

A Ressourcement Vision for Graduate Theological Education

Academic Faculty Address-2017

Thomas A. Baima
Mundelein Seminary
August 11, 2017

I want to welcome everyone to the first of our Academic Faculty meetings for the 2017-2018 school year. I hope all of you had a refreshing summer. This meeting is the result of comments by some of you that the academic department did not have the same opportunity as the formation department for planning and interaction. It is for this reason that I added this morning to the meetings at the opening of the school year. We do need time to work together as a group on the common project of seminary education. Those of you who are more senior will remember that we used to meet for two full days at the opening of the school year and again at the opening of the beginning of the new year. Without those meetings, we have lost much of the time we used to work together. So, I hope this morning will restore some of that, and at the same time not wear everyone out.

Here is my plan for the morning. First, I'm going to do some introductions of our new members. Next, I want to offer some remarks about the vision of higher education. I do this because the academic department is entrusted with the responsibility for the intellectual pillars and shares responsibility for the pastoral pillar

with Formation. As such, we are part of the larger higher education enterprise both of this country and of the Catholic Church internationally. I have some thoughts about our location in those wider communities that I want to share. I will also be sharing these thoughts with the adjunct faculty at a later date.

Introductions

We welcome Dr. Christopher Rogers as the Director of the Feehan Memorial Library and McEssy Theological Resource Center. A historian of religion, as well as a professional librarian, he has taught religious studies and history at DePaul University. Christopher will be joining us in about a month or so having served as Electronic Services Librarian and Acting Director of the Paul Bechtold Library at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago.

Let me once again welcome Dr. Elizabeth Sung to Mundelein Seminary. Dr. Sung will be serving for the next two years as the Chester and Margaret Paluch Professor of Theology. A systematic theologian in the Reformed tradition, her research has focused on theological anthropology. For the last nine years, she has been teaching at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School where she was awarded the rank of associate professor. Having concluded her time there, she was looking for a research appointment to give her time to finish two books she has in the works. And we are happy that she will do that work here at USML. Dr. Sung is already known to us as she did a sabbatical semester here in 2013 and has co-taught the Global Theologies course in the North Chicago Theological Institute with me for the past six years. Having a

Protestant theologian with us this year will help us to engage the 500th Anniversary of the Reformation with greater theological nuance. In addition to her Paluch Lectures, Dr. Sung will also teach History of Christian Thought IV in the S.T.L. program, and offer the seminar “Theology and Social Science” in the Doctor of Ministry Program.

I also want to welcome Linda Couri to our academic faculty meetings. Mrs. Couri is not new to USML, having been on the staff of the Institute for Lay Formation since 2009, first as associate director, then as director of students and finally as Institute Director, the position she occupies today. Beginning this year, she will have a joint appointment with the Institute and Mundelein Seminary, in the Department of Pastoral Theology, where she will be assistant professor of pastoral care and counseling. With this experience at the Institute and her background as a clinical social worker, Mrs. Couri’s national work has focused in two areas, evaluation of progress in human formation and the whole area of certification for ecclesial ministry. Additionally, she is a sought after Pro-Life speaker. Along the way, she has been teaching Pastoral Care and Counseling with Fr. Webb and been on the Narrative Preaching team with Fr. Siwek and Fr. Schoenstene. Last year, Fr. Kartje appointed her to serve on the committee which designed the Teaching Parish Program.

A vision of higher education

With these introductions completed, I want to briefly sketch out something I have been thinking about for a long time, the intellectual vision of Mundelein Seminary.

What I am going to describe to you is not my vision, nor is it a new vision. I propose to you a description of the *operative philosophy* of intellectual formation at work here at this seminary for at least the last twenty years. My remarks this morning then are descriptive rather than prescriptive. They are synthetic rather than original. I propose therefore, a *ressourcement*, a return to our best lights. At the same time, I want to suggest that Mundelein Seminary will thrive when we are faithful to these best lights.

In given expression to our operative vision of higher theological education, I have found that we can make several clear statements which stand behind our work here.

Let me share them:

- We often hear that the goal of any seminary is to produce good and holy priests. “Good and holy” are important qualities but they are not sufficient for what is needed in the parish priest of the 21st century. The parish priest must be good, holy, and *competent*. Competence is a particular responsibility of the academic department.¹
- Because of this, Mundelein aspires to a vision of *integral formation* – a both/and approach.² Integral formation begins with the human, is instructed through the spiritual and intellectual and integrated through the pastoral dimensions. These cannot be separated and are each accomplished with an eye for the others.

