Theology: A National Profile*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1986.

------ and Dean R. Hoge. *Seminary Life and Visions of the Priesthood: A National Survey of Seminarians*. National Catholic Educational Association. 1987.

Hennesey, S.J., James. *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

------. *Rome and the Origins of the United States Hierarchy*. In *The Papacy and the Church in the United States*, edited by Bernard Cooke, 79-97. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Hogan, S.S., J.B. *Clerical Studies*. Boston: Merlier & Company, 1898.

Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition. *Lamentabili Sane Exitu*. July 1907. Accessed June 28, 2020. https://www.papalencyclicals.net/pius10/p10lamen.htm.

Hurley, O.M.I., Denis E. and Joseph Cunnane. *Vatican II On Priests and Seminaries*. Chicago: Scepter Books, 1967.

Hussey, M. Edmund. *A History of the Seminaries of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati, 1829-1979*. Norwood, OH, 1979.

Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology. "Immaculate Conception Seminary School of Theology." In *Seton Hall University Graduate Catalog 2019-2020*, 306-327. Accessed June 28, 2020. https://www.shu.edu/academics/upload/Graduate-Catalogue-2019-2020.pdf.

Jewell, Marti. "Practical Theology: Preparing Ministers for Today's Church." *Theological Education* 51, no. 2 (2018): 19-23.

John Paul II. *Fides et Ratio*. September 14, 1998. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_14091998_fides-et-ratio.html.

------. *Pastores Dabo Vobis*. March 25, 1992. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_jp-ii_exh_25031992_pastores-dabo-vobis.html.

Johnson, Peter Leo. *Halcyon Days: Story of St. Francis Seminary Milwaukee 1856-1956*. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956.

Kaplan, Grant. "The Renewal of Ecclesiastical Studies: Chenu, Tübingen, and Theological Method in *Optatam Totius*." *Theological Studies* 77 no 3 (2016): 567-92.

Kauffman, Christopher J. *Tradition and Transformation in Catholic Culture: The Priests of Saint Sulpice in the United States from 1791 to the Present*. New York: Macmillan Publishers, 1988.

Kopfensteiner, Thomas R. "Institutional Resources in the Seminary." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 207-12. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Kramarek, Michael J. and Mary L. Gautier. *Catholic Ministry Formation Enrollment: Statistical Overview for 2018-2019*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, 2019. Accessed June 28, 2020. https://cara.georgetown.edu/StatisticalOverview201819.pdf.

Lamb, Matthew L. "Challenges for Catholic Graduate Theological Education." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 108-130. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Lamberigts, Mathijs. "*Optatam Totius*, The Decree on Priestly Formation: A Short Survey of Its History at the Second Vatican Council. *Louvain Studies* 30 (2005): 25-48.

Larkin, Emmet. "Cardinal Paul Cullen." In *Varieties of Ultramontanism*, edited by Jeffrey von Arx, S.J., 61-84. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998.

Lawrence, Emeric. "New Directions for Religious Education." *Worship* 37, no. 5 (Apr 1963): 300-306.

Lee, James Michael. "Curriculum and Teaching in Seminary Education." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 353-404. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

------. "Overview of Educational Problems in Seminaries: I -- Objectives and Administration." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 82-117. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

------. "Overview of Educational Problems in Seminaries: II -- Administration." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 118-69. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

Lehner, Ulrich L. *The Catholic Enlightenment: The Forgotten History of a Global Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Leo XIII. *Immortale Dei*. November 1, 1885. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://w2.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_01111885_immortale-dei.html.

------. *Providentissimus Deus*. November 18, 1893. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_l-xiii_enc_18111893_providentissimus-deus.html.

------. *Testem Benevolentiae*. January 22, 1899. Accessed June 28, 2020. https://www.papalencyclicals.net/leo13/l13teste.htm.

Lienhard, S.J., Joseph T. "Historical Theology in the Curriculum." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 266-79. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Lind, O.S.B., Christopher. *Priestly Studies in Modern Papal Teachings*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1958.

Littell, Franklin H. "Protestant Seminary Education in America." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 533-56. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

Lonergan, Bernard. *A Second Collection*. Edited by W.F.J. Ryan and B.J. Tyrell. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.

Maly, Eugene. "Methods of Teaching Sacred Scripture." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 16, no. 1 (Jan 1954): 46-51.

Mansi, Joannes Dominicus. *Sacrorum Conciliorum Nova et Amplissima Collectio, Vol. I*. Paris and Leipzig: Welter, 1902.

Markham, James J. *The Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities of Studies*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1957.

Marthaler, O.F.M.Conv., Berard L. "Catechesis Isn't Just for Children Anymore." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 50-66. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Massa, Mark S. and Catherine Osborne, eds. *American Catholic History: A Documentary Reader, Second Edition*. New York: New York University Press, 2017.

------. *The Structure of Theological Revolutions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

McAvoy, C.S.C., Thomas T. *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

McCarthy, Jeremiah J. et al. "The Public Character of Theological Education: A Perspective from Roman Catholic Schools of Theology and Seminaries." *Theological Education* 37, no. 1 (2000): 17-32.