¹ See *In Fulfillment of Their Mission: The Duties and Tasks of a Roman Catholic Priest, An Assessment Project*, eds. Joseph Ippolito, Mark A. Latcovich, and Joyce Malyn-Smith (Washington, DC: National Catholic Education Association, 2008). This book was the work of a project panel which included Mundelein Seminary professors John G. Lodge, Christopher McAtee and Martin A. Zielinski.

² See Karl Barth, *Die kirchliche Dogmatik* [Church Dogmatics] Vol. I, Pt. 2, 619-20. Quoted from Hans Urs von Balthasar, *The Office of Peter and the Structure of the Church* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986), 303.

- Competence requires a *mastery of specific core content* and competencies.³
- There is a bias in our teaching for the *biblical foundations, doctrinal development and magisterial sources*, before adoption of a particular school of theology.⁴ We are catholic (and that has a small “c”), before we are Augustinian, Thomist, Balthasarian, Post-Liberal or Neo-Patristic.⁵
- We tend to favor approaches which recognize that the *historical dimension* is essential to sound theology.⁶

³ James Matthew Wilson has noted “One central aspiration of modern political ideologies was to efface the traditional vocabularies human beings had used to understand their nature and the nature of the world as a whole, and to replace it with a new one. They hoped thereby that a change in language would result also in a changing in human nature. As human nature has proven intractable stuff in the face of such a radical program, persons in the modern age find themselves grappling with the same realities as their ancestors, even as they stand bereft of the well-seasoned language needed to understand, express, and confront fruitfully the human condition. . . . [We need to equip students] with language adequate to our experience. . . .” (See “Poetry in the Modern Age.” *Modern Age* (Spring 2017), 8.

⁴ The interplay between the disciplines is well described by Joseph Ratzinger in *Jesus of Nazareth* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2007). He makes the point that sound historical/critical exegesis must ground theology, but that theology is not exhausted by exegesis. He cites the work of Brevard Childs, who proposed a method called “canonical criticism” as an example of a fruitful path for theology vis-à-vis exegesis. Childs own work sought to reintroduce the Creed as a rule of faith which would guide and govern biblical interpretation. See *The Rule of Faith: Scripture, Canon, Creed in a Critical Age*, ed. Ephraim Radner (New York: Morehouse Publications, 1998).

⁵ The customary nomenclature is to speak of five schools of Catholic theology, Augustinian, Thomist, Franciscan (Bonaventure) , Scotus and Christian Humanist. For a discussion of this customary list see C. Colt Anderson, *A Call To Piety: Saint Bonaventure’s Collations on the Six Days* (Quincy, IL: Franciscan Press, 2002). In the contemporary period, the notion of “schools” has expanded greatly. To the customary list must surely be added Feminist theology and Liberationist theology which represent significant schools in Catholic thought. Also, theological schools are crossing confessional borders in ways not previously seen. Two major schools in Eastern Orthodoxy, the Russian School and the Neo-Patristic School each have had effects on Catholic theology, as has had the Post-Liberal School and what could collectively be called the Evangelical school. For a treatment of this diversification of schools see *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, ed. David F. Ford, with Rachel Muers (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).

⁶ By the “historical dimension” I am broadly referring to two related, but distinct things: a greater awareness of the need to use the historical method to establish context for biblical and theological interpretation, and the development of historical theology as a distinct discipline in theology. A modern phenomenon, historical theology, which can loosely be traced to the Reformation and Christian Humanism, develops as a distinct discipline and method especially in the late 19th and early 20th centuries through the efforts of John Henry Newman, Johann Adam Moeller and others. For a sense of the origins in the 15th and 16th centuries, see J. Laurel Carrington, “Desiderius Erasmus” in *The Reformation Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Carter Lindberg (Oxford: Blackwell

- Regardless of our discipline, we look to the *papal encyclicals* and other documents to frame the overarching issues which contemporary theology must confront.⁷
- Experience, especially *pastoral experience* is viewed as a legitimate source of knowledge and indispensable as a context for theological learning.⁸

I limited myself to these seven points. Any of you could add several more points to better describe Mundelein. Still I think these seven give us a basis for our discussion.

Whether we knew it or not the curricular choices we have made over the past two decades have made us partisans in the wider debates about higher education. And since I think we have made very good choices, I want to illustrate that by describing the polarization in higher education today, because it affects our incoming students in multiple ways. Part of my reason for attempting a robust description of the intellectual vision of Mundelein is that we academics have a pastoral responsibility to help our seminarians navigate their way out of the world and into the priesthood. And in the years that I have been dean, I have observed that some of their implicit views of

Publishing, 2002), 34-48. In the contemporary period, it would be the work of the patristic movement that would develop historical theology to a distinct discipline.

⁷ Robert Barron has argued that a distinctive feature of Mundelein Seminary was to view the contemporary issues through the lens of the papal encyclicals. This was a favored approach of Reynold Hillenbrand, the second rector. Hillenbrand used the social encyclicals as agenda defining texts for seminary formation. This was novel at the time when neo-scholasticism was the official theological method of the Jesuit faculty at Mundelein. For an excellent treatment of that moment in our seminary's history see Robert Tuzik, *Reynold Hillenbrand: The Reform of the Catholic Liturgy and the Call to Social Action* (Chicago: Hillenbrand Books, 2010).

⁸ Experience is a difficult and challenging source of authority. It requires significant qualification for sin is part of experience and sin has no epistemic value. Still, if experience is holy, it is a way to knowledge of the truth. Archimandrite Vasileios notes: "If the . . . theologian gives guidance to the believer, then equally the believer, fighting the good fight in the Church, directs and lights the way for theological knowledge." See Archimandrite Vasileios of Starvonitika, *Hymn of Entry* (New York: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984), 23-24. For the full context in which I developed this theme, see Thomas A. Baima, "The Nature of Theology" -- Academic Address to the University of Saint Mary of the Lake (April 10, 2013) <https://usml.edu/wp-content/uploads/Academic-Address-April-2013.pdf>

education are preventing them from doing this effectively. For this reason, let me now turn to the situation of higher education from which our students come.

Higher Education in the 20th Century

In order to explore Mundelein's relationship to the wider world of higher education, I want to refer you to a fascinating little book, *Searching for Utopia: Universities and their Histories*, by Hanna Gray. Dr. Gray is the former president of the University of Chicago, and professor emerita who worked in the areas of Renaissance and Reformation political thought. Dr. Gray or Ms. Gray as she would be called at "The University," noted that "the idea of the idea of a university has a history of its own and one which is much shorter than the history of the university itself."⁹

To explore this, Gray turns to John Henry Newman. While she will eventually take a more moderate position than Cardinal Newman, she nevertheless acknowledges that *The Idea of a University* frames the discussion from the time of its publication to today. She notes that an idea must be more than "a commitment to excellence or to be the best."¹⁰ An idea, such as this, must be both "shaping and unifying."¹¹

Gray notes that the two poles in American visions of education are Chicago and Harvard, articulated by those school's presidents in the first half of the twentieth century. The two men had starkly different visions for shaping and unifying higher

⁹ Hanna Holborn Gray, *Searching for Utopia: Universities and Their Histories* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: University of California Press, 2012), 31.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

education. The Harvard idea, largely described by Charles Elliot favored five specific notions.¹²

- Diverse centers of control
- Elective curriculum
- Strong departments
- A single school as a multiversity
- Specialization

The Chicago idea, largely described by Robert Maynard Hutchins was contrary in every respect.¹³ It favored:

- A strong administration
- A fixed curriculum
- The abolition of departments
- Applied studies in separate institutes

¹² See James T. Burtchaell, *The Dying of the Light: The Disengagement of Colleges and Universities from their Christian Churches* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 573. Burtchaell notes that Elliot, who was known for his opposition to the Jesuits, also “harbored disdain for almost all orthodox Christians.” This also falls into the context of the rapid conversion of New England from Congregationalism to Unitarianism, such that by the time of Elliot’s presidency Harvard was for all practical purposes a Unitarian school. See also Timothy Brosnahan, S.J., *President Elliot and Jesuit Colleges in Sacred Heart Review*, (January 13, 1900). At fundamental issue is whether the classical heritage should have pride of place in the curriculum. When coupled with the advance of Unitarian doctrine, with its plural notion of truth, the theological implications of Elliot’s approach become clearer.