McCool, Gerald A. *Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century: The Quest for a Unitary Method*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1977.

McDonald, Lloyd. *The Seminary Movement in the United States: Projects, Foundations and Early Development, 1784-1833*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1927.

McKenzie, S.J., John L. "Theology in the Seminary Curriculum." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 405-28. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

McNamara, Robert F. *The American College in Rome, 1855-1955*. Rochester: Christopher Press, 1956.

Miller, Glenn T. *Piety and Profession: American Protestant Theological Education, 1870-1970*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.

Mitchell, Nathan. "Liturgical Education in Roman Catholic Seminaries: A Report and an Appraisal." *Worship* 54, no. 2 (Mar 1980): 129-157.

------. "Teaching Worship in Seminaries: A Response." *Worship* 55, no. 4 (Jul 1981): 319-324.
Murphy, Charles. M. *Models of Priestly Formation: Past, Present, and Future*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2006.

Mount Angel Seminary. *Mount Angel Seminary: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*. Accessed June

28, 2020. https://www.mountangelabbey.org/wp-content/uploads/MAS-CATALOG-2019-2020-C.pdf.

Murnion, Philip J. *The Catholic Priest and the Changing Structure of Pastoral Ministry, New York, 1920-1970.* New York: Arno Press, 1978.

National Catholic Welfare Conference, Department of Education. *Summary of Catholic Education 1962 and 1963*. Washington, 1963.

National Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Liturgical Formation in Seminaries: A Commentary*. 1984.

------. *Program of Priestly Formation*. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1971.

------. *Program of Priestly Formation, 2nd*. Washington, D.C.: National Conference of Catholic Bishops, 1976.

------. *Program of Priestly Formation, 3rd Edition*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1982.

------. *Program of Priestly Formation, 4th Edition*. Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1993.

Norris, Tom. "Intellectual Formation: Understanding the Faith." In *The Formation Journey of the Priest: Exploring Pastores Dabo Vobis*, edited by Bede McGregor OP and Thomas Norris, 162-74.

O'Connell, Marvin R. "John Ireland, the Vatican, and the French Connection." In *The Papacy and the Church in the United States*, edited by Bernard Cooke, 99-117. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

O'Connell, William Henry. *Recollections of Seventy Years*. Boston, 1934.

O'Donohoe, James A. *Tridentine Seminary Legislation: Its Sources and Its Formation, Bibliotheca Ephermeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, Vol. 9*. Louvain, 1957.

O'Hanlon, John. *Life and Scenery in Missouri; Reminiscences of a Missionary Priest*. Dublin, 1890.

O'Toole, James M. *The Faithful: A History of Catholics in America*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2008.

Pius X. *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*. September 8, 1907. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/content/pius-x/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-x_enc_19070908_pascendi-dominici-gregis.html.

Pius XI. *Ad Catholici Sacerdotii*. December 20, 1935. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://w2.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xi_enc_19351220_ad-catholici-sacerdotii.html.

Pius XII. *Divino Afflante Spiritu*. September 30, 1943). Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_30091943_divino-afflante-spiritu.html.

------. *Mystici Corporis Christi*. June 29, 1943). Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-xii_enc_29061943_mystici-corporis-christi.html.

Plenary Council of Baltimore. *Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis II. . . . Acta et Decreta*. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1868.

------. *Concilium Plenarium Totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae, Baltimori Habitum Anno 1852*. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1853.

Portier, William L. "Church Unity and National Traditions: The Challenge to the Modern Papacy, 1682-1870." In *The Papacy and the Church in the United States*, edited by Bernard Cooke, 25-54. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

Potvin, Raymond. "Role Uncertainty and Commitment Among Seminary Faculty." *SA. Sociological Analysis* 37, no. 1 (Spr 1976): 45-52.

------. *Seminarians of the Eighties: A National Survey*. Washington, DC: National Catholic Educational Association, 1985.

Putz, C.S.C., Louis J. "The Layman in Seminary Education." In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 506-32. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.

Rashdall, Hastings. *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, Vol. I*. Edited by F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.

Reher, Margaret Mary. *Catholic Intellectual Life in America: A Historical Study of Persons and Movements*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.

Riebe-Estrella, Gary. "The Challenge of Ministerial Formation." *Missiology* 20, no. 2 (Apr 1992): 269-274.

Saint Joseph's Seminary. *St. Joseph's Seminary Dunwoodie: 2019-2020 Bulletin*. Accessed June 28, 2020. https://d2y1pz2y630308.cloudfront.net/16540/documents/2019/12/StJosephs_Bulletin_2019_LR.pdf.

Saint Mary's Seminary and University. *St. Mary's Seminary and University, The School of Theology and The Ecclesiastical Theological Faculty: Academic Catalog 2019-2020*. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.stmarys.edu/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/SOT-catalog-2019.revB_.pdf.

Saint Patrick's Seminary. *St. Patrick's Seminary & University, Academic Catalog 2019-2021*. Accessed June 28, 2020. https://www.stpsu.edu/site-images/2019-2021-Academic-Catalog-Final.pdf.

Sanks, S.J., T. Howland. "Education for Ministry Since Vatican II." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 481-500.