¹³ Notable, in light of Elliot’s hostility to orthodox Christianity, was Robert Maynard Hutchins contention that the religious spirit which brought about the founding of the University of Chicago must both dominate the University and endure as part of its permanent ethos. See *Annual of the Northern Baptist Convention, 1930*, 98-105. At the same time as President Hutchins made this statement, the University was in a struggle to sever ties with the controlling ecclesiastical body, the American Baptist Education Society. While William Rainey Harper and Robert Maynard Hutchins held a Christian vision of “field encompassing science” neither the faculty nor the governing board(s) shared it. Rather they “participated selectively.” So, while I agree with the elements of Hutchins’ vision, the University of Chicago cannot be described as an integrated institution as John Kartje or I are using that term. See Burtchael, op. cit., 400.

- Interdisciplinary collaboration

These characterizations are, of course, heuristics, but carry the feel of truth to anyone who had been around this place for a while. Of course, as a Catholic seminary, having a strong administration should go without saying.¹⁴

Regarding curriculum, we have run the gambit. Some of you at this table remember your own days of scholarship here, during the period when there were no required courses and only the area examinations. My class arrived in 1976, shortly after the reintroduction of required classes. About one-third of our studies were so designated.¹⁵ By the time I returned here in the 1999-2000 school year, about three-fifths of the classes were required because of the species known as the “designated elective.”¹⁶ Then, in the 2013 curriculum revision the faculty, by overwhelming majority, moved to an all-required curriculum, yet with a creative option for continuing electives, but in such a way that they were truly elective. I’d like to explore this point further in the coming year to see if we can think creatively about other elective options, such as single session “Master Classes,” and perhaps “supervisions,” a concept Paul Hilliard knows well from Cambridge and John Lodge, Larry Hennessey and I know from our sabbaticals or summer term studies at Oxford.

¹⁴ Can. 260 “In carrying out their proper functions, all must obey the rector, to whom it belongs to care for the daily supervision of the seminary according to the norm of the program of priestly formation and of the rule of the seminary.”

¹⁵ See “Catalog of Saint Mary of the Lake Seminary, 1976” (Mundelein, IL: University of Saint Mary of the Lake, 1976).

¹⁶ See “Catalog of Mundelein Seminary, 1999-2000” (Mundelein, IL: University of Saint Mary of the Lake, 1999).

Mundelein has never had strong subject-level departments.¹⁷ We have favored instead, strong degree programs such as the M.Div., the D.Min. or S.T.L. This has made us more interdisciplinary than other ATS seminaries with whom I interact. And building on the history of the S.T.L. program being operated as a distinct program alongside the M.Div., in the last 20 years, we have developed specialized institutes, following this model, though without perhaps knowing that was what we were doing.¹⁸

After studying Gray's work, I am convinced that we are far more united than we credit ourselves. Indeed, I would argue that we have a compelling vision, a better way to do higher education, which exactly supports graduate seminary formation. I make this claim because the differences between the Harvard model and the Chicago model represent governing values. The choices we have made over the years align us with a set of governing values which are necessary for an education in a seminary and opposed to those values found in a secular university.

Reading Hanna Gray's book gave me language, which helps me to describe what so many of you and our former colleagues have shaped here over the years. Dr. Gray describes Robert Maynard Hutchins and Clark Kerr as the two main figures of higher education ideas in the early 20th century.¹⁹ Hutchins and Kerr were strong critics of

¹⁷ I don't mean we did not have strong academics. I mean that as a structure in the University, the departments have not been our major focus.

¹⁸ USML has six component schools and institutes: Mundelein Seminary, the Pontifical Faculty of Theology, the Liturgical Institute, the Institute for Lay Formation, the Institute for Diaconal Studies, the Institute for Ongoing Formation and the Hispanic Institute/Instituto de Liderazgo Pastoral.

¹⁹ See Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001). See also Robert Maynard Hutchins, *Higher Learning in America* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1962) and *Education for Freedom* (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1943).

each other. At root was a difference in vision of what a school should be. Both, Grey argues, were utopians, though following different paths. While Hutchins followed an idealist path and Kerr a pragmatic one – both were seeking a utopian vision where education would change society. The root difference, Gray claims, lay in the conflict between a collegiate university aimed at fostering the liberal arts and the formation of young people as bearers of the virtues of that classical tradition (Hutchins’ view) and a graduate research university aimed at a commitment to specialized scholarship, and professional training.²⁰ Both men believed they were articulating “an integral idea of a single university culture.”²¹ Gray puts it most starkly when she says describes the divide was between “the collegiate university and that of the professionalized multiversity.”²² My reaction when I read the word “multiversity” was to recoil, remembering a comment by Francis Cardinal George, a former philosophy professor who cared very deeply about words, who said “Words mean things. They need to distinguish as well as include. If everything is ministry then nothing is ministry.”²³

In our world of theological education, perhaps a theological union exemplifies the multiversity.²⁴ I know that Fr. Larry Hennessey had direct experience of this model

²⁰ Gray, *Op. cit.*, 3.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, 29.

²³ Francis Cardinal George, “Remarks” to the annual Lay Ecclesial Ministry candidates, Quigley Center, December 2013.

²⁴ The model of a theological union is the product of the consolidation of religious order seminaries in the 1960’s where individual orders closed their seminaries and merged the academic departments into a single union, responsible for the intellectual formation of their members. Human, spiritual and to a certain extent pastoral formation was carried out in the orders residential houses of formation. This model stands in contrast to the diocesan seminaries which, for the most part, are comprehensive institutions having all four dimensions of formation.

from his time at Washington Theological Union. Linda Couri know it from her work with the lay ecclesial ministry programs with Catholic Theological Union in Chicago and Christopher Rogers was on the faculty of CTU. Theological unions run programs which seek to serve diverse student bodies, some in ministry formation, some in advanced academic study for higher research, some for personal enrichment, some in job training. The union is marked by pluriformity. This follows somewhat the Harvard approach.

Mundelein's model of treating the separate vocational groups as distinct "colleges" seems to mirror the collegiate model as Gray describes it. At root is a concern to care for the specific student bodies, but bounded by their particularity. Certainly, the theological unions care for their students, but academics are one size fits all. The academics are the same while the students are different. Our stress begins with the identity of the ministerial vocation (priestly, diaconal, lay ecclesial, vocational). The identity to be formed guides the academic formation and shapes it in a distinctive way suited to the distinct student groups. Seminarians study in classrooms with other candidates for the priesthood. Deacon candidates do the same, as to lay ecclesial ministry candidates. This insight helped me understand something unique in our way of being a school.

USML can also be understood as heir to the Renaissance or Christian humanism. I say this based on hard evidence, the names of the scholars inscribed in the main

reading room of the Feehan Memorial Library.²⁵ So, I want to say just a bit about the Christian humanistic vision of the Renaissance. Gray, drawing in part of the work of Thomas More, writes:

[they] defined essential knowledge as mastering already existing truth rather than as a process of making new and accumulating discoveries that went beyond the inheritance of the past. The second is that the manner of achieving such knowledge was essentially text based; it was to take place through the recovery and understanding of the works of classical antiquity. Finally, the reading of such texts was an education in the subjects regarded as together encompassing a unity in which all were interrelated and in which each subject of the liberal arts represented a particular approach to the same set of basic truths. . . . over time [this vision] came to shape an idea of a collegiate university and its function of training the individual of general competence, the thoughtful citizen, the cultivated person.²⁶

In other words, humanism was a vision of integral formation. Playing out the vision of Thomas More, Gray writes, and I am paraphrasing her for brevity:

It was “the molding of human character . . . an education valuable in itself and not for what it might prepare a person to do. . . . Such an education creates a way of life that can be translated into positive and active practice and conduct,

²⁵ Eusebius + John Chrysostom + Augustine + Jerome + Aquinas + Venerable Bede + Dante + Alphonsus + Ligouri + Baronius + Thomas a’Kempis + Robert Bellarmine + Duns Scotus + Cervantes + Jacques-Benigne Bossuet + John Dryden + Nicholas Copernicus + Alessandro Manzoni + Peter Canisus + Newman + Orestes Brownson

²⁶ Grey, *Op. cit.*, 35.

whether of the citizen and participant in public life, of the private individual seeking both cultivation and ethical conduct, or of the scholar, philosopher; and teacher [and I would add priest or ecclesial minister].²⁷

Peter Augustine Lawler explored tradition and innovation and offered an additional insight. He proposed that,

culture is meant to be a comprehensive category, incorporating all the best that has been thought, said, performed and done. . . . [It concerns itself with *Scientia* – or knowledge of the way things really are – can be found not only in reports of scientific research but also in treatises, dialogues, novels, confessions, prayers, plays, poetry, music, speeches, and so forth. . . . Joseph Ratzinger reminded us that theology is a science, and Walker Percy said that diagnostic novels are scientific too. The category “cultural” overcomes the alienating and unrealistically abstract distinctions between the social sciences and the humanities, philosophy and tradition, nature and history, and even Anglo-American empiricism and Continental existentialism (and its various post-modern children).²⁸

John Henry Newman added an interesting point which follows from Thomas More’s insights. For Cardinal Newman, the collegiate university exists for teaching. Research

²⁷ Ibid., 36.