Sauter, John D. *The American College of Louvain, 1857-1898*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1959.

Scanlan, Arthur J. *St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York, 1896-1921, with an Account of the Other Seminaries of New York*. New York: United States Catholic Historical Society, 1922.

Scannell, T.B. *The Priest's Studies*. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1908.

Schner, S.J., George P. *Education for Ministry: Reform and Renewal in Theological Education*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed & Ward, 1993.

Schoenbechler, Roger. "Promotion of the Liturgical Movement in Our Seminaries." *Orate Fratres* 7, no. 10 (1933): 455-465.

Schroeder, Henry J., ed. *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*. Charlotte, NC: TAN Books, 1978.

Schuth, O.S.F., Katarina. *Reason for the Hope: The Futures of Roman Catholic Theologates*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989.

------. *Seminary Formation: Recent History-- Current Circumstances-- New Directions*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2016.

------. *Seminaries, Theologates, and the Future of Church Ministry: An Analysis of Trends and Transitions*. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

------. "Theological Faculty and Programs in Seminaries." In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 168-89. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Seminarian's Reading List: Major Seminary, Revised Edition. St. Meinrad, IN: Grail Publication, 1945.

Senn, Frank. “Teaching Worship in Seminaries: A Response.” *Worship* 55, no. 4 (Jul 1981): 325-332.

Sexton, John E. and Arthur J. Riley. *History of Saint John’s Seminary Brighton*. Boston: Roman Catholic Archbishop of Boston, 1945.

Shelley, Thomas J. *Dunwoodie: The History of St. Joseph’s Seminary, Yonkers, New York*. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1993.

Skudlarek, William. “Homiletics in the Roman Catholic Seminary.” *Worship* 46, no. 2 (Feb 1972): 77-85.

Smith, John Talbot. *The Training of a Priest: An Essay on Clerical Education*. New York: Longman’s, Green and Co., 1908.

Stegmann, Basil Augustine. “Importance to Seminarians of the Present Liturgical Movement.” *Orate Fratres* 6, no. 11 (Oct 1932): 491-501.

Szarnicki, Henry. “The Episcopate of Michael O’Connor First Bishop of Pittsburgh, 1843-1860.” Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 1971.

The Saint Paul Seminary. “The Saint Paul Seminary 2018-2019 Annual Report.” Accessed June 28, 2020. https://semssp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/SPS-Annual-Report-2018-2019-FINAL.pdf.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. *Program of Priestly Formation: Fifth Edition*. Washington, D.C.: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2006. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.usccb.org/beliefs-and-teachings/vocations/priesthood/priestly-formation/upload/ProgramforPriestlyFormation.pdf.

Varacalli, Joseph A. *The Catholic Experience in America*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2006.

Vatican II. *Christus Dominus*. October 28, 1965. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_christus-dominus_en.html.

------. *Dei Verbum*. November 18, 1965. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651118_dei-verbum_en.html.

------. *Gaudium et Spes*. December 7, 1965. Accessed June 28, 2020.

http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19651207_gaudium-et-spes_en.html.

------. *Lumen Gentium*. November 21, 1964. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_en.html.

------. *Optatam Totius*. October 28, 1965. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651028_optatam-totius_en.html.

------. *Presbyterorum Ordinis*. December 7, 1965. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_decree_19651207_presbyterorum-ordinis_en.html.

------. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. December 4, 1963. Accessed June 28, 2020. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html.

Veuillot, Pierre, ed. *The Catholic Priesthood According to the Teaching of the Church: Papal Documents from Pius X to Pius XII*. Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1958.

Vieban, Anthony. "Charitable Work of Seminarians as a Preparation for the Work of Ministry." In *Catholic Educational Association, Report of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Second Annual Meeting*: 249-263. 1905.

------. Anthony Vieban. "Father Tanquerey." Voice (1928).

Wagoner, Walter D. "Seminary Clustering: The Way the Wind Blows." *American Ecclesiastical Review*, CLIX (December, 1968): 378-390.

White, Joseph M. *The Diocesan Seminary in the United States: A History from the 1780s to the Present*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.

------. "Historical Background: A. How the Seminary Developed." In *Reason for the Hope: The Futures of Roman Catholic Theologates*, by Katarina Schuth, 11-28. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1989.

------ and Robert J. Wister. "Leadership: The Study of the Seminary Presidency in Catholic Theological Seminaries." *Theological Education* Volume XXXII Supplement I (1995).

Wister, Robert J. *Stewards of the Mysteries of God: Immaculate Conception Seminary, 1860-2010*. South Orange, NJ: Immaculate Conception Seminary, 2010.

------. “Theological Education in Seminaries.” In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 154-67. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Wood, S.C.L., Susan K. “Liturgy: The Integrative Center of the Theological Disciplines.” In *Theological Education in the Catholic Tradition: Contemporary Challenges*, edited by Patrick W. Carey and Earl C. Muller, S.J., 280-95. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Wroblewski, O.F.M., Sergius. “The Intellectual Climate in Seminary Life.” In *Seminary Education in a Time of Change*, edited by James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., 233-53. Notre Dame, IN: Fides Publishers, 1965.