²⁸ Peter Augustine Lawler, “Tradition, Innovation, and *Modern Age*,” in *Modern Age* (Spring 2017), 3-4. Lawler goes on to note that according to Roger Scruton, to really achieve knowledge, in the sense Lawler is using it above, it is necessary to be non-ideological, so that one can approach the modern period critically, but without “rejecting the Enlightenment achievements of the separation of church and state, representative government and the free economy.” I would add the articulation of human rights as distinct from civil rights and the expanded notion of freedom of religion.

is not the business of a university. Research belongs to the academy, which he envisioned as a separate institution composed of individuals, working for the most part on their own for the advancement of knowledge. The academy was a guild of research scholars while the university was a place for teachers.²⁹ The merging of the two ideas and the intrusion of the second into the first is largely responsible for what has made the modern university a confused place and the teaching of theology in Catholic universities so difficult in the contemporary period.

The other insight from Newman that Gray highlights is his stress on the relationship of faith to reason. Newman's goal, according to Gray, "was to find the means, by which, the training of the mind and the unity of [universal knowledge] understood as a good in itself, could be given life and power in a way that would be congruent also with the prescriptions of faith and obedience."³⁰ And if you want to see such an integration of knowledge and have not viewed John Kartje's lecture from the Adler Planetarium, I urge you to do so.³¹ I hope that we can succeed in endowing a Center for Faith and Science, which can build on his success with the Templeton project in the M.A. (Philosophy and Religion) curriculum.

I believe that this uncovers another dimension of Mundelein, which is our shared conviction that Christian theology is a unified discipline. While we have specializations, biblical, patristic, philosophical, dogmatic, moral, historical, spiritual,

²⁹ Gray, *Op. cit.*, 39.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 40. See also John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996), 78-79, 89-90, 98, 99, 109, 125-26.

³¹ See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QjYaPCufDWM>

practical, we nevertheless are engaged in a single enterprise called *theology*, and we have things to say across specialized lines. Matthew Levering's Center for Scriptural Exegesis, Philosophy and Doctrine aspires to just such a notion of the unity of theology. And speaking of Matthew's center, it is true to Newman's vision of mentoring young scholars in the academy. Our STL program does this for our own students and The Center mentors graduate and post-graduate students from universities across the Midwest, who may be the future scholars of theology in the universities.

These notions, that knowledge is the mastery of *already existing truth*, that education is about the *molding of human character*, that culture is a *comprehensive category*, that the university exists for *teaching*, that faith and reason are *inseparably related*, and that Christian theology is a *unified discipline*, describe in shape detail the content of integral intellectual formation as we have developed it a Mundelein.

Application

So, how do we apply such an integral vision? How might we recognize integration when it occurs on the academic side of our house? The broad learning approach described by the humanistic tradition seems the right measure. To apply it to priestly formation, I might suggest an ecclesiological frame.

The four marks of the Church offer us a comprehensive way to approach this question. Unity, sanctity, wholeness, and perdurance must be elements of our way of being instructors. I am using the descriptive terms I favored when I taught the treatise

on ecclesiology.³² These terms were a way to move our students past piety to a focus on meaning. Aligning them with the values Hanna Grey noted,

- Perdurance means we are not looking for fads, no matter how popular with our own age cohort. We seek truth that will last.
- Whole-ism is a better word than universal for translating catholic from Greek. Catholic means “according to the whole.” It refers to both geographical extent, and at the same time to a measuring standard. The Catholic mark of the Church asks the singular to be accountable to the particular, and asks the particular to be accountable to the universal.³³ It also denies ideological polarization a foothold.
- Sanctity is necessary for any true quest for truth. In each of our classrooms, our first goal must be, as Fr. Scott Hebden says: “to intensify our relationship with Jesus Christ.”³⁴ Or from the Christian East, “A theologian is one who prays and anyone who does not pray cannot be a theologian.”

³² See Thomas Aquinas, *Conferences on the Apostles' Creed* (South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 129.

³³ I am using here a terminological proposal by Chor-bishop John Farris. See John Farris, *The Communion of Catholic Churches: Terminology and Ecclesiology* (Rome: Pontifical Oriental Institute Press, 1985). Chor-bishop Farris proposes the introduction of the scholastic triad of universal/particular/singular regarding the classification of entities into conciliar ecclesiology. While Thomas Aquinas does not employ the triad (using universal/singular instead) both Peter Abelard and Albert the Great do use this Aristotelian framework. Farris' argument, as I read him, is that based on the canonical tradition, the three-fold scheme would better express the actuality of the churches existing as they do in a communion which has a universal dimension through communion with Rome and her Bishop, with other local churches bound together by rite and tradition (which he calls the particular church) and the local diocese/eparchy to which he gives the name singular. Even as I try out his nomenclature, I realize that from a theological perspective, more work needs to be done as the universal and the local exist by divine right, while the mediate structures are of ecclesiastical right. While I find his argument appealing, a theological warrant is needed to press it to the extent which he does canonically. I am hopeful that Pope Francis' stress on synodality might produce the theological basis to establish Chor-bishop Farris' argument.

³⁴ W. Scott Hebden, “Christology” Unpublished lecture, University of Saint Mary of the Lake, 2013).

- Unity, both of knowledge but also among the body of scholars, is necessary for a school to succeed in this vision. Unity does not mean agreement on arguments, everyone teaching the same thing in lock step. No, unity means accepting the marvelous diversity in theology, spirituality, liturgy, and canon law which makes up the Catholic Church while agreeing in faith, sacramental life and the ordered ministry. Unity in the essentials is required, which is why we are installed to this faculty by pronouncing the *Profession of Faith and Oath of Fidelity*.³⁵ But this unity admits enough diversity to let the Roman Canon and the Anaphora of Addai and Mari to stand side by side as valid forms for confecting the Eucharist. That is an example of a broad view of orthodoxy.

If we can work from this viewpoint, we can more easily support one another in our mutual effort at teaching. Just like Newman, our primary task is teaching. Yes, I want you to do research and to contribute to the advancement of your disciplines through scholarly academies, but the idea is one of a teacher who also does research, not the other way around. Even our endowed professorships like Matthew Levering and Elizabeth Sung hold include teaching as an essential part of their service.

Support of one another means that we need to know what each other are doing in the classroom. One of the comments from the colloquium on *Amoris Laetitia* discussion which really stuck with me was when one student said he had never seen

³⁵ See

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc_con_cfaith_doc_19880701_professio-fidei_en.html (accessed August 14, 2017)

teachers disagree collegially. Another said that while the students knew that certain professors held different theological opinions, he was surprised to learn that we knew that. He was surprised we knew what our colleagues were teaching. Those comments disclose moments of witness to the four values. I encourage you to find more opportunities, both formal and informal to know each other's work and thought.

Additionally, we need to know what our sisters and brothers in the Formation Department are doing. I mean that we really need to know what's happening in their formation sessions, and they need to know what you are doing in the classrooms. I see teaching and advising as two arms in the work of sanctifying the men entrusted to our care. Please consider personally inviting one or another of the formation advisors to sit in on one or several of your classes. Let them get to know you as a teacher and to have a better sense of what is happening with the students under their care. And I'd challenge you to use the Faculty Dining Room to build personal relationships with colleagues in the other department.

Finally, we need to form "shepherds fitting for the sheep they will serve." I said at the outset that my goal with this talk was to offer some remarks about the vision of higher education. All of the information I have gathered from other academic deans in the Association of Theological Schools indicates that our students are bringing their experience of undergraduate higher education into their formation, and that it is producing a kind of static which impedes them from fully engaging our program. I have tried to analyze the source of that static using the insights from Dr. Hanna Gray on a long-term polarization which exists in American higher education theory. I have also

tried to describe what I see as the organic development over the last 20 plus years, of an integrated educational vision here at Mundelein. Finally, I have described in brief how the integration we have heard about the past two days might practically happen on the academic side of the Mundelein house.

We have been living in this situation of students bringing their experience of polarization with them into formation for at least the last two decades. You have heard my reflections on it, and I would very much like to hear yours. In particular, I hope we can discuss the worldview struggles we see our students having and if you have had some success in your classrooms addressing these struggles that you could share that.

Thank you.